OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

3-4 GEORGE V., 1912-13

VOL. CVII.

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



OTTAWA
PRINTED BY C. H. PARMELEE, PRINTER TO THE KING'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY
1912-13

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

K.C., LL.D.

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1912-13

CABINET FORMED OCTOBER 10, 1911

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Rt. Hon. Robert Laird Borden, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Hon. George Eulas Foster, B.A., D.C.L., LL.D.
Without Portfolio	Hon. George Halsey Perley, B.A.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. William James Roche, M.D.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. Robert Rogers.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. Francis Cochrane.
Minister of Finance	Hon. William Thomas White, B.A.
Postmaster General	Hon. Louis Philippe Pelletier, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service	Hon. John Douglas Hazen, K.C., B.A., B.C.L.
Minister of Justice	Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty, K.C., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. Sam. Hughes.
Secretary of State	Hon. Louis Coderre, LL.B., K.C.
Minister of Labour	Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers, K.C., B.A
Minister of Inland Revenue and Minister of Mines	Hon. Wilfrid Bruno Nantel, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Customs	Hon. John Dowsley Reid, M.D.
Without Portfolio	Hon. Albert Edward Kemp.
Without Portfolio	Hon. James Alexander Lougheed, K.C., Senator.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. Martin Burrell.

Clerk of the Privy Council ..... R. Boudreau.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. T. S. Sproule	Speaker.
Mr. P. E. Blondin, M.P.	Deputy Speaker.
Mr. T. B. Flint	Clerk of the House.
Mr. J. B. R. Laplante	Assistant to the Clerk.
Lieut.-Col. Henry Robert Smith	Serjeant-at-Arms.
Capt. H. W. Bowie	Deputy Serjeant-at-Arms

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

Albert Horton	Editor.
Thos. P. Owens	Associate Editor.
J. O. Marceau	Reporters.
Alphonse Desjardins	
A. C. Campbell	
George Simpson	
R. C. Dunbar	
C. S. Blue	
F. W. S. Galbraith	
E. C. Young	
Chas. W. Boyce	Assistant to Editor.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1912-13

ACHIM, HONORÉ—Labelle.
AIKINS, JAMES ALBERT MANNING—Brandon.
ALGUIRE, DUNCAN ORESTES—Stormont.
AMES, HERBERT BROWN—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ARMSTRONG, J. A. MACDONALD—York (O.), N. Riding.
ARMSTRONG, JOSEPH E.—Lambton, E. Riding.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BAKER, GEORGE HAROLD—Brome.
BALL, R. J.—Grey, S. Riding.
BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton, East.
BARNARD, GEORGE HENRY—Victoria (B.C.)
BARRETTE, JOSEPH ARTHUR—Berthier.
BEATTIE, THOMAS—London.
BÉLAND, Hon. HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BELLEMARE, A.—Maskinongé.
BENNETT, RICHARD BEDFORD—Calgary.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E. Riding.
BEST, JOHN A.—Dufferin.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLONDIN, PIERRE EDOUARD—Champlain.
BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY——Shefford.
BORDEN, RT. HON. ROBERT LAIRD—Halifax.
BOULAY, HERMÉNÉGILDE—Rimouski.
BOURASSA, J. BOUTIN—Lévis.
BOWMAN, JAMES—Huron. E. Riding.
BOYCE, ARTHUR CYRIL—Algoma West.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil.
BOYS, W. A.—South Simcoe.
BRABAZON, GERALD H.—Pontiac.
BRADBURY, GEORGE HENRY—Selkirk.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto, Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BROUILLARD, OVIDE—Drummond and Arthabaska.
BROWN, JAMES POLLOCK—Châteauguay.
BUCHANAN, WILLIAM ASHBURY—Medicine Hat.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURNHAM, JOHN H.—Peterborough, W. Riding.
BURRELL, HON. MARTIN—Yale-Cariboo.

CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.
CARRICK, JOHN JAMES—Thunder Bay and Rainy Riv.
CARROLL, W. F.—Cape Breton, South.
CARVELL, FRANK BROADSTREET—Carleton, N.B.
CASH, EDWARD L.—Mackenzie.
CHABOT, JOHN LEO—Ottawa.
CHAMPAGNE, ALBERT—Battleford.
CHARLTON, WILLIAM ANDREW—Norfolk.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CHISHOLM, WILLIAM—Antigonish.
CLARE, GEORGE A.—Waterloo, S. Riding.
CLARK, HUGH—Bruce, N. Riding.
CLARK, MICHAEL—Red Deer.
CLARKE, ALFRED HENRY—Essex, S. Riding.
CLARKE, W. A.—Wellington, N. Riding.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT SYLVESTER—Comox-Atlin.
COCHRANE, HON. FRANCIS—Nipissing.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM FOSTER—Brantford.
CODERRE, LOUIS—Hochelaga.
CROCKET, OSWALD SMITH—York, N.B.
CROMWELL, FREDERICK ROBERT—Compton.
CROTHERS, HON. THOMAS WILSON—Elgin, W Riding.
CRUISE, ROBERT—Dauphin.
CURRIE, JOHN ALLISTER—Simcoe, N. Riding.

DAVIDSON, AVARD L.—Annapolis.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, MARIE JOSEPH—St. John and Iberville.
DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DOHERTY, HON. CHARLES JOSEPH—Montreal, St. Anne.
DONNELLY, JAMES J.—Bruce, S. Riding.
DOUGLAS, JAMES M.—Strathcona.

EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELLIOTT, GEORGE A.—Middlesex, N. Riding.
ELSON, PETER—Middlesex, E. Riding.
EMMERSON, HON. HENRY ROBERT—Westmorland.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Two Mountains
FISHER, JOHN HENRY—Brant.
FORGET, SIR RODOLPHE—Charlevoix & Montmorency.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOSTER, ARTHUR DE WITT, Kings, N.S.
FOSTER, HON. GEORGE EULAS—Toronto, North.
FOWLER, GEORGE WILLIAM—Kings and Albert.
FRIPP, ALFRED ERNEST—Ottawa.

GARLAND, W. F.—Carleton.

GAUTHIER, LOUIS JOSEPH. St. Hyacinthe.
GAUTHIER, LOUIS PHILIPPE—Gaspé.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLEY—Welland.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GORDON, DAVID ALEXANDER—Kent, E. Riding.
GRAHAM, HON. GEORGE P.—Renfrew, S. Riding.
GREEN, R. F.—Kootenay.
GUILBAULT, JOSEPH PIERRE OCTAVE—Joliette.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HAGGART, HON. JOHN GRAHAM—Lanark, S. Riding.
HARTT, THOMAS A.—Charlotte.
HAZEN, HON. JAMES DOUGLAS—St. John City and County.
HENDERSON, DAVID—Halton.
HEPBURN, BERNARD RICKART—Prince Edward.
HUGHES, JAMES JOSEPH—Kings, (P.E.I.).
HUGHES, HON. SAMUEL—Victoria, (O.).

JAMESON, CLARENCE—Digby.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERICK—Missisquoi.
KEMP, HON. ALBERT EDWARD—Toronto, East.
KNOWLES, WILLIAM ERSKINE—Moosejaw.
KYTE, GEORGE W.—Richmond, (N.S.).

LACHANCE, ARTHUR—Quebec Centre.
LAFORTUNE, DAVID A.—Montcalm.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSAY—Haldimand.
LAMARCHE, PAUL EMILE—Nicolet.
LANCASTER, EDWARD A.—Lincoln and Niagara.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie-Napierville.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Kamouraska.
LAPOINTE, LOUIS A.—Montreal, St. James.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, P.C., G.C.M.G.—Quebec, East, Soulanges.
LAVALLÉE, JOSEPH OCTAVE—Bellechasse.
LAW, BOWMAN BROWN—Yarmouth.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—Rouville.
LESPERANCE, DAVID OVIDE—Montmagny.
LEWIS, EDWARD NORMAN—Huron, W. Riding.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland, (N.B.)
LOVELL, CHARLES HENRY—Stanstead.

MACDONALD, EDWARD MORTIMER—Pictou.
MACDONELL, ANGUS CLAUDE—Toronto, South.
MACLEAN, ALEXANDER K.—Halifax.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, (O.), S. Riding.
MACNUTT, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
MCCRANEY, GEORGE E.—Saskatoon.
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE—Kent, W. Riding.
MCCURDY, FLEMING BLANCHARD—Shelburne and Queens.
MCKAY, JAMES—Prince Albert.
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton, N.
MCLEAN, ANGUS A.—Queens, P.E.I.
MCLEAN, HUGH HAVELOCK—Sunbury and Queens.
MCMILLAN, JOHN ANGUS—Glengarry.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARSHALL, DAVID—Elgin, E. Riding.
MARTIN, MÉDERIC—Montreal, St. Mary's.
MARTIN, WILLIAM MELVILLE—Regina.
MEIGHEN, ARTHUR—Portage la Prairie.
MERNER, JONATHAN JOSEPH—Huron, S. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Victoria, (N.B.)
MIDDLEBRO, WILLIAM SORA—Grey, N. Riding.
MOLLOY, JOHN PATRICK—Provencher.
MONDOU, A. A.—Yamaska.
MONK, HON. FREDERICK DEBARTZCH.—Jacques Cartier.
MORPHY, H. B.—Perth, N. Riding.
MORRISON, A.—Macdonald.
MUNSON, CHARLES ARTHUR—Northumberland, (O.). W. Riding.
MURPHY, HON. CHARLES—Russell.

NANTEL, WILFRID BRUNO—Terrebonne.
NEELY, DAVIS BRADLEY—Humboldt.
NESBITT, EDWARD WALTER—Oxford, N. Riding.
NICHOLSON, DONALD—Queens, (P.E.I.).
NICKLE, WILLIAM FOLGER—Kingston.
NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E. Riding.

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

PACAUD, LUCIEN TURCOTTE—Megantic.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS J.—Beauharnois.
PAQUET, EUGÈNE—L'Islet.
PARDEE, FREDERICK FORSYTH—Lambton, W. Riding.
PAUL, WILLIAM JAMES—Lennox and Addington.
PELLETIER, HON, LOUIS PHILIPPE—Quebec County.
PERLEY, HON. GEORGE HALSEY—Argenteuil.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, WILLIAM—Quebec West.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.
PUGSLEY, HON. WILLIAM—St. John City.

RAINVILLE, JOSEPH HORMISDAS—Chambly and Verchéres.
REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, HON. JOHN D.—Grenville.
RHODES, EDGAR N.—Cumberland.
RICHARDS, JAMES W.—Prince, (P.E.I.).
ROBB, JAMES ALEXANDER—Huntingdon.
ROBIDOUX, FERDINAND JOSEPH—Kent, (N. B.).
ROCHE, HON. WILLIAM JAMES—Marquette.
ROGERS, HON. ROBERT—Winnipeg.
ROSS, DUNCAN CAMPBELL—Middlesex, W. Riding.

SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK LAURENCE—Souris.
SEGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption.
SEVIGNY, ALBERT—Dorchester.
SEXSMITH, JOHN A.—Peterborough, E. Riding.
SHARPE, SAMUEL—Ontario, N. Riding.
SHARPE, WILLIAM HENRY—Lisgar.
SHEPHERD, FRANCIS HENRY—Nanaimo.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Guysborough.
SMITH, WILLIAM—Ontario, S. Riding.
SMYTH, WILLIAM ROSS—Algoma E. Riding.
SPROULE, HON. THOMAS SIMPSON—Grey, E. Riding.

STANFIELD, JOHN—Colchester.
STEELE, MICHAEL—Perth, S. Riding.
STEVENS, HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver.
STEWART, DUGALD—Lunenburg.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton, West.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

TAYLOR, JAMES DAVIS—New Westminster.
THOBURN, WILLIAM—Lanark, N. Riding.
THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon Territory.
THOMSON, LEVI—Qu'Appelle.
THORNTON, CHARLES JONAS—Durham.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TREMAIN, HADLEY B.—Hants.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN GILLANDERS—Assiniboia.

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—Maisonneuve.

WALKER, HENRY JOSEPH—Northumberland, (O.), E. Riding.
WALLACE, THOMAS GEORGE—York (O.) Centre.
WARNOCK, DAVID—Macleod.
WEBSTER, JOHN—Brockville.
WEICHEL, WILLIAM GEORGE—Waterloo, N. Riding
WHITE, GERALD VERNER—Renfrew, N. Riding.
WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY—Victoria, (Alta.).
WHITE, HON. WILLIAM THOMAS—Leeds.
WILCOX, OLIVER J.—Essex, N. Riding.
WILSON, CHARLES AVILA—Laval.
WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.
WRIGHT, WILLIAM—Muskoka.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION, TWELFTH PARLIAMENT

1912-13

ALGOMA, EAST—William Ross Smyth.
ALGOMA, WEST—Arthur Cyril Boyce.
ANNAPOLIS—Avard L. Davidson.
ANTIGONISH—William Chisholm.
ARGENTEUIL—Hon. George Halsey Perley.
ASSINIBOIA—John Gillanders Turriff.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BATTLEFORD—Albert Champagne.
BEAUCE—Hon. Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—Louis J. Papineau.
BELLECHASSE—Joseph Octave Lavallée.
BERTHIER—J. A. Barrette.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Charles Marcil.
BRANDON—J. A. M. Aikins.
BRANT—John Henry Fisher.
BRANTFORD—William F. Cockshutt.
BROCKVILLE—John Webster.
BROME—George H. Baker.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—Hugh Clark.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—James J. Donnelly.

CALGARY—R. B. Bennett.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Daniel D. McKenzie.
CAPE BRETON, SOUTH—W. F. Carroll.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frank Broadstreet Carvell.
CARLETON (O.)—W. F. Garland.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—J. H. Rainville.
CHAMPLAIN—Pierre Edouard Blondin.
CHARLEVOIX—Sir Rodolphe Forget.
CHARLOTTE—Thomas A. Hartt.
CHATEAUGUAY—James P. Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—John Stanfield.
COMOX-ATLIN—H. S. Clements.
COMPTON—F. R. Cromwell.
CUMBERLAND—Edgar N. Rhodes.

DAUPHIN—Robert Cruise.
DIGBY—Clarence Jameson.
DORCHESTER—Albert Sevigny.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Ovide Brouillard.
DUFFERIN—John A. Best.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM—Charles Jonas Thornton.

EDMONTON—Hon. Frank Oliver.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—David Marshall.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Oliver J. Wilcox.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Alfred H. Clarke.

FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

GASPÉ—Louis Philippe Gauthier.
GLENGARRY—John Angus McMillan.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—Hon. John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Simpson Sproule.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Sora Middlebro.
GREY, S. RIDING—R. J. Ball.
GUYSBOROUGH—J. H. Sinclair.

HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX—Rt. Hon. Robert Laird Borden. A. K. Maclean.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON, EAST—Samuel Barker.
HAMILTON, WEST—Thomas Joseph Stewart.
HANTS—Hadley B. Tremain.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Louis Coderre.
HUMBOLDT—David Bradley Neely.
HUNTINGDON—James Alexander Robb.
HURON, E. RIDING—James Bowman.
HURON, S. RIDING—J. J. Merner.
HURON, W. RIDING—Edward Norman Lewis.

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

JACQUES CARTIER—Hon. Frederick Debartzch Monk.
JOLIETTE—J. P. O. Guilbault.

KAMOURASKA—Ernest Lapointe.
KENT (N.B.)—F. J. Robidoux.
KENT (O.), E. RIDING—David Alexander Gordon.
KENT (O.), W. RIDING—Archibald Blake McCoig.
KINGS AND ALBERT (N B.)—George W. Fowler.
KINGS (N.S.)—Arthur De Witt Foster.
KINGS (P.E.I.)—James J. Hughes.
KINGSTON—Wm. F. Nickle.
KOOTENAY—R. F. Green.

LABELLE—Honoré Achim.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph E. Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Frederick Forsyth Pardee.
LANARK, N. RIDING—William Thoburn.
LANARK, S. RIDING—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE-NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION—Paul Arthur Seguin.
LAVAL—Charles Avila Wilson.
LEEDS—Hon. Wm. T. White.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—Wm. J. Paul.
LÉVIS—J. B. Bourassa.
LINCOLN—Edward Arthur Lancaster.
LISGAR—William Henry Sharpe.
L'ISLET—Eugène Paquet.
LONDON—Thomas Beattie.
LOTBINIÈRE—Edmond Fortier.
LUNENBURG—Dougald Stewart.

MACDONALD—Alexander Morrison.
MACKENZIE—E. L. Cash.
MACLEOD—David Warnock.
MAISONNEUVE—Alphonse Verville.
MARQUETTE—Hon. William James Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—A. Bellemare.
MEDICINE HAT—Wm. A. Buchanan.
MEGANTIC—L. T. Pacaud.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Peter Elson.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—George A. Elliott.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Duncan Campbell Ross.
MISSISQUOI—Wm. F. Kay.
MONTCALM—David A. Lafortune.
MONTMAGNY—D. O. Lesperance.
MONTMORENCY—Sir Rodolphe Forget.
MONTREAL, ST. ANNE—Hon. Charles J. Doherty.
MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE—Herbert B. Ames.
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES—Louis A. Lapointe.
MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE—Robert Bickerdike.
MONTREAL, St. MARY—Méderic Martin.
MOOSEJAW—William Erskine Knowles.
MUSKOKA—William Wright.

NANAIMO—Francis H. Shepherd.
NEW WESTMINSTER—James Davis Taylor.
NICOLET—Paul E. Lamarche.
NIPISSING—Hon. Francis Cochrane.
NORFOLK—Wm. A. Charlton.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—William Stewart Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Henry Joseph Walker.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—Charles A. Munson.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—Samuel S. Sharpe.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Smith.
OTTAWA CITY—Alfred E. Fripp. John Leo Chabot.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Donald Sutherland.

PARRY SOUND—James Arthurs.
PEEL—Richard Blain.
PERTH, N. RIDING—H. B. Morphy.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Michael Steele.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John A. Sexsmith.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—John H. Burnham.
PICTOU—Edward Mortimer Macdonald.
PONTIAC—Gerald H. Brabazon.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Arthur Meighen.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE ALBERT—James McKay.
PRINCE, (P.E.I.)—James W. Richards.
PRINCE EDWARD—Bernard R. Hepburn.
PROVENCHER—John Patrick Molloy.

QU'APPELLE—Levi Thomson.
QUEBEC, CENTRE—Arthur Lachance.
QUEBEC, EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
QUEBEC, WEST—William Power.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. L. P. Pelletier.
QUEENS, (P.E.I.)—Angus A. McLean. Donald Nicholson.

RED DEER—Michael Clark.
REGINA—William Melville Martin.
RENFREW, N. RIDING—Gerald Verner White.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Hon. George Perry Graham.
RESTIGOUCHE—James Reid.
RICHELIEU—P. J. A. Cardin.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—George W. Kyte.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Herménégilde Boulay.
ROUVILLE—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
RUSSELL—Hon. Charles Murphy.

ST. HYACINTHE—Louis J. Gauthier.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City—Hon. Wm. Pugsley.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City and Co.—Hon. J. Douglas Hazen.
ST. JOHNS AND IBERVILLE—M. Joseph Demers.
SALTCOATS—Thomas MacNutt.
SASKATOON—George Ewan McCraney.
SELKIRK—George H. Bradbury.
SHEFFORD—George Henry Boivin.
SHELBURNE AND QUEENS—Fleming B. McCurdy.
SHERBROOKE—Francis McCrea.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—William Henry Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—John Allister Currie.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—W. A. Boys.
SOULANGES—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, P.C., G.C.M.G.
SOURIS—Frederick Laurence Schaffner.
STANSTEAD—Charles Henry Lovell.
STORMONT—Duncan O. Alguire.
STRATHCONA—James M. Douglas.
SUNBURY AND QUEENS (N.B.)—Hugh H. McLean.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Hon. Wilfrid Bruno Nantel.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Hon. Jacques Bureau.
THUNDER BAY AND RAINY RIVER—John James Carrick.
TORONTO, CENTRE—Edmund Bristol.

TORONTO, EAST—Hon. Albert E. Kemp.
TORONTO, NORTH—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Angus Claude Macdonell.
TORONTO, WEST—Sir Edmund Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER CITY—Henry Herbert Stevens.
VAUDREUIL—Gustave Boyer
VICTORIA (ALTA.)—William Henry White.
VICTORIA CITY, (B.C.)—Geo. Henry Barnard.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Pius Michaud.
VICTORIA (O.)—Hon. Samuel Hughes.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—William George Weichel.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—George A. Clare.
WELLAND—William Manley German.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—W. A. Clarke.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Gordon C. Wilson.
WESTMORLAND—Hon. Henry Robert Emmerson.
WINNIPEG—Hon. Robert Rogers.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.

YALE-CARIBOO—Hon. Martin Burrell.
YAMASKA—A. A. Mondou.
YARMOUTH—Bowman Brown Law.
YORK (N.B.)—Oswald S. Crocket.
YORK (O.), C. RIDING—Thomas George Wallace.
YORK (O.), N. RIDING—J. A. Macdonald Armstrong.
YORK (O.), S. RIDING—William Findlay Maclean.
YUKON TERRITORY—Alfred Thompson.

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

BEATTIE, THOMAS—London.
BELLEMARE, A.—Maskinonge.
BOULAY, HERMÉNÉGILDE—Rimouski.
BURNHAM, JOHN H.—Peterboro, W. Riding.
COCKSHUTT, WM. F.—Brantford.
DEVLIN, E. B.—Wright.
FOSTER, HON. GEO. E.—Toronto, North.
LAPOINTE, LOUIS A.—Montreal, St. James.
LEMIEUX, HON. R.—Rouville.
MARCIL, HON. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MONK, HON. FREDERICK D.—Jacques Cartier.
PERLEY, HON. GEORGE H.—Argenteuil.
REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK L.—Souris.
TAYLOR, JAMES D.—New Westminster.

Chairman—JAMES D. TAYLOR, New Westminster.

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 21, 1912.

The Parliament which had been prorogued from time to time to the 21st day of November, 1912, met this day for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received a communication from the secretary of His Royal Highness the Governor General as follows:

Ottawa, 21st November, 1912.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that His Royal Highness the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber formally to open the session of the Dominion Parliament on Thursday, the 21st inst., at three o'clock.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

H. C. LOWTHER, Lt.-Col.,

Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable the Speaker
of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by Major Ernest J. Chambers, Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Royal Highness the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

THE SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that the House having attended His Royal Highness in the Senate Chamber, His Royal Highness was pleased to deliver a Speech to both Houses of Parliament. To prevent mistakes I have obtained a copy which is as follows:

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

I have during the past summer spent several months in visiting the principal cities and towns of Canada from coast to coast, and have endeavoured to make myself as far as possible acquainted with the conditions prevailing.

It has been a source of the deepest satisfaction to me to see the almost universal prosperity which reigns throughout the Dominion, and to witness the energy and enterprise which are shown in the developing the rich resources of the land.

It is most gratifying to observe that the trade of the Dominion is increasing rapidly and steadily, the aggregate trade for the last fiscal year being the largest on record. During the present year the same steady increase has been noted, and it is anticipated that the total volume of our trade for the present fiscal year will greatly surpass that of any previous year in our history.

The revenues of the Dominion continue to expand, and in every branch of business and industry there is a remarkable activity which gives assurance of continued progress and prosperity.

A copious and welcome stream of immigration has poured into our country during the past summer. The volume of immigration during the present year is greater than during any corresponding period of our history, and in larger measure than usual it has been drawn from the British Islands.

The labours of the husbandman have been blessed with an ample return; and, although in some districts the weather has been unpropitious for the harvest, it is expected that the total value of our field crops will be greater than in any previous year.

Papers will be laid before you which embody trade arrangements that have been consummated between the Dominion and certain of His Majesty's possessions in the West Indies. It is hoped that these arrangements will prove of great advantage not only to those possessions, but to Canada as well. A Bill will be introduced for the purpose of carrying this agreement into effect.

During the past summer four members of my government conferred in London with His Majesty's government on the question of Naval Defence. Important discussions took place and conditions have been disclosed which in the opinion of my advisers render it imperative that the effective naval forces of the Empire should be strengthened without delay. My advisers are convinced that it is the duty of Canada at this juncture to afford reason-

REVISED EDITION

able and necessary aid for that purpose. A Bill will be introduced accordingly.

A contract for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway from LePas to Port Nelson has been awarded and the work is being pushed forward with all possible speed.

It is abundantly evident that the highways of Canada constitute an important part of an efficient scheme of transportation. The necessity for improving our existing facilities in this regard is manifest and a Bill will be introduced for the purpose of enabling the Dominion to co-operate with the provinces in the accomplishment of this most desirable purpose.

It is satisfactory to know that the proposal of my government to co-operate with the governments of the various provinces in promoting the agricultural industry has met with hearty approval. The appropriations which were made last session in connection therewith have proved to be of marked benefit to the country. After a careful study of the whole question my advisers are convinced that co-operation with the provinces on well defined terms and conditions will achieve the best results along the lines of agricultural instruction. Any such policy to be effective must be continuous. Accordingly, a Bill will be introduced by which a substantial amount of money will be set apart from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purpose of assisting the provinces for a term of years in this highly important national work.

My government has succeeded in securing certain reductions in cable rates and will continue its efforts to obtain further reductions.

Under existing legislation the charters of the banks will expire on the 1st day of July next. A Bill revising and extending these charters will be submitted for your consideration and approval.

Several other Bills will be submitted, including measures providing for increased representation of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba in the Senate.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts for the last fiscal year will be laid before you. It will be satisfactory to you to learn that the revenue has been ample to cover both ordinary and capital expenditure.

The estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted at an early date. They have been prepared with due regard on the one hand for economy, and on the other hand for the necessary development of the resources of the Dominion.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I invite your earnest consideration of the subjects to which I have alluded and I invoke the blessings of Divine Providence upon your deliberations.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS: In the absence of the First Minister, I beg to move:

That the Speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament of the Dominion of Canada be taken into consideration on Monday next.

Motion agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ROGERS: In the absence of the First Minister I beg to move:

That the order for the consideration of a motion for the Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, have precedence over all other business except introduction of Bills until disposed of.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Mr. ROGERS: In the absence of the First Minister, I beg to move:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House under Rule 10; said committee to be composed of Messrs. Borden, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Reid (Grenville), Pelletier, Pugsley, Stanfield and Pardee.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 1, respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—Mr. Rogers.

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of Robert Francis Green, Esq., for the electoral district of Kootenay;

Of William Alves Boys, Esq., for the electoral district of South Simcoe;

Of William Foster Garland, Esq., for the electoral district of Carleton, Ontario;

Of Alexander Morrison, Esq., for the electoral district of Macdonald;

Of Pierre Joseph Arthur Cardin, Esq., for the electoral district of Richelieu.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

William Alves Boyes, Esq., for the electoral district of South Simcoe; introduced by Hon. Sam. Hughes and Mr. W. H. Bennett (Simcoe).

Robert Francis Green, Esq., for the electoral district of North Kootenay, introduced by Hon. Martin Burrell and Mr. George H. Barnard.

William Foster Garland, Esq., for the electoral district of Carleton, Ontario, introduced by Hon. J. D. Reid.

Alexander Morrison, Esq., for the electoral district of Macdonald, introduced

by Hon. Robert Rogers and Hon. W. J. Roche.

Pierre Joseph Arthur Cardin, Esq., for the electoral district of Richelieu, introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Joint report of the Librarians of Parliament.—Mr. Rogers.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, House adjourned at 3.58 p.m. until Monday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, November 25, 1912.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have directed the Clerk of the House to lay upon the table my recommendation in regard to the promotion of Mr. Charles Steedman Blue and the appointment of Messrs. Earl C. Young and Frederick W. S. Galbraith to the positions of offical reporters of the debates of the House, together with the Clerk's report in regard to the same.

COMMISSIONERS OF INTERNAL ECONOMY.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN presented a message from His Royal Highness the Governor General, which was read by Mr. Speaker, as follows:

His Royal Highness transmits to the House of Commons approved Minute of Council appointing the Hon. George Halsey Perley; the Hon. Louis Philippe Pelletier, P.M.G.; the Hon. William James Roche, Minister of the Interior; the Hon. John Dowsley Reid, Minister of Customs, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 11th chapter of Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, intituled: 'An Act respecting the House of Commons.'

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Secretary of State for External Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Rt. Hon. R. L. Borden.

Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada for the same year.—Hon. Mr. Cochrane.

Reports, Returns and Statistics of the Department of Inland Revenue for the same year.—Hon. Mr. Nantel.

1½

POLLUTION OF STREAMS.

Mr. GEORGE H. BRADBURY (Selkirk) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, respecting the Pollution of Navigable Streams.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BRADBURY: The Bill is similar to that which I introduced a year ago, but which, owing to pressure of business in the House, did not make very much progress. The intention of the Bill is to prohibit the depositing of sewage in navigable streams or streams tributary thereto, and it proposes to inflict a severe penalty for any violation of its provisions by any corporation or municipality or private individual. Every hon. gentlemen in the House must realize the great necessity there is for this Bill, and on the second reading I will explain its provisions more fully.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE USE OF FLAGS.

Mr. GEORGE H. BRADBURY (Selkirk) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 3, respecting the use of flags.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. BRADBURY: I introduced a Bill similar to this a year ago, but it was not proceeded with owing to pressure of business in the House. The Bill makes it an indictable offence for any person or persons to deface any flag of the British Empire in this country. Every hon. gentleman has no doubt seen a beautiful Union Jack or red ensign with the name of some hotel printed across its face, or perhaps he may have seen it outside an auction room announcing the sale of some commodity. This Bill prohibits the use of the British flag for such a purpose. It also provides a severe penalty for any indignities that may be offered to the flag. Every member of the House can recall some serious case of indignity offered to the British flag and this Bill provides for the punishment of those guilty of such an offence. On the second reading I hope to convince the House that this Bill is necessary.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

The House proceeded to the consideration of the Speech of His Royal Highness the Governor General at the opening of the session.

Mr. J. H. RAINVILLE (Chambly-Verchères: (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have the honour to move, seconded by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle),

that the following Address to tendered to H.R.H. the Governor General humbly thanking H.R.H. for the gracious Speech he has kindly made to both Houses of Parliament at the opening of this session.

Sir, it is an honour, the worth and the danger of which I both realize, to be called upon to move the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne; and that honour redounds on the constituency which I represent.

However, I feel greatly comforted at the thought that my task is lightened to such an extent by the very progress the country has accomplished, and within so short a time, the bare facts being eloquent enough to dispense me with any lengthy disquisition on the subject.

We are in full prosperity. Older countries admire and proclaim the magnificent results effected through our youthful energy. Our development has been going on for a period of forty years, and we have grown in wealth and power.

The first thing to be done was to open the country to enterprise, in order to allow its immense resources to be developed through the establishment of transportation facilities. So we started building railways, we covered the country with a network of them. Having bound the Eastern seaboard to the centre of the continent, we then boldly set ourselves to the task of reaching the Pacific seaboard through the unexplored region of the interior. The leaders in this venture were men of indomitable energy, and the outcome was such as to amply vindicate the stand they had taken. The rich and fertile West was put under cultivation; large areas were seeded down, and rich harvests obtained in return. To-day Western wheat is a matter of pride to us, and not very long ago the Minister of Commerce victoriously vindicated its superiority in the hearing of the Empire.

Meanwhile we continued carrying on our original policy. Further transcontinental lines were built. Hardly had these new districts been opened up, and even before the building of the railways had been carried through, prosperity, which has always remained faithful to us, hastened to crown our efforts.

As soon as we realized the significance of our progress and the further possibilities which it implied, we made up our minds to organize our forces and protect our territory. Then it was that we outlined a fiscal policy having for its object the safeguarding of our industries.

The treaty concluded in 1854 between Canada and the U.S. had just been repealed. The country had for some time been dreaming of free trade; but very soon the people's will restored to power those who deemed it proper to safeguard the Canadian nation against powerful competitors.

Such was the origin of that policy of moderate protection which ensured the development of our trade. Inspired by these wise provisions, Canada realized that its primary aim should be to develop the resources, the significance of which is fully appreciated.

Sir, to recall the events which occurred in the meantime, is to picture a period of uninterrupted progress. Our trade, which, in 1868, aggregated $131,027,532 amounted in 1888 to $201,097,630. According to the revised figures of the Statistical Year-book, it reached in 1911 the sum of $769,443,905, and yesterday, that of $874,637,794.

One would have to go through every heading under which our national resources are classified in the blue-books. Forests, agriculture, live-stock, fisheries, mines, &c., would have to be taken up in succession and the figures showing the magnificent results obtained throughout would have to be quoted, so as to let the people judge how truthful and encouraging and eloquent they are.

It has often been contended by some that this success is attributable to Providence, while others think the party in power should take the credit to themselves. Both viewpoints can be defended. Of course, governments can take advantage of the blessings which Providence bestows on us. Should they neglect to do so, the national heritage would dwindle to nothing, in spite of its original wealth. I am entirely free to say that the governments which we have had since 1879 have made an excellent use of the National Policy; but more particularly do I believe and state that if our country has reached to such a point of development, it is due, in the first place, to the energy and spirit of enterprise of the people of this country and to the policy of those who realized from the start how important it was that we should be in a position to develop our industries by means of moderate protection. It is owing to them that we have succeeded. As a proof, their policy is still in existence, and even the staunchest Liberals have not dared to do away with it.

Two names are more particularly to be quoted in this connection; two great men are to be remembered by those who are anxious to find in history the true explanation of our success.

Those who understood our youthful community, those who did not hesitate, in spite of the difficulties in the way and the uncertainty of the results to be expected at the time, to start nation-building; those whose insight into the future was far-reaching enough to inspire them with faith in our possibilities; those who applied themselves energetically to carrying out the splendid policy suggested to them by a legitimate and noble ambition; those who persisted until death in spreading their views, in vindicating them and in working

for their triumph, these men, I say, have a right to expect from us, to whatever party we belong, the supreme recognition which is due to nation-builders, some evidence of our gratefulness and admiration. And such is the view taken by us, since we all acknowledge to-day the greatness of the work accomplished in our midst, with such a firm and confident heart, by Sir John Macdonald and Sir George E. Cartier.

Sir, what has the future in reserve for us, and what should be the aim of our further efforts?

Since September 21, 1911, the Conservative Government, supported by the immense majority of the country, have taken in hand the destinies of the nation, and the pace of progress is not any the slower.

I do not propose taking up the time of the House by a consideration of figures which we will be called upon to consider in the course of this session. There are, however, a few points on which I would like to dwell.

Canada's finances are in a most prosperous condition. Our revenue is increasing by leaps and bounds. The figures for the last year, which have just appeared in the blue-book, exceed even our most sanguine expectations. Our receipts from the consolidated fund have reached $136,108,217.36, and the expenditure on that same account a total of $96,161,440.77, leaving a surplus of $37,946,776.59. The expenditure on the capital account amounted, cross entries included, to $38,980.641.43. If to our surplus receipts, there be added $1,156,456.16 for the sinking fund, there remains a balance of $122,591.32 which will go to reduce the national indebtedness.

Wholly by means of our ordinary revenue and without borrowing, we have succeeded, Mr. Speaker, in meeting all expenditure on capital account, and besides we have cut down to a certain extent the national debt. Besides, it is expected that henceforth we shall be in a position to reduce the debt by a still larger amount, through the wise and prudent policy followed by the hon. Minister of Finance.

Sir, a moment ago, I pointed to the development of our trade during the last fiscal year. Let us consider the amount of our imports during the twelve months ended September 30, 1912. They aggregated $616,-842,090, while in 1911, on the same day of the year, they reached $496,837, 471, which means an increase for the year of $120,-004,619, that is to say of $10,000,000 per month. Customs duties collected in 1912 during the same period amounted to $102,-695,974.76, while in 1911, they had not exceeded $78,792,125.49. In other words that means a surplus for the public Exchequer of $23,903,849.27, i.e., in round figures, of $2,000,000 per month. Such a brilliant state of affairs should prove encouraging to us, and nobody will blame the Government for bestowing the greatest attention on the trade question.

Sir, in passing allow me to draw the attention of hon. gentlemen to the thorough and successful work which is being carried on in our midst by the hon. Minister of Commerce. Last year he carried through a Bill for the inspection of grain, and provided for a special commission appointed to look after that important interest. The Government have built at Fort William an elevator to be run under their supervision. By means of such legislation and of strict government control, an effective system of inspection is ensured.

The organization of our service of commercial agencies in foreign lands is now an accomplished fact, and we are assured of the co-operation of the British authorities. The Department of Commerce is from day to day in receipt of fuller information. A statistical commission has been appointed for the purpose of re-organizing the various branches, and the department is in hopes of establishing shortly a system of statistics of interprovincial trade which will be of a nature to help considerably our business men. As regards our intercourse with outside countries, the department has already initiated and is still pursuing its policy of reciprocity with the British colonies.

Sir, it would be an easy matter to take up the various departments and to show what work they are doing. Once more, it it will be found that equal progress has been accomplished by the Departments of Public Works, Post Office, Interior, Marine, Inland Revenue, etc., concerning which my hon. friend from Kingston will more particularly acquaint the House. Similar activity is apparent everywhere, and everywhere there is a like desire to increase the welfare of the country. As a matter of fact the government have improved the postal service, extended help to the railway companies, induced the House to grant a million dollars towards the improvement of highways, a proposal which for party reasons was rejected last year by the Senate and will be once more submitted to the representatives of the people, providing, as I hope, for a still larger expenditure.

Let me congratulate the Government on the substantial help extended to the farming community through the putting of an amount of a half million dollars at the disposal of the various provinces in aid to agriculture.

That generous deed has not yet given the full results which it is expected to give; but I am confident that such beneficial result will go on increasing for the future welfare of that important class so much in need of encouragement, so as to enable it to overcome the innumerable diffi-

culties in its way, that poverty which is often an inducement to emigration.

If it be true that the Government intend increasing this year the grant to agriculture, allow me, Mr. Speaker, to make a few suggestions. Most of the Quebec constituencies are situated at great distances from agricultural schools, and it is a rather difficult matter for farmers to send their children thither. Would it not be advisable to encourage the providing of special classes of agriculture in connection with the business colleges throughout the province? Would it not also be a good plan to increase the number of model farms, to grant each year special and substantial prizes for the best kept farms, and to appoint men for illustration purposes in the various counties?

But what I am more especially expected to solicit from government for this year, is a grant to agricultural societies towards improving their exhibition grounds and buildings with a view to imparting to farm boys an adequate idea of the importance of this feast of agriculture, at which, once every year, farmers from the various parts of the country congregate, compete and compare notes.

Such action of the Government will, I am confident, instil courage in every heart, will do away with apathy, and create a race of sturdy workers, who realize what agriculture means to a country in the shape of cheer and comfort; and then, instead of deserting their village, they will hearken to the great voice of Mother Earth, and huddle around the parish church, whose steeple, the symbol of hope, seems to watch over every home.

Agriculture no longer ensures stability. Young men leave the farms without heed of the future. They take to the cities, there to live under conditions at best uncertain, very often miserable. To all those deserters of farm life, to all those place seekers who idle in the streets and increase the number of unemployed, I suggest that they meditate the following lines of the poet so touching and yet so true for them as well as for us:

Et comment se fait-il, voilà ce que j'admire,
Qu'aucun père, à son fils, ne s'avise de dire:
Paris est encombré de hardis compagnons,
Retourne aux champs déserts, aux champs dont nous venons.
Portes-y ta jounesse et tes saines idées,
C'est là qu'est le salut de la société.
Remettez en honneur le soc de la charrue;
Repeuplez la campagne au dépens de la rue;
Grevez d'impôts la ville et dégrevez les champs,
Ayez moins de bourgeois et plus de paysans.

Sir, I cannot help pointing out that Canada's forward march has continued steadily and successfully without the help of reciprocity with the United States. I am satisfied that the development of our trade with England and its overseas dominions will be more beneficial to our economic progress and to the expansion of our national resources, than would have been the depressing outlook pointed to in the famous Taft-Roosevelt correspondence.

Sir, among other changes outlined in the Speech from the Throne, I notice the revision of the Banking Act. The upholding and safeguarding of our credit are things of the greatest importance, and the circulating medium, as well as deposits, should be surrounded with every guarantee the legislator is able to provide.

Lastly, Sir, a question of the greatest import for our country at this iuncture, is that relative to its share in the defence of the empire of which Canada forms part.

We are not all agreed as to the form that contribution should take, but from one end of the country to the other, Canadians are unanimously intent on maintaining England's supremacy at sea, in the interest of the whole British Empire.

And should any one doubt my words, I might read the resolution of 1909. I might even quote, if it were deemed necessary from an editorial of 'Le Devoir', of October 12, 1912, wherein the following words appear: 'The Nationalists have never contended that Canada should not do anything for the safety of the Empire.'

However, Sir, let me state very plainly my mind in this connection. Europe is threatened with a general war. It is not yet known whether the great powers will allow the small Balkan states to extend their boundaries. The decisive victory won by the Bulgarian army has unexpectedly set diplomacy on the alert. Inevitably the powers will have to intervene, and it is a difficult matter to foresee what will be the outcome as regards European intercourse. England is not a disinterested onlooker; she will likely have to take a stand, and if war breaks out, an array of all her forces will be in order. Under the circumstances, the stand taken by the government will be readily understood.

If we are rightly informed, the Government propose introducing this year a provional measure of assistance, reserving the right to consult the people, when the time comes to provide for a permanent contribution, and such contribution, if and when it is granted, to be made dependent on the right of representation in the councils of the Empire. That is the purport of the statements made in England and in this House, on behalf of the Government, by the Right Hon, Prime Minister who has the support of the country.

To my mind, that is a reasonable proposal and neither our autonomy nor our constitution will suffer thereby.

As for those who would recklessly refuse to do anything to help Great Britain, the

country, I am satisfied, would rebuke them in the words of a great French orator, Mr. Paul Deschanel:

How we do prefer these wise great men who set a limit to their field of activity and keep the upper hand over situations which they have themselves marked out. They first modify their plans to suit the men and things they have to deal with, but later on these will be made to conform to their views. They abide with their times, in order to better influence and direct them; they hold what they have, because they are careful not to take more than they are able to hold. How we do prefer those well-tempered, subtle and keen minds, a Richelieu, a Frederick, a Cavour, to those demi-gods, those fatal and often blind powers, who by their wild leaps and foolish ventures, throw entirely politics out of kelter.

Sir, such are the few considerations suggested to me by our political situation. I firmly believe that we have wisely carried on the work outlined in days bygone by the pioneers of this country. We should remain confident. To-day the attention of the whole world is centered on Canada. Its resources are known, its success applauded. With sufficient boldness and self confidence, Canada goes on its way, showing its prodigious force of expansion. Its merchant navy scours the seas, and last year we were building railways in countries as far distant as Austria. Its happy inhabitants are full of energy and of hope. Given its resources, the wealth it holds from a bountiful nature, the intellectual forces which are at its disposal, it is bound to make rapid progress on the road to success, whose horizon expands infinitely before our eyes. Canada is bound to grow, full of youthful confidence and vigour; and thanks to the carrying out of a healthy and rational policy, we shall witness with pride the fulfilment of its glorious destinies. Canada for ever.

Mr. Speaker, the Government has done me a great honour, an honour to me in person, an honour to my compatriots, an honour to my province, in entrusting to me the moving of this resolution, an honour accorded to but one other of my tongue during the past fifteen years. This circumstance gives evidence of the good harmony and sympathy which unite my province to the present administration.

Canada to-day is in a condition of unexampled prosperity. Our financial position has never been so good, our customs receipts are increasing by leaps and bounds, our commerce is expanding with lightning rapidity, railroads are spreading their network over the whole Dominion. In all other departments of government there is the same story of abounding increase and prosperity. And all this without reciprocity with the United States. Would that those great statesmen Macdonald and Cartier could view to-day the magnificent superstructure being erected on the foundations which they so ably assisted in laying.

It is with pride, Sir, I refer to the coincidence that the mover and seconder of this Address have the honour to represent in Parliament the two constituencies formerly represented by these distinguished statesmen, Kingston and Verchères.

Sir, perhaps the most important subject which will engage the attention of Parliament this session is the relations between Canada and the Mother Country. In this connection, the Prime Minister and three of his colleagues have recently held conferences with the Imperial Authorities. The result of these deliberations will be given soon to Parliament. My confidence in the Prime Minister is such that when his proposals are announced, I have no reason to doubt that they will be found to be of such a character as to meet with the approval of my fellow citizens of the province of Quebec in common with the rest of the Dominion, because, Sir, we have had the advantage of being a great part of a great Empire, and our success in the past should incite us to so continue, and in that union we shall always know and feel that from across the sea Britain with her arm extended bids us to be of good cheer, and hurl defiance at those who would dare to oppress us.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, since the days when Frontenac, that most intrepid French administrator, first pitched his tents on the shores of what was then known as the Cataraqui river, in the hope of diverting the fur trade of the north and west from New York and the Hudson to Quebec and the St. Lawrence, Kingston has played a not ignoble part in the history of Canada, and on her behalf, Sir, I desire to express appreciation to the right hon. the leader of the Government for his recognition of her in allowing her representative to be heard at this time in what promises to be one of Canada's most historic sessions of parliament. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, it is not amiss at a time like this that I should extend to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition the sincere sympathy of those of my fellow citizens of Kingston who do not happen to be of my political faith, at the irreparable loss his party has sustained during the present year in the unexpected death of Sir Richard Cartwright. He was known to us Kingstonians as a courteous courtly Canadian, a man of strong views, who had a singular aptitude for saying what he thought; and, Sir, I feel that, without contradiction from this side of the House, or from that, I may say that Canadian public life is the poorer for the loss

of Sir Richard Cartwright, who for so many years was a genuine believer in the politics of the gentlemen who face me.

It is difficult and perhaps odious to make comparisons, and yet I feel that I would be unworthy of my trust if I did not set out, in contradistinction to all that has happened during the recess the trip of the right hon. the leader of the Government to England. Since I came into this House I have been time and again struck by the loyalty that the gentlemen opposite show to the leader of the Opposition, and I would like now to tell them that we on this side feel the same loyalty to the man who is the leader of the Conservative party and the leader of the Government. We admire his courage: we admire his foresight: and may I say that it gave us a thrill of satisfaction during the election just past when he faced an adverse audience and told them that sooner than abandon the principle he held, he would renounce all claim and all chance of ever being Premier of Canada. We know his scholarly attainments; his integrity of purpose. We know his zeal for the public service. We have watched him as ably he led this Government during the past session of Parliament. Sir, it is well known that there is no time in a party's history when disunion is so likely to take place as in its first session of power. Men have not then learned to feel that sentimental bond that binds them together in what may fairly be termed a huge political machine. We on this side admire and respect the man for his courage and tact. And when he went to England we realized that fresh problems faced him. He went to England, and we wondered what would happen. If I may be permitted to say so, if it be not presumption, we read his speeches, we watched his movements from day to day, and we realized that the man was making an impression on the public life of England. English newspapers and English statesmen are slow to show enthusiasm. But in the case of the right hon. leader of the Government they did show enthusiasm. We admired his constitutional carefulness. He did not commit Canada to any definite schemes. He enunciated a clear-cut policy —that if Canada was to assume responsibility Canada must be heard in the councils of the nation. It was with a sense of satisfaction that we awaited his return to this country, and now, Sir, we realize that the name of Borden is enrolled upon that scroll upon which fame has written the names of great Canadians.

I am not going to follow the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rainville) who has just taken his seat, in a detailed statement of Canada's prosperity and advancement. But perhaps I may be pardoned if I allow fancy to run away with me for a little while. Let me draw attention to a contrast. The other day a gorgeous scene was presented to our view, when I saw on the Throne a Royal Governor and when the Senate Chamber was filled with the representatives of the wealth, the intellect and the ability of Canada. As I looked upon that scene, with those gothic arches splashed with the colours of the setting sun, I was carried in imagination back to the year 1792, when Governor Simcoe came to Kingston and held his first legislative council in a clap-boarded building which still nestles on the hillside, and which is something like fifteen feet square. Canada has made tremendous advances. We are beginning to feel the first pulsation of nationhood, we are beginning to feel our importance, and, though we know not how, we know not when, yet we realize that the day will come when Canada will be a power in the world's affairs, and we look forward with confidence upon the vision of our future.

But, Sir, it is not my duty to take up the time of the House with discussions of Canada's greatness or of Canada's great men. Certain subjects are referred to in the Speech from the Throne. One of the most important of them is the subject of banking. I doubt if the ordinary Canadian knows by what tremendous steps that branch of Canada's life has advanced. During the twelve months ending April 30, 1912, the paid-up capital of the chartered banks increased from $100,000,000 to $112,038,000, and the rest or surplus from $85,000,000 to $100,038,000. The public deposits in Canada increased from $837,000,000 to $960,000,000, and the deposits outside of Canada from $69,000,000 to $85,000,000. In the same period, the total assets of the banks increased from $1,247,000,000 to $1,439,000,000. The total current loans, representing advances to manufacturing, mining, agricultural and ordinary mercantile businesses grew from $710,000,000 to $833,000,000. At the close of 1911 there were 2,435 branches of banks in Canada, and in 1912 there were 2,793. And yet, Mr. Speaker, our vanity has received some rude shocks during the past few years. We prided ourselves on the soundness of our banking system and the perfection of its organization. Perhaps hon. members will be surprised to know that from 1865 until to-day Canadian investors in bank stocks have lost no less than $40,000,000. In 1890, the banks were reorganized and the Bank Act was revised, and from that day the losses have been not anything like in proportion what they were in the early days of Canadian struggle. But we must not forget that the Ontario Bank, through the reckless expenditure and gambling of its manager, came to grief. We must not forget

that the Sovereign Bank came down because high finance ruled its board. We must not forget that the Farmers' Bank became involved because wild finance took possession and had control of its organization. I trust that when the Bank Act comes before the House, the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White), whom I have known well for a number of years as a close student of economic and fiscal questions, a man practical as well as theoretical, will see to it that some method is devised by which a more careful audit will be obtained, that the thrift of the investor and the savings of the depositor shall not be entirely entrusted to those who, at times, seem to forget that they are trustees for others. I trust that the Finance Minister will keep in view the fact that we must have the greatest freedom of circulation consistent with safety. The country is growing, and no opposition must be permitted that will prevent the expansion of our financial institutions. I would draw his attention to another factor, and that is that, if it be possible, some means should be devised by which the directors and presidents of banks shall be made to feel the responsibility they bear. There seems to be a belief in some parts of the country that the position of president or director of a bank means nothing, that men's names should be used to draw capital for the institution, but that, having been so used, they have fulfilled the object for which they were solicited. I have confidence in the Finance Minister, that these things have had his careful consideration, and that when the Bank Act comes before us it will be found that reasonable and proper methods have been adopted by him to secure the end desired.

Coming from Ontario, an agricultural province, it probably is wise that I should say something in regard to that great industry. As is well known, the power to legislate in regard to agriculture is concurrently held by the Dominion and the provinces, with this restriction that when there is a conflict of legislation that of the Dominion takes precedence over that of the province. The Dominion and the provinces have carried on work in relation to agriculture for some time, and it is not surprising that, in the elaboration of the work there should have been a certain overlapping and duplication. Perhaps, it might be said that in the main the work of the Dominion has been more experimental and research work and has dealt more with interprovincial and international questions, while that of the province has been educational work and work of demonstration. It was a matter of congratulation last session when the estimates disclosed the fact that the Government had decided to appropriate $500,000 for the purposes of agriculture. Of this amount $175,000 went to the province of Ontario. And it seems, Mr. Speaker, that no wiser or saner course could have been adopted than that a part of the growing wealth of the Dominion should have been placed at the disposal of the provinces where the machinery for administration and education is well established. Education has been defined at the adapting of the individual to the environment in which he is to live, a rough definition perhaps, but if I can judge the work that is being done in Ontario that is the underlying principle of her undertakings. Through the agricultural college, Ontario is trying to teach the scientific principles of agriculture. Through her demonstration work recently undertaken—but since undertaken copied in the States to the south of us by some of the railways and other hugh corporations in the hope of increasing the productivity of the soil—work is being done on the farms of the people.

It is not a case of telling how ; it is a case of showing how. The representative of the district serves the ends of the community in the same way as the doctor, except without fee. This work has been so eminently satisfactory that the money available to the province of Ontario last year has been made use of in enlarging the sphere of its agricultural work along this line. Ontario is trying to make life on the farm more comfortable. We have heard a great deal in the last few years about the high cost of living, and we have read many reports dealing with the various causes leading to that condition. If one reads a report issued by a legislature or a committee whose theories are opposed to free trade, he finds the tariff is accused of being the cause of the increase. And yet men seem totally oblivious to the fact that in England, a free trade country, the increase in the cost of living has been almost as great as in Canada, where we have a protective tariff. Coming from a constituency that is not rural, I know that the increased cost of living is bearing hard on our industrial classes. Ontario is trying to solve the problem of more scientific farming, of increasing the productiveness of the soil by the application of scientific principles, not to lessen the earnings of the farmer, but so to increase his products that they may be sold at a better price in the markets of the cities. Great credit is due to the Hon. Adam Beck for the efforts he has put forth to introduce electricity throughout the western and eastern parts of the province of Ontario, in the hope that the labour of the farmer will thereby be somewhat reduced.

It is a matter of regret to us, Sir, that the Highway Bill introduced at the last session met an adverse fate in the Upper House. It is an old maxim that a chain is no stronger than its weakest link,and if I may change the wording somewhat, I may say that a road is no better than its worst mile. For reasons perhaps that are not altogether an advantage to the country, such a Bill may not become law this session ; but I have reason to believe that those who live in the rural parts of the province of Ontario are not unmindful of the fact that the benefits they might derive from such a measure are not being withheld by the Conservative party.

It may perhaps be a considerable jump, Mr. Speaker, from agriculture to penitentiaries, but it is a jump I am going to try to take. As I study the reports in reference to penitentiaries I am struck with the fact that we have a large mass of unproductive labour confined in these institutions. The problem that confronts the Minister of Justice is great. It is a well-recognized maxim of political wisdom that it is unwise to bring prison labour into competition with free labour ; and I may say that I concur in that principle. It is only just and fair that the man who earns his living by the sweat of his brow should not have the fruits of his labour brought into competition with the products of the penitentiaries. But, Sir, there is another side to the question. While we may have the right to take from a man his liberty because he has broken the laws of society, I doubt very much whether we have the right to allow a man to rot, if I may use the term, in idleness. Something must be done to find employment for these men. The penitentiaries as they are administered to-day, are really homes of idleness. Why should not the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Justice get their heads together, and elaborate a scheme by which every penitentiary in this country would be a farm of demonstration? It may be said, that this will cost money, but everything that is worth doing costs money. Surely it is well worth while doing something to uplift and reform our prison population. I have not the statistics before me, but I was amazed a day or two ago to see the large proportion of men incarcerated in the penitentiaries who were under the age of thirty. Indeed there are persons who are practically children in these institutions, and there is no segregation. A boy under twenty, sometimes only fifteen or sixteen, through an ill-advised judgment of a thoughtless magistrate, is sent to penitentiary when he should have gone to a reformatory. He associates with the most defiled and debased criminals, and yet we expect him to leave the penitentiary a better man than he was when he entered it. Sir, we must look forward to a better day—to a day when our penitentiaries shall not be mere punitive institutions, but shall be, in the full sense of the word, reformatory. I would like to take advantage of this opportunity, Sir, to urge on the ministry the necessity of doing something that will make the men in these institutions more fit when they leave them to earn their living. On a Sunday afternoon I have spoken in the Kingston Penitentiary to 600 men whose faces showed nothing but sullen despair and hopeless sorrow. I believe that something can be done to improve the condition of these men, and I want to urge upon the Minister of Justice, whose humanitarian principles I well know, and on the Minister of Agriculture, who will I know recognize the necessity in this matter, that such steps be taken as will make each penitentiary a demonstrative and reformative institution. There is no reason why cheap land should not be bought and be so developed that the farmers who live in the adjacent municipalities and districts may come and see what is being done, and how they may best improve their own condition. In following out these principles a benefit will be conferred upon the prisoner, because when he leaves the penitentiary he will not be obliged to enter again the city slum with all its temptations, and a benefit will be conferred on the agricultural classes, because from one end of this country to the other the cry goes up for farm help. A benefit will likewise be conferred on the state by freeing it from what must always be a burdensome load.

Perhaps in speaking on the subject of agriculture it is only right that I should say something in regard to immigration. The Speech from the Throne touches upon the welcome and copious flow of immigration that is coming to our shores. Perhaps we are paying more attention to the size of the stream than to the purity of the waters that compose it. The statistics in regard to immigration are amazing. We find that from 1902 to 1912 two million immigrants have come to this country, that we have rejected at ocean ports 8,500 men, that there were held for inspection 41,000, and that 5,600 of those who passed the officers of inspection were deported. I know that statistics are not as a rule welcome to the House, but there is no other way in which I can impress on hon. members the necessity for more rigorous inspection than by drawing their attention to the statistics in this regard. During the above mentioned period there were deported for criminality, 749; vagrancy, 253; insanity,

648; public charge, 2,461; senility, 22; mental weakness, 133; general debility, 226; tuberculosis, 271. And yet the great flow of immigration goes on with careless inspection.

Canada has reached the time when she does not need to take anything but the best. The problem that confronts Canada today is one, not of securing immigration, but of assimilating the immigrant. We heard from time to time during the last parliament, from hon. gentlemen opposite that there was an antagonism between Ontario and the West. Why should there be such antagonism. The best that Ontario has had have gone to the West. What the West does the West does well, and in her efforts to assimilate and develop the citizens from foreign lands she has emptied our schoolhouses; she has made it impossible for us to get teachers for our schools. But there is no antagonism on Ontario's part for this. Ontario is proud to be playing her part, through the little red school-houses of the Western plain in continuing our ideals of order, justice and civilization.

I feel, Sir, that I am now getting on delicate ground, because I want to say a word on the navy question. If I can judge the general attitude of men on this question, it is possibly one of doubt and uncertainty. There is a fine old piece of colonial constitutional loyalty in the address which the Legislature of Upper Canada sent to the King on the 23rd of January, 1826, when they said:

> We also, may it please Your Majesty, disclaim the opinion that because we inhabit a colony remote from the United Kingdom we are therefore not equally interested with other subjects of Your Majesty in every event that can tend to the strength and prosperity of the Empire and equally bound to share in the dangers and misfortunes of any war which may be necessary to vindicate the honour of Your Majesty's Crown or to maintain the rights of the British nation.

The reason I refer to that extract is that it differs so radically from the naval policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite as embodied in their Naval Service Act. I do not wish to precipitate a debate on this question; but, if I understood the debates of the last parliament two things were made manifestly clear: that the Canadian navy was not a part of the British navy, and that by some constitutional declaration of neutrality we were, if so desired, in case of any war, to remove ourselves, so to speak, from the sphere of activity. It is utterly impossible for me, as a lawyer, to comprehend by what declaration Canada, in time of need, can remove herself from the sphere of war unless she declares her independence. That is an objection to the Naval Service Act, and the naval policy of the right hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It has a tendency towards a declaration of independence rather than a tendency towards a closer union of the Overseas Dominions with the British Crown.

The Speech from the Throne makes reference to the visit of the right hon. the Prime Minister, and his colleagues to London. It states three things, as I understand it: First, that there is necessity for aid; second, that there is an obligation on our part to assist; and, third, that we are willing to do something. The conditions, as I said a moment ago, are not outlined to us, so it is impossible or at least difficult to debate the question with any degree of fullness. Even the cursory reader cannot help being struck with the tremendous growth of the navies of the foreign powers. In looking through a return lately published by the British Government I find that the growth of naval expenditure by the chief European powers within the last decade has been as follows:

Country.	Expenditure 1901-2.	Expenditure 1912-13.	Increase.
Great Britain ..	£31,000,000	£45,000,000	50%
France..	14,000,000	18,000,000	30%
Russia..	9,000,000	18,000,000	100%
Germany..	9,000,000	22,000,000	140%
Austria-Hungary	2,000,000	6,000,000	300%
Italy	5,000,000	9,000,000	90%

Can we be blind, Mr. Speaker, to these conditions? It is all very well to say that diplomacy may smooth the way. Diplomacy may tend to peace, but when the test comes England's right can only be maintained by England's might, and I say it is the duty of England and of the Overseas Dominions to see that that might is available when the time comes. The critics of the right hon. leader of the Government, say that, even assuming that the condition is critical, there is no obligation on the part of Canada to contribute, and they give various reasons for their belief. Some advance the Monroe doctrine. They say that the United States will not permit any foreign country to get a hold in Canada. When Mr. Speaker, did Canadians become so weak that they relied on the support of a foreign nation for their autonomy? If I understand correctly the spirit and intention of the Canadian people, they are determined that their nationalism will never rest on the will and favour of any foreign power. The critics again say that we owe no duty to England because she has not been fair in diplomacy. They quote Maine, Vermont, Oregon, Alaska, and similar cases. I have not the time, nor has the House the patience to permit me to unwind the tangled web of diplomacy in these cases, and it would be useless simply to contra-

dict and say they are not true; weight would not be carried by my words. But I have no less authority than the Professor of Colonial History in Queens University for saying that in the unwinding of the tangle incidental to Maine and Vermont, he is able to prove that the Mother Country got for us rather more than we were entitled to. Then we have the case of Oregon. Each country had historical claim, and fought for it with vigour. It is within your memory, Sir, how a great party in the United States attained power by the cry of 54:40 or fight. They did not get 54·40 and they did not fight. The President of the day would have fought, but he could not carry the Senate with him, the reason being that they had a war on their hands with Mexico that took up their entire energy. The point I wish to make is that Britain took the stand: we will fight if we have to, but we are going to have what is fair—and Canada got what was fair.

Another argument, which was used in the election recently held in Hochelaga is that England was recreant to her trust and to Canada in that she did not, at the time when the North and South were in the clutches of their struggle, strike a crushing blow at the North. Can one conceive a more Machiavelian impropriety than that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. NICKLE: That England owed no duty to the United States, a nation with whom she was on the friendliest terms, but was recreant to Canada because she did not break every rule of international law and strike a friend when she was in trouble. Let us assume that that would have been a correct policy. What would become of Canada if she depended on principles of that sort? What would become of Canada if England were in trouble and other nations assumed that as a straight and honest foreign policy?

Another point is raised. They tell me that if the policy of the right hon. leader of the Government prevails we shall divide Canada into two parts, that we shall have Quebec on the one hand and the English speaking provinces on the other. I cannot believe these foretellers of such dire forebodings.

My mind goes back in history to the time when, in 1775, the revolting American colonies used every wile to win the French Canadians from their allegiance to the British Crown ; my memory goes back through history to the war of 1812, when French Canadian blood watered the lower provinces for the maintenance of British supremacy ; history tells us how, in 1840, the French Canadian people, more numerous then than the people of Upper Canada, threw in their lot with us for a united parliament in order to better the conditions of Canada ; and again, if more recent allusion is necessary, I have not forgotten that, in 1867, Canada, from one end to the other, united, with hardly a dissenting voice, in so far as the provinces were concerned, to bring about Confederation.

The hon. member who has just taken his seat, has drawn attention to the fact that it is his privilege and mine to represent the constituencies which were at one time represented by Cartier and Macdonald, and, Mr. Speaker, in that fact, we, or at least I, feel a tremendous responsibility. It is not the responsibility of a man who ever expects to do much in politics, but it is the responsibility of doing well the little we have to do. And if my hon. friend and myself represent in that way the union of these races, there is no antagonism between Quebec and the other provinces. Canada is a united Canada from one end to the other.

You may say that there is a menace, or that there is not a menace, that the British Colonial policy was a poor policy or was a good policy, that we owe nothing to England for anything which she has done for us ; but, Sir, when the last word is said, when the last argument is advanced, the question we have to answer in this Parliament is this : is the British Empire worth preserving ? If the British Empire is not worth preserving, if it has outlived the sphere of its usefulness, then let it follow the other empires of the world and go into oblivion ; but, if the British Empire is worth preserving, let us see that we do our part. Some one has said that Rome was the lone mother of dead empires. But Britain is the loved mother of living nations. She has realized what the protection of her great empire means as no other world power has ever done. I am not blind to the picturesqueness of nationalism. Being Scotch, my blood thrills at the efforts of the Scottish people to maintain their independence against the aggression of their southern neighbours. I can appreciate the literature, the philosophy and the culture of Greece, and I understand that the union of the German provinces was brought about that the people of that country might have fuller opportunity for national development and advancement. The term 'Empire', in the working out of the problems of diplomacy, has been given a new and fuller meaning by British statesmen. I am an imperialist and I believe that, in the proper acceptance of the term, the great majority of the members of this House are Imperialists; Imperialists in the sense that we realize that the British nation has still a great work to do, not in wars of aggression,

not in the acquisition of more territory, but in the maintenance of the world's peace. We must realize that the only way to secure peace is, in quietness of spirit, to make the defence of the Empire so sure that the powers of Europe will see that armaments launched against them, will be courting the fate that awaited the fleets of Phillip and Napoleon, and in giving effect to this policy we would be taking a practical step towards the Parliament of man, the federation of the world. I have much pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in seconding the resolution first moved.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Quebec East): Mr. Speaker, though there is very little with which I can agree in the observations with which we have been favoured by the hon. member for Champlain and Verchères (Mr. Rainville) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), it is certainly my pleasure to offer to them on this occasion the congratulations which the House is always happy to extend to its young members under similar circumstances. I am particularly grateful to the hon. member for Kingston for the very gracious tribute which he has paid to a citizen of Kingston—I mean the late Sir Richard Cartwright—who, for many years, occupied so conspicuous a place in the public life of Canada. The efforts of the hon. the mover and the seconder of the Address were certainly very creditable, all the more creditable because of the fact that, in the Speech which was placed in the mouth of His Royal Highness by his advisers, there was very little from which they could draw any inspiration. The Speech is remarkable both for what it contains and for what it does not contain. From the point of view of the Government the Speech contains just as much as could not be excluded from it, and, from the point of view of the people, there are many subjects of the greatest importance to which the attention of the House should have been directed.

Of course, everybody expected that the Speech would mention the extended trip of His Royal Highness over the whole continent from Prince Edward Island to Prince Rupert and even to the frontier of Alaska, and the House, I am sure, will only be too glad to extend to His Royal Highness its appreciation of his determination to become acquainted with the range of the vast country over which he is called upon to preside.

Everybody expected also that some reference would be made to the good crops with which we have been blessed—not as large as we might have expected, because, as is suggested in the Speech, the almost constant weeping of the heavens since the 21st of September, 1911, has marred what promised to be a most bountiful crop during the past season. But, still, for its abundance we are certainly most grateful to Providence, and, if Providence could be depended upon to market this crop advantageously the farmers of the West would have additional cause for gratefulness to the Heavens, because, under this Administration, Providence is the only power upon which the farmers of the West can rely for the marketing of his crop. The best the Government could do for him was to ask the railways and the Interstate Commerce Commission at Washington to give him a favourable tariff so that he could take his grain over American railways to American shipping ports, with possible injury to his loyalty and the opening of a possible way to annexation, so far at all events, as Tory electors are concerned.

Of course, it was to be expected that we would be asked to ratify the trade agreement which has been made by the Government with a section of the West Indies known as the Bahama Islands, and I can assure my hon. friend that it will be our pleasure on this side to ratify that agreement if the terms are not too outrageous. The principle is right. The effect will not be much, because, after all, the market which is to be opened to the Canadian producer in the Bahamas is not of very great magnitude. The principle is right, I say, because at the present moment there is nothing of which the Canadian people are so much in need as outlets for their productions.

Every year we get from the farm, from the forest, from the mine, from the sea, far more than it is possible for our people in Canada to consume, and hence we have to find markets for the surplus products abroad. How much advantage can we hope to have from the market of the Bahamas? Here is the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1911, and this report shows that the Bahamas imported products to the value of $1,601,201 and exported products to the value of $946,175; the total annual trade of the Bahamas being about two and a half million dollars. And this is the market which is offered to the Canadian people. It is as if a thirsty man were to be offered a thimbleful of water to quench his thirst. But with a government of such contracted ideas as that now in power, we must be grateful for small favours and even a thimbleful of water may be welcomed.

We expected, also, that there would be an announcement that a measure for the improvement of highways would be introduced again this year; the measure which was killed last year by the Government, and not by the Senate, as has been stated in the Conservative press. That measure

passed through this House, and it was improved by the Senate; but the Government would rather kill it than accept it as so improved. The Bill came back to the House of Commons with an amendment. Was that amendment at all prejudicial to the provinces which the measure was intended to benefit? Why, the effect of that amendment would have been simply to provide that all the moneys which were to be appropriated for the betterment of highways should be put under the control of the governments and legislatures of the provinces. Under our constitution the highways were under the control of the local legislatures, and, therefore, it was quite in accordance with the spirit of the constitution that the moneys which were to be given for highways should be placed under provincial control. Nay, more, when the measure was introduced by the Minister of Railways, he himself stated that the principle which guided the granting of provincial subsidies would be the guiding principle of the measure; but, although he said that, he refused to incorporate that principle in the Bill; and, when the Senate did so, the Government rejected it. In many of the newspapers supporting the Government, the statement was made that the Bill had been killed by the Senate; but, let it be well understood, the Senate, instead of killing the Bill, improved it, and the Government, rather than accept the improvement, deliberately killed the measure. I express the hope that the Government may have become wiser by reflection, and that it will incorporate in the measure to be reintroduced, the principle contended for by the Senate. But I fear that it is difficult for this Government to learn, and that the Bill will come back just as it was introduced here last year.

Every one expected that there would be something said in the Speech about the naval policy of the Government, but what that policy was likely to be, no man has been so rash as to venture an opinion. What that policy would be the Lord only knew, and the Lord knew because in His omniscience He knew the minds of the ministers when the ministers themselves did not know their own minds. We have had evidence coming from different quarters that the ministers were tossed hopelessly upon the many currents and cross-currents whih raged in the Cabinet, which more than once threatened its very existence, and which at last submerged one of its most important members. Evidences there were, not a few, coming especially from the many semi-official communications to the press, that the ministers were unsteady and variable; as unsteady and variable as an autumnal morning—passing from mist to sunshine, and again from sunshine to mist. At last we are told that the Government have framed a naval policy, that they have completed their meditations and are about to submit it to this House. The policy they are going to propose to us is foreshadowed by information conveyed in this language to be found in the Speech from the Throne:

> During the past summer, four members of my Government conferred in London with His Majesty's Government on the question of naval defence. Important discussions took place and conditions have been disclosed which in the opinion of my advisers render it imperative that the effective naval forces of the Empire should be strengthened without delay.

May I be permitted to observe that this language is absolutely in contradiction of the language which I have heard from the Imperial authorities from time to time. It is in contradiction of the language of Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister; it is in contradiction of the language of Mr. Churchill, the First Lord of the Admiralty; who have not once but many times, on the floor of the Imperial House of Commons, at the Mansion House, on the hustings, on numbers of occasions, told us that England feared no enemy, that she was prepared and ready for all comers, now as ever. But, Sir, I will not prejudge the question; I will not now discuss that statement in the Speech; I will maintain on the present occasion the attitude which I have maintained ever since the prorogation of Parliament last session; I will not discuss the question until the policy of the Government has been disclosed. Whatever may be the information which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has had in England in his conferences with the Imperial authorities, we shall know by and by; and when this information has been placed before us, when the policy of the Government has been announced, we on this side of the House will judge the question upon its merits, guided only by the dual inspiration of what we owe to England as British subjects and of what we owe to Canada as Canadians.

My hon. friend from Kingston is not clear as to the attitude of the province of Quebec upon this question. The province of Quebec, whether it supports the policy of the Government or opposes it, will support it or oppose it, not because it is the province of Quebec, but we will take our stand with our fellow Liberals, and, I hope, with all our fellow Canadians as well. We cannot hope upon this question to be united. Perhaps we may be but that will depend very much on the character of the information which is placed before us. It will depend very much also upon the character of the policy which is presented to us. But whatever may be the policy, whatever may be the information laid before us, if there are in the province of Quebec a few men who say that we owe nothing to England,

they are far less numerous to-day than they were previous to the 21st of September, 1911. I see men to-day on the other side of the House—nay, I see men sitting on the Treasury Benches—and we shall have their word in due time, who said, before the 21st of September, that Canada owed nothing at all to England. There has been a material change in their views since that time, and therefore, I have only to repeat that there is no cause for apprehension in that direction. There has been too much in the past of appeals to passion and prejudice, and I hope for my part there will be no more.

There is another subject, one of which there is no mention whatever in the Speech from the Throne, but as to which we should have some information on an occasion like this. That is, the changes which have apparently been made in the character of the Transcontinental railway. Our engineers some ten years ago, when we commenced the construction of the Transcontinental railway, designed a railway which would be in advance of everything that had up to that time been planned, not only in Canada, but in any part of the American Continent; a railway which would be practically level from ocean to ocean, with no grade exceeding 21 feet to the mile. Specifications for such a road were prepared by our engineers. Those specifications were approved by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have constructed their share of the road upon those specifications from Winnipeg westward. The road has been constructed on those specifications from the Rocky mountains to the St. Lawrence. I understand that the Government have now changed the character of the road from Superior Junction to the St. Lawrence. We have never had any satisfactory explanation upon this point; but I agree altogether with the statement of my hon. friend from Kingston, that no road is better than its worst mile, and in degrading that portion of the road the Government are degrading the whole road from ocean to ocean. This is a question which interests not only the province of Quebec, not only the province of Ontario, but the whole of the Dominion from the Maritime Provinces to British Columbia. The matter was mooted in the press more than once, and the only explanation coming from the Government, which was given to us was that nothing had been done; no changes had taken place which would in any way alter the usefulness of the road. That is not a satisfactory answer. That is begging the whole question. We want to know as a matter of fact whether or not the engineers in charge of the work have received instructions from the Government to alter the character of the road, and to degrade it.

I do not at the present time make any charge against the Government. We have not got the information. We will wait for its answer. But we have reason to complain that such a change should have taken place without any information being given of it. My hon. friend had the whole session before him last year, and if he had intended to change the character of that road, he should have given us notice of it, so that we could have debated the matter and could have suggested whether or not it was advisable to take such a course.

Another matter of some importance, which should have been mentioned in the Speech, and of which we should have had some information, is the extraordinary step which was taken last year by the Government in undertaking by Order in Council to amend the tariff and to reduce by one-half the duty on cement. This was a most important step to take under existing circumstances. I address myself in particular to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and I think, upon this occasion he took a course for which no precedent can be found. We derive our revenue from a customs tariff. There are many people who believe that a customs tariff is not the best method of raising a revenue. For my part, I say frankly, I do not believe that it is possible now, or will be for many years, to raise our revenue in any other way. But whether we approve of that system or not, whether we are free traders or protectionists, we are agreed that once a duty has been imposed that duty should not be lightly interfered with. In the first place, a duty should not be levied except after ample consideration as to the amount of revenue that it may produce, and the effect it may have ; because the effect of any customs tariff, even if it be for revenue only, is to create a different atmosphere and therefore likely to produce very serious consequences. For that reason I say that no changes in the tariff should be lightly made. We made in our day a change in the tariff when we abolished the coal duty west of Lake Superior, but we gave the reason. The West was threatened with a coal famine, and it was to avoid that most dire calamity in a country like Canada in the winter time that we resorted to that method. But what is the justification for the course which was taken last June ? We were told all of a sudden that the duty on cement had been reduced by one-half. On this subject there was published in the Canadian Courier in the month of July last, a most illuminating correspondence, in which the charge was made, that the

duties were reduced not as a matter of policy, not because of the condition of the country, but simply with the object of influencing an impending election in the province of Saskatchewan. I would not venture to make the suggestion myself, although my confidence in the Government is not very great. But the charge is made by one of their own supporters, and therefore it is more serious for them than if it had come from me. In July last the 'Canadian Courier' published this letter :

May 10, 1912.

To the Right Hon. R. L. Borden.

Hon. Sir,—Some weeks ago the cement interests were advised that certain members of your Cabinet were contemplating the reduction of the duty on cement and sundry other articles, with the sole view of influencing the elections pending in the Northwest provinces. Messrs. Rogers and Cochrane were the prime movers, and according to our information it was intended that the order should be rushed through in the absence of yourself, Mr. White and Mr. Foster. Such an order would be inconsistent with the doctrine of the Conservative party and contrary to the pledges of every leading member of your Cabinet. I may here say that a deputation from companies interested, interviewed Mr. White and Mr. Foster a short time ago and presented our case. The deputation was received with great courtesy and was assured by the ministers that the duty on cement would not be lowered.

However, I see by to-days' 'Daily World,' Toronto, a semi-official statement that this good Conservative doctrine and the personal pledges of nearly every one of your ministers are to be ignored, and the whole cement industry of the Dominion is to be destroyed, all for the sake of assisting Mr. Rogers in his election.

Such a breach of faith on the part of your Cabinet should and would bring about disaster to the party at the next election.

You act on the principle that a little strained money advantage in the West would help your party at present. That might be so, but you should think what would be the effect in Ontario and other parts of the Dominion if you depart from your honoured National Policy and destroy an industry in which so many millions of money are invested. Our company has upwards of four hundred stockholders, and the total number of cement shareholders must be about ten thousand. I ask you, would it pay you to sacrifice these ten thousand, mostly your supporters, for a paltry success gotten by the sacrifice of principles which you and the Conservative party have for years advocated, and which placed you in your present proud position?

No man ever entered upon a career with a better name or brighter prospects. You were admired as a true man by Tory and Grit alike, and it would be a sad blow to the Conservatives to find you breaking a pledge or weakening to the baser elements of your ministry.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier held his party together by the firmness of his management and his adherence to his own personal pledges and the traditions of his party; but in a moment of weakness he listened to the voice of the tempter, to Fielding, Paterson and 'The Globe'—you know the result; his party spurned him and them.

You were elected to fill the place of that great statesman, Sir John A Macdonald, in the Conservative party; you have the ability, honesty and a good name which the whole world recognizes and is waiting to see if you have the generalship and firmness of character necessary to control your Cabinet and not permit them to lead you into shallows and confusion.

I have written this in the interest of the company I represent, and I say sincerely, as your ardent admirer and a life-long supporter of the Conservative party, that I trust, notwithstanding the rumours to the contrary that your decision will be on true nation grounds.

Yours faithfully,

The answer of my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was marked 'confidential' and was therefore not given to the press. But the rejoinder to that answer appears in the same issue, as follows:—

June 10th, 1912.

To the Right Hon. R. L. Borden.

Hon. Sir,—One month ago to-day I had the honour of addressing a letter to you on the subject of the duty on cement, and beg to refer you thereto. On the 13th May I received your prompt and courteous reply. In my letter I called your attention to rumours to the effect that certain of your ministers, in your absence, were pledging your Government to a reduction of the duties on cement, and for the sole purpose (according to rumours) of influencing the elections in Saskatchewan in favour of the Conservative party. In your reply you stated that I gave undue credence to rumours which appear in the press, but it now appears that the rumours as to lowering of cement duty only foreshadowed the event which has taken place; unless the report in the 'Globe' to-day is equally astray. It now appears that what seemed to my credulous mind to be a conspiracy against your honour and the pledge of our leaders has taken place, and all for the sake of influencing a petty local election in a western province.

Your letter to me, which I believed was written in all sincerity, led me to believe that such action was in no way contemplated, and that there was no fear of a departure from the well defined and established policy of the Conservative party.

In view of your letter, as manager of this company, I proceeded in the expenditure of several thousand dollars for the purpose of increasing our output, and have commenced the season on a larger scale than ever before. Had I not believed your letter, or had you suggested the most remote possibility of the lowering of the duty, or even that the matter was under consideration, I would have advised the directors to close the plant and hand it over to the English bondholders.

The action of the Government in this matter is a violation of every pledge given before election, and is distinctly repugnant to the Conservative party. There can be no economic reason for it since there are over one

million barrels of cement on hand and sufficient mill capacity to satisfy any possible demand. Had the Government forced the transportation companies to do their duty and carry the necessities of the country at a reasonable rate, there would be no complaint of a shortage in the West or clamour for a reduction of the duty. Whatever may have been your motive in making the order I can assure you that the public will regard the act as an election dodge pure and simple.

It was the hope of the Conservative party that in you they had found a man who was more than a politician, a man who was a statesman, one upon whose firmness they could rely for steadfastness of policy. Lacking such a man at its head, any Cabinet becomes a nest of intriguing politicians.

This action of yours will do more to split Canada at Winnipeg than Sir Wilfrid Laurier did in his whole life, and to advertise and make known the special and divergent interests of East and West. I have travelled all through the West several times, and I firmly believe that eventually the Conservative party has no hope of support from that quarter. Why, therefore, alienate your certain support from the East, and particularly Ontario?

I conclude only by saying that I am much poorer in purse by relying upon your letter upon this subject, as it would be read by any reasonable man, but poorer far in heart and mind when I see the sacrifice to which politicians are driven.

Yours faithfully,

To that letter——

An hon. MEMBER: Name.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The name is not given but we shall have it bye and bye when the papers are brought before the House. To that letter there was an answer as follows:

Ottawa, June 13, 1912.

Dear Sir,—In the absence of the Right Honourable the Prime Minister your letter of the 10th instant with reference to the remission of the duty upon cement has been brought to my attention, and I regret very much that under an entire misconception of facts you should criticise so strongly the action of the Government in this matter. The Prime Minister's statement to you under date of May 13th was absolutely correct because at that date the matter of the cement tariff had not been in any way under consideration by the Government. During the past two weeks, however, an extremely serious situation has developed in Canada, and particularly in the West, due to shortage of cement supply, with an accompanying suspension of buildings, paving and construction work in many localities. From careful inquiries made, it became apparent to the Government that the situation should be remedied at once and a fifty per cent remission of duty was decided upon until October 31st. I am satisfied not only that the action of the Government will meet with the approval of the public generally, but that the fears you express as to its consequence will be found to be not well grounded. The present tariff affords protection of at least sixty per cent to the cement manufacturers, and even with the cut they still have thirty per cent, which is higher than the average rate upon dutiable goods entering Canada. I desire to entirely repudiate your suggestion that the reduction was in any way influenced by political considerations, and feel confident that upon reflection you will agree that the action of the Government was a proper one in the public interest.

Yours very truly,

There is one sentence in this letter to which I will call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White):

The Prime Minister's statement to you under date of May 13th was absolutely correct because at that date the matter of the cement tariff had not been in any way under consideration by the Government.

This implies that long previous to the 13th of May applications had been made to the Government for the reduction of the duty. The fact is that last session it was rumoured in the corridors of this House that the cement duties were abnormal and that the matter had been called to the attention of the Government. But they did not take it into consideration at that time. I wish to suggest to my hon. friend that the time to have taken that matter into consideration was while Parliament was sitting, and that their policy should have been presented to the House for adoption here. It is stated here that the matter was not taken up until after the 13th of May, but the conditions after that date were not changed from what they had been six months before—nor for that matter, were they different from what they are to-day. And, if the duty on cement was 60 per cent, and if reasons were given after the 13th of May why that duty should be cut in two, there must have been just as good reasons why that course should have been taken before that time. The well-wishers of the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) of whom I claim to be one, believed that no consideration of political expediency would move him in dealing with a question of the tariff, but that the only reasons which would ever appeal to him for the revision of the tariff, were reasons of political economy. And the views which he had expressed more than once we believed were as firmly rooted in his breast as the Rock of Ages.

There is, in the Speech from the Throne, a most important paragraph, which reads as follows:

Several other Bills will be submittel, including measures providing for increased representation of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba in the Senate.

A Bill is to be introduced for increased representation of the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba in the Senate. With this Bill, as with the naval

policy of the Government, I will not deal at the present moment. It would not be fair to the Government, to myself, or to the House, to venture any criticism of that policy, whatever it may be, and we shall wait until it is presented to the House. I presume that the words put into the mouth of His Royal Highness have been duly weighed, and if so, there is only one conclusion to be drawn from them, and that is that the Government have no intention this session of introducing a measure of redistribution. There may be some reasons why the representation of these three provinces should be increased in the Senate—we do not know them. But there is a reason why the representation of those provinces in the House of Commons should be increased, and we do know it. The British North America Act provides that there shall be a census every ten years, and that after every census the representation of the provinces in this House shall be rearranged according to the figures disclosed by the census, upon the basis of population. There is no more important provision in the British North America Act, and I say to my right hon. friend, and to those who sit behind him, that there devolves upon them a consitutional and imperative duty to have this redistribution immediately—not next session, not the session after next, but during this present session. The British North America Act, in section 58, paragraph 5, dealing with the redistribution which must follow the census, provides as follows:

> Such readjustment shall not take effect until the termination of the then existing parliament.

It may perhaps be said, that it is sufficient to have this redistribution made before a general election, but that is not the interpretation which has been given in the past to this provision. The Act provides that the redistribution shall take place as soon as the figures of the census are known. And why? It is true that a parliament may continue for five years, but everybody knows that Parliament can be dissolved at any moment. It may be the will or the pleasure of the Governor General to dissolve Parliament at any time, there may be a crisis which may make this course advisable. Therefore it is necessary that the conditions under which elections must take place should be the same at all times. This has been the policy which has been followed after every census. In 1871, in 1881, in 1891, and in 1901, the redistribution took place as soon as the figures of the census were known. Why, then, this exception? What is the sinister design which exists in the mind of the ministry when they actually contemplate not having the redistribution during this present session? I shall await, what the Government have to say on this important subject. I assume that they have to-day no intention of performing what is an important constitutional duty. If I am wrong I shall be glad to know it, and it will be my duty to apologize, but if I am right the Government may expect to hear of the question again during the present session.

There is one thing in regard to which the Government are silent, that is, as to their achievements—and for a good reason. When nothing has been done, of course nothing can be said. If it can be supposed of governments what is sometimes applied to individuals, that to each one is assigned an angel whose mission is to record his good deeds and his bad deeds, the angel of the present Government as far as good deeds are concerned, has had nothing whatever to do, his pen has been rusty, his page has been blank, and I must say that that angel has indeed had many causes to weep.

When the members of the Government were sitting on this side of the House, they were voluble and indefatigable preachers of virtue. The people took them at their word, believing that their deeds would correspond to their statements, but they have found that these men who were preachers can be little esteemed as performers. My hon. friend who sits opposite, when he was in the place I now occupy, used to deliver homilies on the necessity of having bye-elections on the same day when there were several vacancies at the same time. These homilies have been altogether forgotten. My hon. friend has had the oportunity during the recess of making practical application of his doctrines, but like the old moons, they have gone away—we do not see them any more. There were several vacancies, and several elections took place—I do not speak of the last, which was caused by the resignation of Mr. Monk, but of the others—and there was no reason why these elections should not have been held on the same day. But they were not brought on the same day, they were scientifically spaced with regular or irregular intervals so as to bring the greatest possible measure of success to devoted apostles of the Government.

In other matters I have to charge them with dereliction of duty of the gravest character. I have to say here and now that in the elections in Macdonald and Richelieu there were practices connived at by the Government, which would put to shame the worst record of Tammany Hall. The election in Macdonald was under the charge of my hon. friend the then Minister of the Interior, the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). He stated in one of his speeches, and that speech was endorsed by

Sir Rodmond Roblin, that the constituency of Macdonald was full of thieves and thugs from Alberta and Saskatchewan. My hon. friend was shocked by the presence, as he said, of thugs and thieves, and we have, I suppose, to presume that on the other side there were nothing but angels. We shall see the character of those angels. My hon. friend said in his speech that in Macdonald there were thugs and thieves from Saskatchewan and Alberta, but that he had his eye on them, that Sir Rodmond Roblin had his eye on them also, and that the whole machinery of the law would be at their command, and every one of the thieves and thugs would be arrested and properly dealt with under the law. Mark the words, the statement was made not once but several times, that the whole machinery of the law would be used by the hon. minister to put out of business the thugs and thieves of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The machinery of the law was, in fact, at the disposal of the Minister of Public Works, and he used it. A couple of days after this first statement he made the assertion that one of these thugs and thieves had been arrested, was in durance and would be properly dealt with. At that time, it is true, one of the canvassers of Mr. Richardson, the Opposition candidate, had been arrested. His name was Sullivan. Another one was arrested; his name was Walkinshaw. Another man was arrested; his name was Sifton. Another man was arrested ; his name was France. They were all arrested under the machinery of the law; and, Sir, under the machinery of the law these men were put in jail. They were not allowed to see their counsel; bail was refused to them; they were released only when the elections had taken place. And now were they released, these thugs and thieves who were to be looked after by the vigilant eye of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works? What has become of them? The whole severity of the law was to be brought to bear on them. You will naturally suppose that they have been tried and convicted, and are now suffering for their offences. The truth is, Sir, that at this moment these poor men who were arrested by the machinery of the law set in motion by the Minister of Public Works, were, every one of them, absolutely innocent of any charge whatever. One was acquitted honourably, as I shall show presently, and as for the others, my hon. friend, who had set the law in motion against them, did not dare to prosecute them, and to bring them to trial. There was a whole system of terrorism in the election of Macdonald to prevent four honest men performing their duty as British subjects, and to prevent other friends of Mr. Richardson exercising their right as British subjects of canvassing for the candidate of their choice. Sir, I am shocked to see men who can take such a matter as that with such levity as I see on the other side of the House. I followed this matter very closely as the election was going on. In the 'Citizen' of October 12, two days before the election, we read:

Winnipeg, Oct. 11.—The arrest of two more Liberal workers by the provincial police to-day was the feature of the wind-up to the Macdonald campaign, and added fuel to the bitter controversy now raging as to whether these arrests are justified or are merely to intimidate the Opposition candidate's organization.

This is a ministerial paper, a respectable journal of this city. It goes on:

The arrests were made at Cardinal in the French district of Macdonald riding. R. J. A. Prince, one of the men arrested, is a Winnipeg law student whose parents are respectable French-Canadians living across the river at St. Boniface. He is charged with having given a voter ten dollars.

That was published in the 'Citizen' on October 12. On October 18 another despatch came from Winnipeg addressed to the 'Citizen' in these words:

Prince Case dismissed.

Morden, Man., Oct. 17th.

The case against R. J. A. Prince, of Winnipeg, who was arrested at Cardinal a week ago in connection with the Macdonald election was dismissed here this morning by Magistrate Morden. In dismissing the case the magistrate stated emphatically that the young man should not have been arrested at all and that it was time to put a stop to such proceedings.

This was the only one of the four men who were arrested who was tried. On the same day there appeared in the 'Citizen' a similar despatch with regard to the case of Walkinshaw.

Portage la Prairie, Man., Oct. 17.—D. H. Walkinshaw, who was arrested at Rothwell charged with infractions of the Dominion Election Act in the Macdonald by-election, appeared before Mayor Garland this morning and was dismissed, after F. G. Taylor, who appeared for the Crown had stated that he had no evidence to offer in support of the charge. E. J. McMurray on behalf of the accused asked for a certificate of honourable acquittal which was granted.

Then on October 16 there appeared in the Ottawa 'Citizen' a despatch in these words:

Winnipeg, Oct. 15.—The 'Free Press' this morning publishes what it describes as a swift vindications of Captain William B. Sifton, the Minitonas man who was arrested by the provincial police charged with various offences against the Election Act in connection with some active canvassing he had been engaged in during the by-election here in the St. Laurent district. It was claimed Saturday Sifton had pleaded guilty under section 269 of the Dominion Election Act, but yester-

day he pleaded not guilty and the preliminary hearing was set for next Saturday. 'Counsel for Sifton,' says the 'Free Press,' 'then made the remarkable discovery that the inforamtion on which the warrant of arrest was issued was dated October 7, while the alleged offence was not committed until October 10.'

This goes to show that the machinery of the law was set in motion in advance. The despatch concludes:

Later on in the afternoon Provincial Magistrate McMicken stated the case had been withdrawn.

Here is a man, Walkinshaw, arrested, taken to Winnipeg, from Winnipeg taken to Portage la Prairie, kept there in jail, and when the time for his trial came the case was withdrawn because there was no evidence against him.

The same thing applied to the other man, Sullivan. Now, Sir, this is not all. On the following day two personators were arrested by the scrutineers of Mr. Richardson. A day was set for the trial; the plaintiffs, their counsel and their witnesses came to court, and they were told that the men had been discharged from custody, that they had pleaded guilty and had been sentenced to a penalty of $50. The law says that, under such circumstances, there shall be a penalty in money, a fine, or imprisonment. The magistrate undertook to dispose of the case an hour before the time set for the trial. The machinery of the law had been set in motion by somebody, but these men were not allowed to be tried in public. Their case was disposed of in camera. So that at the present time we have no opportunity of knowing what was the extent of their guilt, or whether they should have been punished by a fine or by imprisonment, or who were the parties behind them. That is the way in which the Macdonald election was carried on and won. But, Sir, that is not all. The activity of my hon. friend was not confined to the province of Manitoba. My hon. friend is ambitious in this respect. He had gone to Saskatchewan in the summer; he came to Quebec later on. He came to Richelieu, not himself, personally, but by proxy; he sent a proxy to Richelieu, and the proxy came with his hands full of promises of public works if the electors would vote for the Conservative candidate, Mr. Morgan. I again charge the Minister of Public Works, and I arraign him before Parliament, with having tried to bribe the electors of Richelieu. I call as witness a member of this House, the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) and I say, on the word of the hon. member for Charlevoix, that he was sent by the Minister of Public Works to Richelieu to try and bribe the electors. I shall not use my own words; I have the words of Sir Rodolphe Forget published in 'La Patrie,' which is the paper friendly to the Government and especially friendly to the hon. member for Charlevoix. The hon. member for Charlevoix came to the town of Sorel, the shire town of the county of Richelieu and held a meeting, and this is his language as reported in his own paper, 'La Patrie':

He said that he was coming in the name of the government, at the request of the Hon. Mr. Rogers, to beg the electors of Richelieu to send to Parliament a member in sympathy with the present administration.

If my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works had sent the hon. member for Charlevoix simply to ask the electors of Richelieu to send to Parliament a member in sympathy with the administration, I would have nothing to say. He would have been within his rights. I would not have objected had he tried to influence the electors by any honourable means. But the hon. member for Charlevoix did not come empty handed. On the contrary, the hon. gentleman went on and spoke as follows:

I would not come here, said he, until I had the promise of the Government that you would have the marine railway, of which I spoke to you at the banquet offered to Mr. Hazen. It has been promised to you, and I now come to ask you to elect my friend Mr. Morgan, so that Sorel and the county of Richelieu may progress with the assistance of the Government.

I caused promises to be made to me, not electoral promises, but real promises, and I have the pleasure of telling you that if Mr. Morgan is elected your member on Thursday, you will have the marine railway of which you stand in such need, to procure to your city the progress to which it is entitled. I can assure you that you will have this just improvement which has been promised you for the last twenty years, and which you never obtained. You will have it not later than the next session, which opens in one month. The Government on the demand of your member, Mr. Morgan, will have the necessary subsidies voted, one hundred thousand, two hundred thousand dollars, if need be, and you shall have it.

What is your interest, I ask you? I do not want to say anything, gentlemen, of the Liberal party, against Mr. Cardin. Were this a general election, I might probably tell you to vote with your party, but in this election, the interest of the party is not the issue; the interest of Sorel is the sole issue. Well then; it is a Conservative government which is in office. Do you not believe that you must send a member in sympathy with it, so as to obtain all the favours which you may wish for?

That is the way in which it was attempted to bribe the electors of Richelieu.

The bribe failed in Richelieu. Intimidation did its work in Macdonald ; but, in so far as the electors are concerned, we want to feel that such methods cannot be countenanced. It is unnecessary to make any comment upon such practices as these. It is sufficient to bring them to the attention of the House, and I avail myself of the first opportunity, so that they can be stigmatized at once, in the hope that in the future we may be able to prevent their occurrence. Differ as we may upon political questions, we ought after all to carry on our contests in the light of British institutions. I have heard a great deal this afternoon about British institutions, and I agree with everything that has been said, but it is the spirit of the British constitution that we should have fair play. We did not have fair play in these contests, but an attempt was made to debauch the electorate. In view of this, and to bring the attention of the House to the matter, I beg to move that the following words be added to the Address :

We beg to represent to your Royal Highness that in the elections of Macdonald and Richelieu there were practices calculated to terrorize and corrupt the electorate, which were connived at by your Ministers and which deserve the censure of the House.

The amendment having been put :

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Will you permit me a correction ? I understand that the commercial agreement made by the Government is not only with the Bahamas, but with the whole of the British West Indies.

Mr. BORDEN: Certainly. I was going to make that correction.

Mr. SPEAKER: The question is now on the amendment.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I join with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in the congratulations which he has extended—although in a somewhat grudging manner—to the mover and the seconder of the Address. The right hon. gentleman found very little in the speeches of either of these gentlemen with which he could agree, and I do not wonder at that because their speeches were inspired by a good, strong, healthy spirit of patriotism and optimism. As the right hon. gentleman proceeded I did not hear from him any of the particulars in which he ventured to disagree with what these gentlemen had uttered in speeches which I am sure commanded the attention of the House and which will compare very favourably with the addresses delivered in the past on similar occasions. My hon. friend from the province of Quebec (Mr. Rainville) spoke in commendable terms of the spirit of Canadian unity, which does animate, and which ought to animate, all good Canadians. Does my right hon. friend agree with that? My hon. friend from the province of Quebec (Mr. Rainville) spoke of the marvelous development and progress of this country during the past twenty-five years. Does not my hon. friend agree with that? Why, when he sat on these treasury benches there was little else we heard from him but boasts of the country's progress and prosperity and the additional suggestion, that Providence after all was only a junior partner of the then administration in any benefits conferred upon the country, and that all the progress of this country was due to the measures placed before the House by the Liberal Government and due to nothing else.

I join with my right hon. friend in the tribute he paid to the memory of Sir Richard Cartwright who held a high position in the public life of this country for a very great number of years. Although hon. gentlemen on this side of the House did not see eye to eye with Sir Richard Cartwright on many great public questions, and although he was wont to speak his mind with a peculiar frankness when he was discussing the supposed demerits of his political opponents, I am sure that no one of us had ever anything but the kindliest feelings towards him. Though Sir Richard Cartwright was a man strong and earnest in speech, we knew that after all he was inspired by a kindness of heart which never failed to exhibit itself in the relations of private life.

I would like to pay a tribute here to the memory of my friend, Edward Kidd, a member of this House who has died since last session, and whose friendship, nay more, whose devotion to the party and to myself, was evidenced in a marked degree. When, after the general election of 1904 I found myself, owing to circumstances which I was unable to control, without a seat in this House, Mr. Kidd resigned his seat for the county of Carleton and I had the honour to be elected to represent that county. Afterwards when I was elected for Halifax in 1908 Mr. Kidd succeeded me as member for the county of Carleton. He was a man of few words, but he possessed a great deal of businesslike common sense and was gifted with a very much wider knowledge of public affairs than was attributed to him by those who did not know him intimately. His loss is not only a loss to the county of Carleton but a loss to this House and to the people of Canada.

I join most heartily with what my right hon. friend has said with regard to the visit of His Royal Highness the Governor General to the provinces of Canada since last session. For five or six months His

Royal Highness was engaged in traversing this great country from ocean to ocean, making himself acquainted with all its conditions, and becoming seized with the spirit of its people. It was a great task which he undertook, a task which he carried out with that devotion to duty which has characterized him all his life. There is no doubt I am sure in the mind of any hon. gentleman in this House that the visit of His Royal Highness to all these provinces of Canada has resulted not only in a stronger spirit of union between this country and the whole Empire, but in a stronger spirit of Canadian unity and solidarity than even we possessed heretofore.

I now come to some observations of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition with which I am not so inclined to agree. He indulged in some more or less slighting remarks with regard to the arrangements that have been made in Western Canada for the purpose of removing any possible congestion in the transportation of the grain crop. Does my right hon. friend object to these arrangements that have been made? If he does not object, then why does he waste the time of the House in discussing them? We desire to do everything in our power to facilitate the transportation of the West and increasing products of Western Canada, and not only this year but last year we took such action with regard to that as will commend itself to the men of Eastern Canada and to the men of Western Canada as well.

My right hon. friend corrected himself with regard to the West Indies agreement, and he might have followed that example with regard to some other portions of his speech. Ever since the defeat of the Highways Bill, last year, at his dictation—because he took full responsibility for the defeat of that Bill in the Senate—ever since then he has been endeavouring to explain and to apologize for that unfortunate action of his. To-day we have a renewed attempt on his part to explain and to apologize. Well, I can only say to my right hon. friend that the best explanation and apology he can give for that unfortunate action on his part last year, would be a suggestion to his friends in the Senate that when that Bill goes through this House again they shall take good care not to lay unholy hands on it.

My right hon. friend referred also to the naval question and he spoke of certain currents and cross-currents which he said had resulted in the submersion of an important Minister of the Crown. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) is not here to-day to speak for himself, unfortunately he is ill, but I venture to believe that the late Minister of Public Works will be able to discuss his position on that question with my right hon. friend or with any other member of this House. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) acting under a high sense of duty, did see fit to resign his position in the Government, but I venture to think that it will not lie in the mouth of my right hon. friend to utter one word of criticism or reproach against the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) in respect to that. Currents and cross-currents and dissensions—why did not my right hon. friend explain the remarkable change of programme under which he gave up his projected tour in Western Canada? There were tremendous headlines in the Liberal press all over the country, and especially in the province of Ontario, announcing a tour to be made by the right hon. gentleman who was to speak in every province of Western Canada. They were followed by what? By a gathering of certain very influential members of the party in the city of Ottawa, and, if I am not mistaken, within the very precincts of this building. I am not in a position to speak with absolute accuracy as to what took place, but there are rumours that loud tones were heard, that harsh words were interchanged, that fists were even shaken across the table, and that these eccentricities of temperament and temper did not by any means cease when these gentlemen emerged into public gaze. Indeed my right hon. friend was said to have been so very much disturbed by what took place on that particular occasion, that he was not quite himself during the rest of the day, at a public occasion when he had an important duty to perform. As a direct result of these loud and unfortunate dissensions the great western tour was abandoned.

Well, we will go on to one or two more references which my hon. friend has made. He touched on the naval question somewhat lightly. I do not propose to deal with it to-day, because the proposals of the Government will come before Parliament at a very early date, and we shall have full opportunity of debating that question; but he tells us that he had always heard that England feared no enemy. I would rather put it in this way, that the Empire fears no enemy. But, Sir, the fact that the Empire fears no enemy is not a good reason in my estimation why we should delay to a day of possible peril that preparation which ought to be made in advance.

My right hon. friend spoke of change of grades on the Transcontinental railway. I think he will find that my hon. colleague, the Minister of Railways and Canals, will have an answer with regard to that particular question, which, whether it is satisfactory to my right hon. friend or not, will be found eminently satisfactory by the

people of Canada in every province from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

My right hon. friend has spent a very considerable portion of his speech in reading from a public newspaper a series of letters respecting the reduction on the duty in cement. I observed that my hon. friend the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) was not particularly comfortable while he was reading those extracts. Perhaps I may be mistaken in my appreciation of the feelings which animated that gentleman while his leader was discussing that subject. We have heard from a number of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and especially from the hon. member for Edmonton, diatribes without number against the so-called trusts and mergers and the combines, and this very combine, the alleged cement combine, is one that has been held up to contempt and harsh language and obloquy by the hon. member for Edmonton on more than one occasion ; and he even now nods his approval. Now, I would simply like to ask my hon. friend from Edmonton what he thinks of his leader when he poses as a champion of this awful combine. I do not propose to take up time in debating that subject, except to say that it was thoroughly discussed by the Government before the action was taken, that they made themselves acquainted with the facts and the circumstances, and to add further, that before the conclusion of this debate my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will state to the satisfaction of the majority of this House and to the satisfaction of the majority of the people of the country, the reasons which led the Government to take that course.

My right hon. friend went on further, and attacked us in anticipation, because he declared that the Speech from the Throne ought to contain a reference to the Redistribution Bill. My right hon. friend is very anxious and very much concerned about an anticipated crisis in the Government. He desires to provide carefully in advance for every possible crisis. I think if he will provide for any crisis which arise in the ranks of his own party, he will have enough to engage his attention, and he need not trouble himself very much about our supposed crisis. I beg to inform my right hon. friend that, as I understand it, and as he understands it, any redistribution measure that may be passed cannot take effect until after the dissolution of the then existing parliament. That is absolutely understood. Now I have under my hand a pretty careful statement of what has been done in that regard since the inception of this Confederation, but I will take only one illustration. As I understand it, in 1901 there was a preliminary report of the census made on the 15th day of August, 1901, and the Redistribution Bill was not assented to until the 24th day of October, 1903, more than 26 months afterwards. The report which we issued to the public was under date of 27th February, 1912. The census of last year having been taken on the basis of June instead of March as in previous years ; and if we put through this Redistribution Bill by April 1914, we shall have made as much progress after the census of 1911 as my right hon. friend did after the census of 1901.

My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) comments upon the Government's silence as to their achievements. We differ from our hon. friends on that side of the House in that our achievements are such as speak for themselves while these hon. gentlemen were obliged continually to boast of theirs.

My right hon. friend then went on to profess himself shocked in respect of certain misdeeds which he declared to have taken place in the riding of Macdonald and in the riding of Richelieu, and he brought in as incontrovertible evidence of these misdeeds —what do you suppose? Certain newspaper clippings! My right hon. friend, in days gone by, was wont to speak of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, as 'Scrap-book orators.' I venture to think that when a man who has been Prime Minister of Canada and is to-day leader of his party desires to present to the House and to the country a resolution of such a character as that which my right hon. friend has brought forward, for the sake of his own reputation and for the dignity of Parliament, he should desire to be supported by something better than a scrap-book. He will have a test upon his proposed motion. These professions do not come very well from a right hon. gentleman who had to do with the West Huron and Brockville elections, one who obtained the vote of members of this House by his pledge that the investigation into these cases should be carried out to the very end—and yet from the day that pledge was made up to the present time it has not been fulfilled. If he desires to go into these matters and to have recrimination and reminiscence, let me remind him of what took place in London, in Hastings, in Yukon, and in many another election under his regime, the very enumeration of which would occupy too lengthily at the moment the time of this House.

My right hon. friend has referred to a few other matters which we may leave for the moment as they are not of very great importance. The hon. gentleman has been holding a series of meetings throughout the country during recent weeks. He did not, it is true, go to the West, but remained

in the East, for reasons into the mysteries of which I do not propose further to pry. But I observe that in his addresses in the province of Ontario and in the province of Quebec, which were the provinces he visited in this way, he was inclined to condole with the people of this country upon the election of September, 1911. He is not at all concerned, he assures us, about himself, but he is very much concerned for the people of Canada. I would suggest to him that his concern is absolutely unnecessary, for the country is quite contented. I would ask him when next he addresses the people of these provinces to throw aside this depression and gloom and join with the rest of us in endeavouring to do some good work for the country. He bewails the rejection of reciprocity. I do not think that the people, under present prosperous conditions, are at all inclined to sorrow over the verdict they gave on the 21st of September, 1911. Allusion has been made to a certain communication which was made public last spring in April or May, I think —a letter written by Mr. Taft to Colonel Roosevelt, which sets forth:

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not wonder that my hon. friend groans. I will spare his feelings to the extent of refraining from reading that letter; I do not know what the consequences to him might be if I should read it. But I would like to bring to the attention of the House, and of the country, one circumstance in connection with it which is of some significance. There is a very well known and responsible newspaper in the city of New York known as the Evening 'Post'. It was supposed to be thoroughly in the confidence of Mr. Taft and his administration. Any gentleman who is curious in these matters will find in the columns of the New York Evening 'Post' of Friday, May 3, 1912, an editorial article touching this letter, and from that article I will read just one sentence:

> When we recall that the 'adjunct' letter was passed upon by the full Cabinet and by other advisors of the President, the mistake of giving it out appears the more inexplicable.

That is to say, that letter was not merely the personal opinion of Mr. Taft, but was a letter which had been passed upon by the whole Cabinet of the United States, and by other prominent men in that country. This circumstance, it seems to me, gives it a somewhat odd significance. My right hon. friend, notwithstanding, has nailed his colours to the mast—at least we are so informed by his friends, and therefore the statement must be correct; my right hon. friend will not deny it, for this is an extract from a circular used in the West by his friends in a certain recent election:

> The reciprocity flag has been nailed to the mast by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

And if my right hon. friend did not exactly nail it to the mast it was because he seems inclined to pursue his usual course of retiring within the lines of Torres Vedras whenever any difficult or important question is presented for his consideration.

He did, however, tell us at Marieville on the 7th of September: 'My heart and my soul have not changed and my policy has remained the same.' At Cochrane on the 20th of September he said: 'The ideals which we have striven for are stronger than ever.' At North Bay, on the 21st of September, he said: 'On the 21st of September we went down in a noble cause.'

My hon. friend's optimism and courage were very great when he began, but as he proceeded they did not seem to continue, because while at first he was inclined to prophesy the immediate return of his party, yet when he reached Sherbrooke on the 29th of October, after about six weeks of a campaign, in speaking of the next election he said that 'he was not prepared to say that the Liberals would win the first time, but he hoped they would.'

Mr. Speaker, just one moment more. The condition of this country has been described by the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded this debate as satisfactory from a material, industrial and commercial standpoint. There has been expansion of revenue and there has been general development. These are due primarily to the intelligence, foresight, courage and industry of the people, and this Government is prepared to co-operate with the people of Canada in every possible way to increase and advance that development which has been so marked in the past.

My right hon. friend has charged that we have failed to implement pledges. Let me tell him and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, that we have been in power a little more than one year and during that period we have fulfilled at least four times as many of our pledges as these hon. gentlemen opposite in the whole period of their administration. What have we done? We promised aid to agriculture; we brought it in. We promised aid to highways; we brought it in, and my hon. friend's supporters in the Senate defeated it at his dictation. We promised to create a tariff commission; we brought in that measure. We promised terminal elevators, under government ownership and control, and that we would deal with and settle the question of the extension of provincial boundaries; these questions were dealt with last year. We promised that we would proceed at once with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway; the contract has been let for the whole line. We promised to

proceed with the equipment of our national ports; they are being attended to to-day. We promised the development of our waterways; and already we have made a substantial beginning. We promised a reorganization of the public service; and we have brought from Great Britain one of the ablest and most experienced men in the public service of that country, whose report I hope will be placed before Parliament at no distant date. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are prepared to meet my right hon. friend in any comparison of fulfilment of pledges, and to submit our record in that regard side by side with his when we appeal to the people of this country,—and we do not doubt what the result will be.

At Six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, when the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. R. L. Borden) was concluding his remarks, he laid considerable stress upon the fulfilment of promises by the Government of which he is the leader. I am sure the country will be glad to know that we have a government that fulfils it promises, and what it has done we will expect it still to do. But when the right hon. gentleman mentioned to the House a list of the promises made that had been fulfilled, it struck me that possibly there was quite a difference between his point of view and that of other members of the House in regard both to the promises and their fulfilment. If I caught his words correctly, he mentioned amongst the promises that had been fulfilled the promise to grant a Tariff Commission. The country has not got a Tariff Commission. While the right hon. the Prime Minister may juggle with words, the fact remains that if he made that promise it has not been fulfilled. He also promised aid to highways. That promise also, as I understand it, has not been fulfilled. He says the Opposition are to blame; the Opposition say he is to blame. The Opposition may be right; he may be right; but in any case the promise has not been fulfilled.

What is no doubt an important question is the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. He is fulfilling the promise of the Government in that regard. May I suggest rather that the Government of the day are fulfilling the promises of their predecessors in relation to that important work. Supporters of the Government will say that the Government are fulfilling their pledge in regard to the improvement of harbours. Does not the House remember well that it was a part, a very important part, of the policy of the late Government to improve the harbours of the Dominion? And does not the House remember also that it was the part of those who were then in opposition to view with alarm the proposed expenditures of the late Government on these objects just as to-day it is their pleasure to point with pride to the still greater expenditures that they themselves are prepared to make? In regard to these promises there will be no difference of opinion as between the two sides of the House. We are proud to see our successors in office carry out our policy and if it is possible for them to improve on it they will have our hearty co-operation for the welfare of our country.

One promise, the most important made by the Government when in opposition, the promise that achieved office for them, the promise that placed them in power, has not been fulfilled. Surely that promise should be fulfilled if any, and if it is not then our friends of the Government cannot in reason claim merit or credit for the fulfilment of minor promises and especially for carrying out the promises of their predecessors. The promise of which I speak—and I hope I am stating it correctly—was that there should be no more truck or trade with the Yankees. That promise was heralded from every platform. It was that allegation which caused the old flag to wave so tremendously and successfully on behalf of our friends. But the facts are that notwithstanding their accession to power, notwithstanding that they are in a position in which they can carry out their policy, the truck and trade with these miserable Yankees has actually increased under their administration and, more outrageous than that, I believe there has been an increase of percentage as well as an increase in amount. In the face of this absolute failure to implement this most important promise, I ask why should the Prime Minister or his colleagues claim credit or merit for having fulfilled their promises? Why it is a notorious fact that Canada buys from the United States approximately twice as much as she sells to the United States. Under the declaration of policy upon which these gentlemen secured office, first of all, trade between Canada and the United States was objectionable and, in the next place, it was objectionable that we should buy from the United States. But to-day we are buying more from the United States than ever before and we are selling them, I verily believe, proportionately less than in recent years. That is, the balance of trade as between Canada and the United States is more heavily against Canada to-day, under the administration of these hon. gentlemen, than it was under the administration of their predecessors.

But, worse than that, our friends will surely not deny that it was a leading part of their policy to prevent the carrying of trade north and south by railways. They surely will not deny that that was proclaimed on every platform from which they addressed the electors. The Minister of Finance (Hon. Mr. White) will not deny that at the last session of this Parliament he declared that to be part of the policy of the Government of the day, and to-day when the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) suggests for a moment to the right hon. the leader of the Government (Mr. R. L. Borden) that there may be something to be asked in regard to the effort made successfully by the Government to have Canadian grain carried to United States ports across the line he replies: Why should it not be so? Certainly why should it not be so. We say by all means it should be when the conditions demand it. It was our friends on the other side who said it should not be so and yet they are helping to make it so and they ask us to give them credit for the fulfilment of their promises. It is true that circumstances required that they should reverse their policy, the policy upon which they were elected, that they should belie the promises made to the electors by which they secured election. It was necessary that they should adopt measurably the policy of their opponents. But having done so it strikes me that the right hon. the leader of the Government (Mr. R. L. Borden) was asking too much of this House when he asked us to give his Government credit for having fulfilled their promises.

Reference was made to the retirement of the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) from the Government and the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) spoke of him as he should speak of a late colleague, in terms of the highest commendation. He said that Mr. Monk in his retirement was actuated by the highest motives. It struck me at the time that it was a fair subject of inquiry what motives actuated those members of his Cabinet who entered that Cabinet on the same terms and under the same conditions and advocating the same principles as the Hon. Mr. Monk and who still remained in the Cabinet. If Mr. Monk in retiring from the Government showed himself to be a high-minded gentleman I forebear to suggest in what position that leaves his colleagues who still remain in the Cabinet. I shall leave that to my right hon. friend the Premier.

I was somewhat astonished to hear the right hon. the Premier dwell at some length on the fact that the right hon. leader of the Opposition had not made a western visit this summer. I could not see the connection between this fact and the subjects under discussion before the House, the subject matter of the Address, or the remarks that have been made on the reply to the Address. This the right hon. the Prime Minister made a matter of importance, and he went beyond that and gave what he asserted was suggested to be an account of a stormy meeting that took place amongst the friends of the leader of the Opposition in connection with this visit. Let me say one word in regard to that. There never was any foundation whatever in any way, shape, manner or circumstance, for any of the suggestions made by the right hon. Prime Minister in that connection. I can only suppose that he arrived at that conclusion by having depended too much upon information derived from the special detective service of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) and that, upon that occasion, I can only presume that the chief of the special detective service had had an attack of the jim-jams and had reported matters which had appeared to his inner consciousness and not matters that had reached him through ordinary sources of information. I would respectfully further suggest that, while this special detective service of the Minister of Public Works may have some usefulness in some regards, its usefulness ceases absolutely when it is required to do detective work.

The Prime Minister was good enough to ask my opinion of what the leader of the Opposition had said with regard to the removal, or partial removal, of the cement duty. I have no difficulty in giving him exactly what I think. I think exactly as the leader of the Opposition expressed himself, namely, that if the duty upon cement should be reduced, and I have no hesitation in saying that I believe it should, it should be reduced by Act of this Parliament at the proper time, in the proper place and in the proper way; and that it would not be a proper action by the Government of the day to make that reduction having a view to the effect that it might be expected to have upon a provincial election rather than upon the welfare of the country. I am against the cement duty. I am for a reduction, and if the duty had been reduced at the last session of Parliament the duty would be reduced to-day and it would have remained reduced. It would not have been juggled with to be off to-day and on to-morrow. We had freedom from half of the cement duty during the summer but we are paying the whole of the cement duty now, and I say again that, while there may be emergent circumstances such as occurred in the case of the removal of the coal duties by the late Government, there are no such emergent circumstances in the case of

cement. If the cement duty was too high in May it was too high in February and if it was too high in May it was too high in October. I have no hesitation in saying that it was too high in both February and October and I look to the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) to bring in a measure to remedy that condition in the proper way and at the proper time, and if he does he certainly shall have my support.

I was somewhat astonished at the manner in which the Prime Minister saw fit to consider—or to refuse to consider—the position placed before the House by the leader of the Opposition in regard to the Macdonald and Richelieu elections. I was educated, I will admit, in the belief that there was a great deal of iniquity in the Tory party. I have always been glad to believe that my education was, to some extent, misdirected. I have always been glad to think that, especially when persons acquired membership in that party from amongst those who were formerly Liberals—I shall not mention any names—the gentlemen who became members of that party brought with them to some extent the leaven of their Liberal principles and improved the party to that extent. Therefore, I was astonished beyond measure that the Prime Minister, with his traditions, and, may I say, his record in Opposition, should have seen fit to ignore the statement of fact placed before this House and to merely reply: Oh, that was an election occurrence such as took place on former occasions and in other places.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I might trespass upon the time of the House, I wish to place before you and the House facts which I think will establish that there were certain occurrences in connection with the election in Macdonald, Manitoba, that are unique in the history of this country, that no other such occasion has ever yet arisen within the knowledge of this Parliament and that it does claim at hands of the members of this Parliament for the protection of the rights and dignity of this Parliament, the most serious consideration. I do not suggest that, upon any statement of facts I can place before the House to-night, the House will be required to take certain action, but I do say that it is possible to place before the House such a case, such evidence that, unless the House is prepared to go further and make inquiry for the protection of its rights and dignity, this country has entered upon an entirely new political phase the results of which no man can prophesy.

Ordinarily an election contest is dealt with before the courts. The election in Macdonald will be dealt with before the courts. An election petition has been entered and proceedings are now in progress. But there were proceedings in the Macdonald election that do not come within the jurisdiction of the courts, that concern the courts themselves and go so far towards the very fountain of justice and liberty in this country as to demand the attention of the only body that is able to give that attention and that is this Parliament.

I was pleased to hear my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) speak of the might of Britain and the navy of Britain, and also to hear the right hon. the Prime Minister speak in much the same strain. But, let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, why is the might of Britain and the navy of Britain important in the world. Is it because of the number of its ships, and its guns, and the men that are on board its ships, or the money that it costs? Every man knows that the importance of the might of Britain is that Britain stands for the liberty of the subject and the right of free speech. And, it is because it is the belief of the civilized world that the navy of Britain is behind these rights that the navy of Britain is important in the eyes of the world. And it is because of that that the people of Canada and of the islands of the sea are ready to support that navy and to sustain that might and power. But, if a condition of affairs arises when, in the name of the Crown of Britain the liberty of the subject is denied and the right of free speech is prevented, then I ask you to what end the navy of Great Britain or the might of Britain? In this election in Macdonald, I have the affidavits in my hand which prove conclusively that imprisonment was enforced upon free citizens of this country because they dared to exercise the right of free speech; that this was done by the authority of the Premier of Manitoba, that authority in which rests the courts of that province, and, that it was actively connived at by members of the Government who sit in their places in this House. I speak of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of the Interior. Not to weary the House too long but to come to the proof—the House is aware and the country is aware that the Premier of the province of Manitoba is Sir Rodmond Roblin and that the newspaper exponent of his Government in Winnipeg is the 'Winnipeg Telegram.' And in the 'Winnipeg Telegram' of October 5th, just seven days before election day in Macdonald, the following appeared:

> Saskatchewan Crooks at Work in Macdonald. Declares the Premier.
>
> Sir Rodmond Roblin returned to the city last night from the electoral division of Macdonald, where he has been campaigning for the last week. When seen at his house by a Telegram representative, and asked for his

opinion on the result, Sir Rodmond made the following statement:

I will read just the part that bears on the point I have placed before the House :

The fact is that the province of Saskatchewan has undertaken to run the Macdonald election, and I warn the electors of Macdonald of the work these men will do or attempt to do, and ask them, Liberals and Conservatives, to co-operate with the Attorney General's Department and the chief of the Provincial Police in order that honesty and decency may characterize the election.

I have instructed the Provincial Police to arrest these men, and they will be placed in jail at the earliest possible moment when they attempt to do the work they have been sent there to do, and I want to say that because a man is an M.P.P. or ex-M.P.P. in Saskatchewan or of anywhere else, it will not prevent justice being done.

This was followed up by a speech which the Hon. Robert Rogers delivered at St. James on Monday, October 7th, and which appears in the Winnipeg Telegram of October 8th. The Hon. Mr. Rogers said, in part :

I know we have nearly one hundred thugs from Saskatchewan scattered throughout this riding. They are in this very polling division, and we are watching them. One of the ringleaders of that gang, a special and personal friend of Mr. Calder, was arrested to-day in the town of Carman.

In the press of Saturday Mr. MacNutt made the statement that Mr. Richardson was going to succeed. Mr. MacNutt evidently thought he was in Saskatchewan, because he knew he was surrounded by the thugs which Mr. Roblin had described. The thug arrested to-day came into the constituency with Mr. MacNutt. He went to Carman for a week and registered as Sullivan. He spent his time there for a week and then came into Winnipeg with Mr. MacNutt. Mr. Sullivan, of Carman, walked down to another hotel in Winnipeg and registered as Sutherland. He was at this hotel on Sunday and had interviews with Grit election manipulators, and yesterday (Monday) morning went to Carman again and registered as Sullivan, but the moment he started to operate he was nabbed and was now behind the bars. 'There are many others who will follow him,' declared the speaker, amid applause.

This was followed up by a notice in the 'Winnipeg Telegram' on the front page dated October 8th :

First of Arrests in Macdonald is Reported

J. J. Sullivan, said to be of Melville, Sask., and a Liberal organizer in the northeastern part of Saskatchewan, was arrested at Carman, Man., to-day. He was brought into Winnipeg and arraigned before Magistrate McMicken, charged with infractions of the Elections Act. He was remanded to the cells. Warrants have been issued for the arrest of seven other election workers in Macdonald.

Speaking at Roland on October 9 in the presence of the Minister of the Interior,

Mr. OLIVER.

Sir Rodmond Roblin is reported in the 'Winnipeg Telegram' of October 10 as saying :

I have received a telegram this afternoon stating that two notorious crooks from Saskatchewan are now operating in the St. Laurent district. I also have felt it in the public interest to invite the co-operation of the three distinguished Liberals of Winnipeg who were good enough to promise me assistance if I could show them where these political artists were working. To that end I have sent the following message, addressed to Edward Brown, Edward Martin, and Frank O. Fowler, of Winnipeg.

These gentlemen were the executive committee on behalf of Mr. Richardson, the Independent candidate. This is the telegram :

'Two Saskatchewan election manipulators now at St. Laurent. They register as Davidson and Friend. Will you please co-operate with the Attorney's General's Department and assist in punishing two imported election wrongdoers.'

(Signed) 'R. P. Roblin.'

Sir Rodmond Roblin continues :

I sent this message before I have the assurance of these gentlemen that they will not look with favour upon any dishonest or improper conduct on the part of these hordes of political workers that are now in the province. I gladly give whatever weight my assurance carries, and I believe the gentlemen to whom I sent the message I have mentioned, and all other respectable Liberals in this electoral division and the province will protest against the horde of heelers that have been sent in here presumably by the Saskatchewan Government.

I make no vain or foolish statement when I say that they are here for improper purposes.

The Sullivan who travels under an alias has admitted that he is a nephew of the notorious Cap Sullivan, who ruined the Liberal party by his scandalous and outrageous manipulation of elections in Ontario.

When arrested and put in jail there was found in the pocket of Sullivan from Saskatchewan a complete list of all the Metis voters in Carman and district, as well a list of the German and foreign voters at Brunkild. He had marked opposite the names of these men certain hieroglyphics, which doubtless carry certain information to him, but which we as yet have not been able to interpret.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this was what Sir Rodmond Roblin knew after search of Sullivan, and it was on this that he justified Sullivan's arrest. I ask this House if it is not beyond the bounds of absurdity to say that a citizen of Canada is subject to arrest because he had in his pocket a complete list of all the Metis voters in Carman and district, as well as a list of the German and foreign vote at Brunkhill, and that he had marked certain heiroglyphics after these names.

Sir Rodmond Roblin, speaking at Carman, Manitoba, on October 10, with my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, present, as reported in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' of Friday, October 11, said:

Saskatchewan was claiming a victory for reciprocity, but that victory had been won by the votes of Americans and aliens. Now the Saskatchewan government was endeavouring to sway by illegal means the foreign vote in Macdonald. There were hordes of boodlers and bribers from Saskatchewan in Macdonald. Some of them were in the hall that night. They had got several in the jail and they would get more there before the election was over. They did not intend meekly to submit to such insults.

That is to say, Mr. Speaker, and I notice it has the approval of my hon. friends on the other side, that the Premier of the province of Manitoba, the head of the Government in whose hands is the administration of justice in the province, is considered by those gentlemen who are his friends, on the other side, to have the right to stand before the people, and to threaten the citizens of Canada with arrest because they exercise the right of free speech in the carrying forward of an election campaign. I say, Mr. Speaker, that a new era has dawned in this country if that condition of things is to be maintained.

Now, let me just point out to you, Mr. Speaker, for a moment, the method by which elections in the province of Manitoba are conducted. First, the voters' lists are prepared. Naturally, the Government of the day has means at hand to see that its friends are on the voters' lists, or that the friends of its friends are on the voters' lists, some of them having existence, and some of them without existence. In other words, there are opportunities on the part of the Government for satisfactorily and sufficiently stuffing the lists, and I am sure nobody who has followed the career of the present Government of Manitoba will suggest for a moment that these gentlemen have lost their opportunity. As a matter of fact, or so it has been represented to me, on the voters' lists in the town of Carman, where this man Sullivan was arrested, there were between seventeen and twenty-five names on the voters' lists, which were the names of a telephone gang in the employ of the Provincial Government, whose homes were not in the town of Carman, there or thereabouts, who in all human probability did not vote at the town of Carman on election day; but, with Sullivan in jail and other Liberal scrutineers frightened away from the polls, there was no reason in the world why the seventeen telephone men should not be voted in the town of Carman, although their bodily presence might be at the other end of the province.

In the poll of St. Laurent where the same thing was done, the agent of the independent candidate, Mr. Sifton, was arrested immediately before the election. He was not allowed to telegraph to the contral committee to let them know of his arrest. The poll was left unguarded, and of course there was no trouble in establishing a magnificent majority for—Heaven save the mark—for loyalty to the British Empire; and so throughout the province, throughout the constituencies on that day, giving a condition whereby the threat can be handed out from platform after platform, by the man in whose hands rests the authority, who declares in so many words that the right of free speech is not allowed in this constituency and in this province at this time under pain of imprisonment; and I ask you if there is any difficulty in insuring an endorsation of an anti-reciprocity candidate or in maintaining the dignity of the British Empire.

In order to establish what I have said, I will have to ask the House to bear with me while I read affidavits and copies of affidavits made by gentlemen who were arrested under this suspension of the right of the ordinary British subject to free speech and personal liberty. The four men whose cases I propose to bring before the House are J. J. Sullivan, D. H. Walkinshaw, W. B. Sifton, and R. J. A. Prince. The affidavit of Walkinshaw is as follows:

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Manitoba.

In the matter of the arrest of D. H. Walkinshaw at Rathwell, Manitoba, by the Manitoba Provincial Police, in pursuance of a warrant signed by one Chad, on October 9, 1912.

To wit:

I, Donald H. Walkinshaw, of the city of Winnipeg in the province of Manitoba, Agent, do solemnly declare that:

1. That hereto attached and marked Exhibit 'A' to this declaration, and signed by me, is a statement setting forth the circumstances in connection with said arrest.

2. That all allegations contained in said statement are true in substance and in fact.

And I make this solemn Declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me at the City of Winnipeg in the province of Manitoba this 2nd day of November, A.D., 1912. J. A. Wilton.
A Notary Public in and for Manitoba.

DONALD H. WALKINSHAW.

This is Exhibit 'A' referred to in the declaration of D. H. Walkinshaw hereto attached declared before me this 2nd day of November A.D., 1912.

J. A. WILTON, Notary Public.

I was born in Toronto twenty-six years ago, but have spent the last seven years up in Timiskaming, Ontario, where I was engaged in business on my own behalf, and

always took an active part in the work of the Liberal party in this district. Just previous to my going West in the middle of last September, I undertook to help in the organization and the correction of the voters' list in the Province of Ontario, under the supervision of Mr. Inwood, the Provincial secretary of the Liberal association. This work being completed, I came out to the West with the idea of getting into business Winnipeg, and naturally in the course of a few days identified myself in the Liberal Executive headquarters, where I was told of the by-election which would be contested in a few weeks in the constituency of Macdonald. Mr. Richardson, who was the independent candidate, and making his platform that of reciprocity and wider markets, invited me to take part, and not being particularly busy at the time, I volunteered my services. I did not ask for any remuneration, and instead of being a 'hired tool' of the party as our opponents claim, I am as a matter of act out of pocket, as a result of my zeal in the cause.

On Monday, September 30th, I went down to Rathwell to look after the organization in that district. In company with Adam Forbes, a merchant of the town, I canvassed electors from day to day with very fair success, in fact so much so that I aroused the resentment of the other party. Although there were two or three outside conservative workers hanging around in Rathwell, I could not find that they were making much effort to canvass the voters, but were evidently spreading stories about my work, and impugning my motives, with the idea of discrediting me. I was however, always treated most courteously by the farmers with whom I came in contact, and given a fair hearing for my story, and I am still firmly of the opinion that the majority of the farmers really believe that freer trade relations with Great Britain and also with the United States would be in the interest of the West, and would gladly lend their support were it not for the sinister influences brought to hear by the Roblin-Rogers combination.

The day I was arrested, October 9th, I spent canvassing in the neighborhood of Indian Ford, north of Rathwell, and on my return to Rathwell about 6 o'clock, I found a provincial policeman in the hotel. He didn't, however, attempt to molest me until after I had had my supper. He called me into another room as I came out of the dining-room and, after asking me if I were Mr. Walkinshaw, said he had a warrant for my arrest. The constable's name was A. C. Ross. I asked him if he intended to serve it, and he said he certainly did. I then demanded to see the warrant and he protested that it was not necessary to show it to me. However, on my insisting, he took me to his room, accompanied by two assistants, and showed me the warrant which was sworn before Paul Kane, justice of the peace in Rathwell, and the information was laid by C. Chad, of St. James.

The information stated that I was charged with violating section 269 of the Dominion Election Act, and on my asking what specific charge was laid against me, he told me I would find out soon enough. On my questioning his right to serve a warrant on such a vague charge, he told me he had nothing to do with the matter, but was told to serve the warrant, and hoped I would go along peaceably. Ross then searched me, took my papers, money, watch, and in fact everything he found on my person. He also took charge of my grip, and on my asking to be allowed to settle my hotel bill, he instructed one of his assistants to find out the amount. This was handed over and a receipt secured from the hotel keeper for me.

Ross then took me by the arm and walked me down to the station, and sat with me in the station waiting room until the train arrived some half an hour later. He was very officious in his manner and spoke offensively to several of my friends who were interested in what was going on, ordering them away, and asking that any remarks be addressed to him. He and one of his assistants then accompanied me on the train to Winnipeg.

On reaching Winnipeg, J. W. Wilton, who is a solicitor, attempted to give me some suggestions and legal advice, but was ordered by the detective to keep away under threat that he would fix him. I was then hurried into a waiting automobile, and rushed to the provincial jail, where arrangements had been made to receive me. On being entered I was again searched and then the detective handed over my effects to the jail authorities, and I gave a receipt for the same on being asked for it. I then asked to be allowed to communicate with my counsel, but was told that I could not do so, as it was after 11 o'clock. They then took me into the ward, and I was ordered to get undressed and leave my clothes on a bench in the aisle. After doing so, I was locked in a cell and left for the night.

At 6 o'clock in the morning a gong rang and I was roughly ordered to 'hurry and get up now.' My door was unlocked and I got my clothes and dressed. All the others had prison suits, and these suits along with my clothes lay together in the aisle outside the cells. The cells were then locked again and a man came through with a tin of porridge without any milk, a portion of dry bread, and a tin cup of tea without sugar or milk. These were poked through a hole in the cage, and constituted the regular prison breakfast. Not being used to this kind of fare however, I found it impossible to force myself to eat it. After a short while another warder or turnkey came to me and took me into another ward and locked me in a cell there. He said it would be quieter.

I was left there till about twenty minutes to ten and was then taken to the office, where my solicitor, Mr. McMurray was waiting to see me. But I had hardly shaken hands with him when I was taken out of the office into another room, where I was weighed and measured and particulars of my personal appearance taken down in the prison records. They quizzed me as to my name, address, age and record, asking me if I had ever been in prison before.

I was then handed over to a provincial detective who took me out of the building, and as I was leaving I asked if I was not to be allowed to see my solicitor. The man only said he had his orders. A taxicab was waiting for us outside. My solicitor attempted to get in and ride down with us to our destina-

tion, but was ordered away by the detective. He has since told me that the official in charge of the provincial jail informed him that he might ride in the cab with me, but this was evidently done to put him off, as he was refused permission when he attempted it. I was then rushed to the C.N.R. depot and on to the train for Portage. I was not informed, however, of my destination until I was getting on the train.

On arriving at Portage, the detective took me straight to the provincial jail, where on his telling them who I was, they said they were expecting me. After being entered I was taken into the common ward and locked in a cell until after dinner. Dinner in this jail consisted of a thin, greasy soup, one baked potato, dry bread and a tin cup of rank tea without sugar or milk.

After dinner I was taken to the police court and was brought up before Magistrate Marshall, in what looked to me like a secret session, as the only persons present were the magistrate, the prosecuting attorney, the detective who brought me and a local police officer. The charge was then read by the magistrate, and it was found to be just the same vague charge as was set forth in the warrant under Section 269. The Crown prosecutor, F. G. Taylor, then stated that as the documents relating to the charge were not in his possession, he would ask the court to remand the case until Saturday afternoon, October 12, in order that they might get their case prepared.

The magistrate was about to close the matter in this way, when I took the matter in my own hands, and addressing the court, asked the magistrate if he intended to commit me without any definite charge being laid. As he did not make any comment, I asked that I be admitted to bail. Turning to the Crown prosecutor, Mr. Taylor, he asked him what he thought of that. Mr. Taylor replied that although they were not there that day to try the case, in view of the fact that the prisoner was not represented by counsel, the information which he had was of too serious a nature to permit of bail. Without further comment, Magistrate Marshall committed me to the jail till Saturday, October 12, two o'clock in the afternoon.

I was then taken back to the provincial jail by the detective, and on being turned over to the prison officials was locked up in a cell just like a common criminal and was subjected to exactly the same treatment with regard to meals, sleeping accommodation and confinement as I had been previously. On returning to the jail I demanded to be allowed to get into communication with my solicitor, and I was permitted to call him up on the phone. After being locked up in the cell for some time, I was taken into the office and allowed a few minutes private conversation with my solicitor. He stated that he would see what he could do about bail, although he was afraid there was not much chance of doing anything in view of the attitude of the people pressing the prosecution.

I didn't see my solicitor again until a few minutes before the time to go to the court house on Saturday afternoon, when he informed me that he had so far been unable to do anything with them in the matter of bail, but that he hoped to be allowed to get me out on bail after the hearing that afternoon. I was taken over to the police court by one of the prison officials and the case was again called. After this Mr. Taylor, the Crown prosecutor, read a telegram from the head of the provincial police asking for a further remand till Wednesday or Thursday of the following week in order to enable them to have their witnesses present. This was granted by the court.

My counsel then asked that a special charge be laid or be made, and objected strongly to the vague wording of the information that had been submitted. Mr. Taylor, Crown prosecutor, then stated that the documents in connection with the case had not been forwarded to him, and that he didn't know any more about the case than was contained in the warrant. Now, Mr. Taylor had stated at the hearing on the previous Thursday that the case was too serious a one to allow the prisoner to be admitted to bail. My solicitor then demanded that bail be allowed, and after consultation with the Crown prosecutor the magistrate fixed the bail at two sureties of $1,000 each, and one personal surety of $2,000, or altogether $4,000.

As we were not prepared at the time to produce this bail, I was again taken back to the provincial jail and kept there till 8 o'clock on Saturday evening. In the meantime I had been given my supper and had gone to bed in the ordinary prison routine. At a few minutes to eight one of the jail officials came in and told me to get up and dress, as they were going to take me over to the court house, where my bail would be arranged. After dressing, I proceeded in his company to the court house where bail was arranged by my friends in the town. I then proceeded to the hotel and the following morning came back to Winnipeg.

On the Thursday following, that is to-day, my solicitor, Mr. McMurray, got into communication with Mr. Taylor, the Crown prosecutor, asking him to bring the matter up at once in order to have it disposed of as soon as possible, and Mr. Taylor, after telephoning to the authorities in Winnipeg, and asking them whether they intended to go on with the case, acceded to Mr. McMurray's request. In the absence of Magistrate Marshall, Mayor Garland occupied the bench. The Crown prosecutor asked that the case be dismissed, as he had no evidence to submit. My solicitor immediately asked for and received a certificate of discharge.

I did not then, nor have I since been able to find out, what the nature of the charge against me was. The man Chad, who laid the information, stated that he was an official of the police department, but they have denied any knowledge of him at all, and so far we have been unable to find any trace of him in the country, and the matter has been treated by the police officers and opposition papers as a political joke, and something against which I should have no right to complain.

D. H. WALKINSHAW.

That is to say, a man is held under $4,000 bail against whom there is not a shred or a tittle of evidence to warrant his arrest, much less his detention in jail. All that Mr. Walkinshaw was guilty of was the exercise of the right of free speech; he suffered

for that by deprivation of his personal liberty.

I now wish to read the affidavit of Rosario J. A. Prince, dated 6th November, 1912:

Province of Manitoba,
Dominion of Canada,
To wit:

In the matter of the arrest of Rosario J. A. Prince, prior to the election held in the Electoral Division of Macdonald, on October 12, 1912, which arrest took place on the 11th day of October, A.D. 1912.

I, Rosario J. A. Prince, of the city of St. Boniface, in the province of Manitoba, student-at-law, do solemnly declare that:

1. That I am the Rosario J. A. Prince who was arrested on the date above mentioned.

2. That hereto attached and marked Exhibit 'A' to this my declaration is a document containing all the circumstances connected with said arrest.

3. That all the statements contained in said document are true in substance and in fact.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the 'Canada Evidence Act.'

Declared before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 6th day of November, A.D. 1912.

J. W. Wilton,
A notary public in and for Manitoba.
R. J. A. PRINCE.

In the matter of the arrest of R. J. A. Prince. This is Exhibit 'A' referred to in the declaration of Rosario J. A. Prince, sworn before me at Wininpeg this 6th day of November, 1912.

J. W. WILTON.
A notary public in and for Manitoba.

I went down to Cardinal on Monday, October 7th, to take part in the elections. On Tuesday the day following, October 8th, I drove up to Notre Dame de Lourdes along with Cyril Rozier to prepare for a meeting which we were to hold there that evening. On our arrival there, we stopped at the boarding house kept by Paul Fries. We had our dinner there, and left without paying for it, and drove further on into the country. We returned later and prepared the hall for the meeting, and then had supper at Paul Fries's house. After supper we went to pay for the meals, and I had no change less than $10. Rozier paid for the meals. Later on in the evening when we were leaving, we had the horses harnessed up outside, and as we were going I paid Fries for the stabling. He had no change with him, and went into the house for it. I said jokingly to him, 'Don't say I gave you that to keep you from voting.' He came back in a few minutes with the change, giving me $9.50 A man by the name of Laboret was with me when Fries gave me back the change.

We returned to Cardinal that night, and I continued my work there. I knew that I was watched all the time. There were detectives in the hotel at Cardinal all the week, and they were watching all that was going on. Many times during the week I was told by different parties that I would be arrested. Finally on Thursday night, after the Conservative meeting held by A. Potvin at Lourdes, at which Mr. Gauthier spoke for us, I was once more admonished by Paul Fries in his stable, that I would be arrested the next day. Fries told me that one Dixon wanted him to appear against me, pretending that I had given him (Fries) money. To this I answered that I did not care, and that they could not arrest me, because I had done nothing wrong.

A most innocent young man—although he lived in the province of Manitoba. I may say that he was young, and that is the reason he did not know better. He knows better now.

Fries insisted, saying 'I want to tell you that Dixon wants to have you arrested, and wants me to appear as witness.' I said 'My dear man I don't know you.' Then he said 'If you are arrested, call me up, and I will come to help you out.'

I got back to Cardinal that night, and acted as if nothing was stirring against me, but I had an idea that I could not clear up, as Fries's words and actions were strange to me. At last on Friday morning, I was called aside by Frank Chittick, and he asked me to go to his room. He then said I was under arrest, and as I protested and would not go into his room, he finally showed a warrant which had been made out against me. I read the warrant which had been signed by two justices of the peace. One appeared to me like the signature of one Defromant, and the other was Louis Fouasse. The name of Defromant was struck off, and Mr. Fouasse appeared to have taken the oath. This indicated to me that the warrant was possibly sworn in blank.

Soon after my arrest, I was joined by A. C. Ross, provincial detective, bringing a man by the name of Frank Turcot. Then I tried to phone to Winnipeg to tell the executive of my arrest, but Ross snatched me away from the phone. A few seconds after the phone rang, and some one called for me. I was allowed to go and answer the message, possibly because they thought that I could not do anything more. It was the executive that was calling me up, and I told them of my arrest. I then asked Ross where he was going to take me to, and he said to Winnipeg, so I told the executive that I was coming to Winnipeg. Here I was maliciously deceived, as I was taken to Morden by Detective A. C. Ross, who failed to keep his word, as he could have taken me down to Winnipeg more easily than to Morden, as the train was coming from the west to Winnipeg in about an hour's time. After I was through phoning I protested against my arrest to both detectives in the presence of about twenty people, and I asked that the case be tried at once, either at Cardinal or at Notre Dame de Lourdes, where the warrant was sworn, and before the justice of the peace who swore it, but this was not of any use, and they searched me, and took all papers and documents they could find. I had on me all the scrutineer's papers for the surrounding district, and I tried to pass them to Mr. Gauthier, but A. C. Ross refused. By this device they had all the organization work crippled up on our side.

From Cardinal we took the train to Somerset, and from Somerset we took the train to Miami, where Detective Ross hired a four-seated buggy and drove us eighteen miles to

Morden. Whilst on the way to Morden, Detective Ross used abusive language against the Liberal party and the late Liberal government, and to this I could not reply, only by saying that I would get even for the way I was treated some day.

When we arrived at Morden it was about half-past 6 o'clock that night. I was taken to the jail and locked up in a cell. After a time they offered me something to eat, and when I insisted on having more than bread and water, they brought me some ginger biscuits, which was all I had that night, and I had to pay for them. They then called me up and read the charge, which was for giving $10 to Paul Fries on Tuesday in order to keep him from voting. To this I pleaded not guilty, and the case was remanded till the next day at 4 o'clock p.m., and I was taken back to the cell.

I ask the House to bear this in mind.

Shortly afterwards I was interviewed by Detective Ross with a list of names which he said were in my book when he took it away from me. Upon that list was the name of Paul Fries, and opposite was a sign—$10. I told Mr. Ross that I had never seen the list before, and that it was not my writing. He still affirmed that it was mine, and that I was accused of a very serious charge, and that they had all my books and papers, and that they had very strong evidence against me, but that if I pleaded guilty, I would be let out without any trouble, and nothing would be done against me. Shocked by the impudence of a man that wanted to play with my honour like that, I strongly denied the charge, and I told him that I was not guilty, and that I would wait until I could get justice. That was all that night, but in the morning they started again. The jailer was the first, and on coming to my room he said that I was charged with a most serious offence, and that if I would only consent to plead guilty, they would let me off. I absolutely refused to listen to him. Then came Jack Kennedy, who is a proprietor of one of the hotels there. He also tried to get me to plead guilty, saying that it would be better for me, and that I would get off right away, and that he would see that nothing would be done to me, and that if I would not do that, that they would hold me for a long time, and I might get a heavy sentence. Then I was interviewed by Mr. Kennedy again, and by two jailers or detectives, but still I held out. After that, the whole five came in a body, and pleaded with me to give in and say I was guilty. They said that I would get off if I would only say I was guilty, but still I held out.

At 4 o'clock in the afternoon, they again summoned me into the court room, and Magistrate Morden was then present. The charge was read against me, and again I pleaded not guilty. The magistrate said I would have to go back to jail, and the case would be remanded till Thursday at the request of Mr. Bowen, Crown prosecutor. Mr. H. McConnell, the lawyer, then rose, and asked that I should be allowed out on bail. The magistrate refused to allow bail, and Mr. McConnel insisted, but the magistrate was obdurate, and I had to go back to the cell. Some time later I was surprised when the jailer came to the cell, and I was summoned to the court, and asked to sign papers for admission to bail. I was somewhat suspicious at first, as I did not know who were the men who were going to assist me, but I saw that they were anxious to get me at liberty, and so I signed the papers and was released. This was all that happened, and I came home on Monday, and returned to Morden for the trial on Thursday. My case was then heard before Justices Morden and Jicklie. Nobody appeared for the prosecution except Mr. Bowen, the Crown attorney, who asked for a further remand.

The following are Magistrate Morden's words in dismissing the case:—

Before dismissing this case, I would like to say that it is entirely wrong altogether, either one of two things is true;—this young man should never have been arrested, or the Crown should be in such a position as to go on with the charges which have been laid against him. They are not prepared, and there is only one conclusion to the case, and that is to dismiss it. There has been ample time for the preparation of evidence. The Crown ought, if there were a real case now, to be ready to go and proceed with the trial. There is absolutely no reason for a remand. There is no excuse for this case being carried any further, and I therefore dismiss the case.

Mr. William Manaham, my counsel, asked for a certificate of dismissal, and the magistrate said that he would willingly grant that, and this I received the next day.

The information laid against me, read as follows:—

R. Dixon,

City of Winnipeg,

At Notre Dame de Lourdes.

Tuesday, the 10th day of October, 1912.

I have reason to believe, and doth believe that on Tuesday, the 8th day of October, at Notre Dame de Lourdes, Rosario Prince did give to Paul Fries, of Notre Dame de Lourdes aforesaid, the sum of ten dollars, upon the promise of the said Paul Fries neither to vote nor use his influence in the approaching election in the constituency of Macdonald.

Louis Fouasse,

Justice of the Peace.

(Signed) ROLAND DIXON.

After the case was dismissed, I got back my book and papers and also the scrutineer's certificates which I had before my arrest. In my note book, every page where there were notes or writing, was initialled with the letters 'A.C.R.', which are the initials of A. C. Ross, and the name of Paul Fries was indeed in my book, which I had as a reference, but there was no sign of 10 opposite to the name.

R. J. A. PRINCE.

Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that there was an evident attempt to frighten this young man into pleading guilty to a charge of which he was not guilty by—I do not know whether I should call it forgery or not; but the officers of the law placed papers before him representing them to be papers taken from his person, which were not taken from his person, but were prepared by the so-called officers of the law for the purpose of im-

pressing him. I have no doubt that these so-called officers of the law verily believed that as he was young and had had no experience, they would be able to force from him a confession of something of which he was not guilty, and thereby secure a justification for their action. I ask the House if they have ever heard in the history of this country of a more outrageous proceeding than that in the case of this young man, Prince, and I would ask the right hon. the Prime Minister and the members of the Government if there is not a serious difference between the cases I have mentioned in relation to the election in Macdonald and any other election of which he has ever heard in Canada.

I desire also to read the affidavits of W. B. Sifton:

Province of Manitoba,
To wit :

In the matter of the McDonald By-election, for the Electoral Division of McDonald, held on the 12th day of October, A.D. 1912.

Affidavit of W. B. Sifton.

I, William Blake Sifton, of the Post Office of Mannitonas, in the province of Manitoba, farmer, make oath and say as follows :—

1. Prior to the 12th day of October, I had no particular employment to take up my time, and came to Winnipeg, and went to Mr. Richardson's Central Executive, and volunteered my services in connection with the by-election.

2. As I had been a resident of Manitoba for some thirty-three years, of which time I lived for some twenty years on Lake Manitoba, and in the vicinity of St. Laurent ; consequently being well acquainted with the people at St. Laurent and vicinity, I was requested by the committee to look after the organization for Mr. Richardson, the independent candidate at that point.

3. On the afternoon of Tuesday, the 8th day of October, I left Winnipeg and went to St. Laurent on the Canadian Northern Railway train, arriving at St. Laurent at 6.25 p.m. or thereabouts. I spent the balance of the evening of the 8th and all day Wednesday the 9th, and the evening of Wednesday the 9th, visiting my old friends in St. Laurent, whom I have known for twenty years or thereabouts, endeavouring to show those whom I interviewed why they should support the candidature of Mr. Richardson. On Thursday the 10th, I took a team and drove through that portion of the country lying to the northeast of St. Laurent, where I found that a good many of my friends had left the village and homesteaded in the country, and returned to St. Laurent that night.

4. On Friday the 11th, I spent the forenoon in the village, and was about to go to Oak Point, a distance of seven miles farther, which place I had not visited. While I was in the act of stepping aboard the train, my arm was seized by some person in the rear of me. I turned around and saw a party whose name I have since learned was Jarvis, who told me that he was a provincial constable. Jarvis tried to pull me off by force, without having produced a warrant or notifying me that he had one, but I resisted and he was unable to do so. I finally extricated myself from the grasp of Jarvis. I then jumped off the train to find the reason of my being interfered with, and approached Jarvis and asked for an explanation of his seizing me on the train. He says 'I have a warrant for you' and immediately produced the warrant, and stating at the same time that he was a provincial constable.

4. Another party, whose name I have since learned was Thomas Steadman, of Winnipeg, was standing beside Jarvis at the time the latter grasped me while I was boarding the train, and I heard Steadman tell Jarvis to jerk me off the train. The same party, namely, Steadman, was standing beside Jarvis when I approached the latter demanding an explanation.

5. After the warrant was produced by Jarvis, he Jarvis, proceeded to read it, and I stated that I would prefer to read it myself, and he handed to me and I perused same, and having perused it handed it back to Jarvis.

6. After I had handed the warrant back to Jarvis, I stated to Jarvis and Steadman that I supposed they were paid tools of the government, to which Steadman replied 'we have the authority.'

7. I then stated to Jarvis that I did not know whether I would pay any attention to the warrant or not, or words to that effect, and he referred me to Steadman who at once stepped along side of me.

8. I said to Steadman, 'I do not know what your name is, but I presume I will find that out later, but I am not going to be searched, and I won't go to jail.' Steadman said to me. 'You are wanted in Winnipeg, you will have to go to Wininpeg.' All this conversation took place on the station platform at St. Laurent.

9. After Steadman said this, he and Jarvis walked off together, and held some private conversation, and then they came back to me, and the three of us entered the station. I knew that the headquarters were depending upon me to look after the interests of Mr. Richardson at this poll on election day, and I therefore felt that it was absolutely necessary to wire them informing them of my arrest, so that they might send some person out on the 4 o'clock train that day to take my place. I went up to the wicket in the station and asked for a telegram pad. The agent handed it to me, and I wrote a telegram out informing the executive that I had been arrested, and asked them to provide for the poll. I took twenty-five cents out of my pocket, and shoved the telegram and the money to the station agent. The station agent picked up the telegram and the money, and turned to send the telegram, but Steadman walked into his private office, and put his hand on his shoulder, and said in my hearing to the station agent, 'I demand that you shall not send that telegram under my authority as a police officer, this man is under arrest. The station agent handed the money back to me, and I refused to take it, but the station agent said that I might as well, as he could not send the telegram.

You will notice that they have things pretty well in a corner in Manitoba.

10. Steadman, Jarvis and I then went up to the hotel, to my room. I was kept by the constables in my room all that night. They did not let me leave the room at all, and the following morning about 7 o'clock, we left the hotel, the two constables with me, and took the train to Winnipeg. Jarvis accompanied me to Winnipeg, but Steadman remained in St. Laurent.

11. Upon our arrival at Winnipeg, I was taken to the Provincial Police Court, and I was taken into the room of McKenzie, one of the provincial police. McKenzie called Marsh Jackson, another police officer into his room, and upon Jackson entering the room Jarvis was dismissed and left the room, and then McKenzie left the room, leaving me alone with Jackson.

12. I asked Jackson what the charge was, what the reason of my arrest was, and why I was brought to Winnipeg. 'Well,' he says, 'clause 269 of the Election Act is very broad, even a man for making a public speech could be arrested through a certain interpretation of that clause.' I told Jackson that I had done nothing wrong, and I asked him what was the nature of the charge against me, to which he replied. 'Well the nature of the charge is that you were in the contittuency of Macdonald and influencing voters there.'

That is to say that Mr. Sifton was exercising the right of a British subject which is prohibited in the province of Manitoba during elections as against those who are not voting the way the Roblin government want them to.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Are these provincial constables appointed by the provincial government?

Mr. OLIVER: So I understand. I am not at all sure that all of these gentlemen who represented themselves as provincial constables were provincial constables, but they may have been.

Thereupon I became somewhat angry, and said—'Now, look here Mr. Jackson, that is no charge to arrest a man on,' and he replied. 'Look here, we have two sworn affidavits that came in on the train today, that you offered two men $25 a piece for their vote.'

The same sort of business that was proposed in the same case of Prince—

to which I replied, 'Jackson, that is an absolute falsehood, and I don't believe you have them either,' or words to that effect, to which he replied. 'Well these affidavits will not be produced when you are brought before Magistrate McMicken if you plead guilty to the charge laid in the information.' Jackson further told me that I had better plead guilty, because the charges in the information were of a serious nature, and that I could be released provided I went home, and took no further part in the election. Thereupon I said in a laughing way, 'I will certainly plead guilty, because I have certainly been in the constituency of McDonald, influencing voters, for I went there for that purpose.' This ended the conversation.

13. Jarvis then came into the room and took me before Magistrate McMicken, Jackson and McKenzie accompanying us. When I went in before Magistrate McMicken and appeared before him for a considerable time he said nothing to me, apparently being uncertain as to how to proceed, but finally he spoke and said. 'Is this the man with whom we have to deal, the man that was arrested yesterday' looking at me as he said this. I believing that he was addressing me spoke up and said. 'Well I am the man that was arrested yesterday, but I do not know what dealings you have with me.' Thereupon the magistrate turned to the party acting as clerk of the court, and who from the way he talked I would judge to be a foreigner, and asked him to read the information. I was standing near this party, and as he read it I looked over his shoulder and read the information also, and I noticed that I was charged with being in the constituency of Macdonald influencing voters, and also charged with bribery and corruption. After the clerk got through, the magistrate looked at me and said. 'Are you guilty or not guilty?' I replied, 'I am not guilty of bribery and corruption, but I certainly was in the constituency of Macdonald and attempted to influence voters to vote for Mr. Richardson.' The magistrate then said. 'We can remand this case until a later date if you will take the next train and go home and not do any more work in the election.' McKenzie then spoke up and said that he could remand it to a later date if he wished, and that he, McKenzie would be responsible for my appearance. Thereupon Jackson spoke up and said that it would be remanded provided that I took the next train to Dauphin, and did no more work in the elections. I said I could not take the next train to Dauphin, that I had personal business in the town on Monday, and would need to stay here. The magistrate then when he found I could not take the next train to Dauphin, said that I would have to go to jail until the case was decided, but McKenzie spoke up, and said that I need not go to jail, that he would be responsible for my appearance. The magistrate then said. 'We will release you up to Monday at 10.30, upon the condition that you stay in the city, and do not go into Macdonald constituency, and do not work for Mr. Richardson.' I then walked out of the room.

14. Before I left the court room, Jackson told me that I must appear on Monday, and that the elections being over, upon my appearing on that date, I would be given a complete dismissal, and I could then go home.

15. I then saw my solicitor, and on Monday morning in company with my solicitor, I appeared in court. The case was called and Magistrate McMicken was on the bench. I elected for a trial by jury, and the case was remanded until Saturday.

That is a week after the election.

16. I had lunch that day with a provincial constable from Dauphin, a friend of mine. During our conversation he asked me if I would not like to have that case dismissed. He said 'I think I can arrange to have that dismissed today, I know the people pretty well that run this government.' 'Well' I said 'if you can get an honourable dismissal, with a regular acquittal, it will be all right; sure I would like to have it.' This gentleman, whose name was Rooke and I then went over to the provincial buildings. I stayed in the outside room while he consulted with Graham, the attorney general for the province. After about half an hour he returned and took me into Graham's office, and we shook hands, and Graham said, 'Mr. Rook has stated this to me. and we can arrange that all right. and I will telephone the magistrate, and you fellows go right up there' We left the building, and went to the Provincial Court on Fort Street in the presence of Magistrate McMicken, and on our way I suggested to Rooke that I consult my solicitor. He said it was not necessary, if we could get this case dismissed with an honourable acquittal, that should be satisfactory. I said 'I will be satisfied if I have an honourable acquittal' and before entering the building we stopped and talked on the street, and I again told him that I had better consult my solicitor, and he said. 'It is not necessary, come on upstairs,' and we met Marsh Jackson and went into his room, and talked there for a minute or two, and then we all went into Magistrate McMicken's room, where I was supposed to get an honourable acquittal. I said to them. 'while I will be glad to get an honourable acquittal, this looks illegal, and I will get either myself or you people or my solicitor in trouble. I think I had better consult my solicitor before anything is done.' The magistrate told me that it was not necessary to consult my solicitor, if I would consent to elect to be tried by him instead of by jury, he would try me and give me an honourable acquittal there and then. I did not know what to do, but I finally consented to elect to be tried by him as he the magistrate suggested. The magistrate then said that he dismissed the case, and wrote something on the information. I then asked for a certificate of dismissal. He said. 'It is not necessary, you are honourably discharged. I have written on this information—on the document, and find no charge against you.' I insisted upon a certificate, but he said. 'Can't you trust your friends standing here that this case has been honourably disposed of?' I said 'Your honour, I have a great many more friends in the country, and I would like to have a piece of paper to show them, undoubtedly they have heard of my arrest.' He got excited, and said that it was not necessary, that the newspapers would come out with headlines, especially the Telegram, showing that I was honourably acquitted. I said. 'That is all that can be done. I am a free man.' He said. 'Yes sir, you are absolutely a free man, go where you will.'

17. I then came immediately and informed my solicitor of what had taken place. He said that I was entitled to that certificate, and he suggested that we return at once to the Police Court, and make another demand for the same, which we did, and two other lawyers. The magistrate was undecided. He said. 'I can't sign this until I confer with other people, and if you come here at 12 o'clock tomorrow, I will tell you what I will do.' We went the next day and he refused point blank to give me a certificate of dismissal.

18 I appeared on Saturday with my solicitor, and demanded a trial, and was told by the magistrate that the matter had been disposed of, and he would not hear it.

Sworn before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 9th day of November, A.D. 1912.

James Auld,

A Notary Public in and for the province of Manitoba.

W. B. SIFTON.

In this connection I want to draw the attention of the House to the intimate relations which existed between the election activities of the Provincial Government in Manitoba and the administration of justice in the province of Manitoba, a connection that I think will be found unique, a condition that is entirely extraordinary; and, when such a combination is directed against the election of members of this House it is distinctly an infringement upon the rights and dignity of this House, and it calls for action by the Parliament of Canada in protection of its rights and dignity. I am sorry to have to detain the House at this length, but I wish to still further establish this remarkable connection between the election activities of the province of Manitoba and the administration of so-called justice in the province of Manitoba. I read:

Canada.

Province of Manitoba, Wininpeg.

In the matter of an election holden on the 12th day of October, A.D., 1912, in the Electoral District of Macdonald in the province of Manitoba.

I, Hugh Mackenzie of the City of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, Barrister-at-law, do solemnly declare that,—

1. On Saturday the 12th day of October, A.D., 1912, I was present at polling booth in division No. 2 in the Electoral District of McDonald in the province of Manitoba, as the duly appointed agent of Robert Lorne Richardson, candidate in said electoral district at an election held on the said date for the election of a member for said electoral district to serve in the House of Commons.

2. That while polling was in progress a person representing himself as John H. Humphrey made application for a ballot in that name and duly recorded his ballot which was received by the Deputy Returning Officer and deposited in the ballot box. Said person who was unknown to me appeared during the time that Alexander Gunn, Mr. Richardson's local scrutineer, was absent from the polling both for the purpose of recording his vote in polling subdivision No. 3 in said electoral district. Later in the

afternoon the real John H. Humphrey appeared and upon taking the prescribed oath was permitted to record his vote. Upon his appearance in the polling booth he was immediately recognized and greeted by Charles Carr, the poll clerk at said polling booth and a prominent worker in St. James in the Conservative interest. Mr. Carr had been present when the personator appeared and gave the name of John H. Humphrey but he made no objection to said personator receiving a ballot and casting his vote in said election. The name Humphrey appears only once on the voters' list for said polling division and said Carr always referred to said list before entering the name in the poll book.

3. That the name of Allen W. Craigie is in the correct list of qualified electors entitled to vote in said election in said polling division.

4. During the polling of votes at said election a person whose name and identity were unknown to me but who subsequently was identified to me as one Robert Stout applied in the name of Allen W. Craigie to the Deputy Returning Officer for a ballot saying at the same time that his name was Allen W. Craigie, that he resided on Roseberry Street, and that he was a carpenter by trade.

5. I imediately asked the said applicant a number of questions as to his identity and at the conclusion of his answers thereto the Deputy Returning Officer upon my request placed the said applicant in the custody of the poll constable as a person who had applied for a ballot in the name of Allen W. Craigie but not being said Allen W. Craigie.

6. That immediately upon the detention of said person I preferred information in writing oath before said Deputy Returning Officer charging said person with the offence of personation.

7. That the Deputy Returning Officer thereupon issued his warrant for the arrest and detention of said person and placed said warrant with the Provincial Constable James Bain, who thereupon took the said accused into custody and placed him in confinement in the jail at St. James in the province of Manitoba.

8. That after the said person had been taken into custody the matter of his arrest was discussed in the polling booth and James W. Hatch of St. James, the duly appointed agent of Alexander Morrison the Conservative candidate at said election, stated to me that he knew that said person was not Allen W. Craigie although when I was interviewing the said person with a view of ascertaining whether or not he was the person, he represented himself to be, the said James W. Hatch took no part in the discussion and did not offer to inform me that said person was not Allen W. Craigie.

9. That on Tuesday, October 15th, I went out to St. James, where I saw Chief Constable Bain who informed me that one S. D. Richardson, a Justice of the Peace in and for the province of Manitoba, had on the evening of said 12th day of October, ordered and had caused the release of said accused and had remanded him for trial before Alexander McMicken, Provincial Magistrate at the Provincial Police Court in the city of Winnipeg on Wednesday the 16th day of October at the hour of eleven o'clock in the forenoon of said day.

10. That on said Tuesday, October 15th, at three o'clock in the afternoon in company with W. H. Trueman, my Counsel in connection with the prosecution of said information, I went to the office of the said Provincial Police Court in the said City of Winnipeg. We there interviewed Felix N. Hryniewiecki, clerk of said Provincial Police Court, and asked him if the matter of my information against said accused was to come before the Provincial Police Court at eleven o'clock in the forenoon of the next day. He replied that it was. Mr. Trueman then applied on my behalf for subpoenaes for three witnesses who were required to give evidence in connection with said information, Said subpoenaes were prepared by said clerk and they commanded the attendance of said witnesses at said Provincial Police Court at the hour of eleven o'clock on Wednesday the 16th day of October, 1912.

11. That on Wednesday, October 16th, I attended at the said Provincial Police Court from fifteen minutes to eleven o'clock in the forenoon until about thirty minutes after eleven o'clock in the said forenoon. My counsel, W. H. Trueman came to said police court at eleven o'clock in said forenoon.

12. On my arrival at said police court I was informed by Alexander Gunn, one of the witnesses subpœnaed on my behalf, that the case had been disposed of and I immediately communicated this information to Mr. Trueman upon his arrival at the court house. Said Mr. Trueman and I then spoke to the clerk of said court and told him that we were on hand to proceed with the matter of my said information. The said clerk informed us that according to the records the case had been disposed of. I asked him if he had seen the accused and he replied that he had not. I asked him if the accused had been there that morning and he said he did not know. I asked him if he had any record in the matter and he then produced my written information upon which was written the following memorandum over the signature of said Alexander McMicken—'Pleaded guilty with extenuating circumstances, fine $50 and cost.

(Sgd.) A. McMICKEN.

13. When I arrived at said police court the said Alexander McMicken was presiding in said court for the trial of cases. My counsel informed the said Alexander McMicken that he appeared on my behalf in connection with said information and that we were prepared to proceed with the hearing of said charge. The following conversation then ensued between the said Alexander McMicken, the said W. H. Trueman and myself:—

Magistrate McMicken: 'Both defendants have been here already, have been tried and have been heavily fined.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Were Mr. Mackenzie or Mr. Macdonald present?

Magistrate McMicken: 'I don't know whether they were or not.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Did any one appear for them?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'Yes, Mr. Sullivan was there.'

Mr. Trueman: 'What Mr. Sullivan?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'My God, what questions you ask; Mr. Sullivan, the lawyer.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Are you sure he appeared for the prosecution?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I don't know anything about that.'

I then made the statement that Mr. Sullivan was not authorized to appear for me and had no instructions to do so; whereupon Magistrate McMicken said 'You shut up, you have no business to speak here.'

I said. 'I have a right to speak here as I am the person who swore out the information against the accused.'

Magistrate McMicken again ordered me to shut up and to stop making a noise.

I then asked Magistrate McMicken why the case had been disposed of in my absence and in the absence of my counsel before the time fixed for trial.

Magistrate McMicken again ordered me to shut up, remarking that he would send me somewhere I wouldn't like, and he called several times for a constable. Mr. Trueman again asked Magistrate McMicken if he would give any information regarding the case, to which Magistrate McMicken replied, 'I won't tell you anything.'

Mr. Trueman: 'What was the amount of fine imposed?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I won't answer any questions; the men were fined and fined heavily.'

Mr. Trueman asked several times for the amount of the fine imposed, but was constantly met with refusals for the information.

Mr. Trueman asked why the cases had been proceeded with in the absence of the prosecution, to which Magistrate McMicken replied: 'Now go away and don't bother me. I have a lot of business to do here.'

Mr. Trueman: 'You won't say why you did not wait for the people who laid the information.'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I'm not going to stand for nonsense of this kind in court.'

Mr. Trueman: 'It's not nonsense at all; it's a most serious case.'

Magistrate McMicken: 'You shut up and don't bother me.'

Mr. Trueman: 'You refuse to say anything further about the case?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I don't want to hear you speak any more.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Am I to understand then that you will say nothing further in the matter?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'You can understand what you like, and I can tell you it is not very much. I can tell you that much, that your understanding is not of a very high order.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Well, you are doing nothing to assist me in improving it. What right had you to close the case up without the prosecution being present?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I want to hear no more of this.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Was Mackenzie or Macdonald present at the trial?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I don't know, there was a lot of people about.'

Mr. Trueman: 'Well, I understand that the reporters were here from 10 o'clock and that they saw nothing of the case going on, and they say there was no case heard in the court here.'

Magistrate McMicken: 'Perhaps they were drunk, I don't know.'

Mr. Trueman: 'In what court was the case tried?'

Magistrate McMicken: 'I won't tell you.'

Thereupon Mr. Trueman and I left the court room.

14. Subsequently I returned to the court room and asked Magistrate McMicken if Mr. Sullivan had stated that he, Sullivan, had appeared in my behalf. Magistrate McMicken replied, 'No, no, he said he appeared for the prosecution. Now you get out of here and don't bother me any more.'

I further asked Magistrate McMicken what extenuating circumstances had been urged on behalf of accused, to which Magistrate McMicken replied that Constable Bain had stated that the accused was drunk. I said: 'But Constable Bain told me that he was sober and gave no evidence of having been drinking.' Constable Bain was present and in answer to my request that he confirm my statement, stated that he had made no statement whatever with reference to the accused having been drinking. Magistrate McMicken then said: 'Now you get out of here and don't bother me any more—go to blazes—go to the devil. I won't give you any more information.'

15. At the time of accused's arrest he appeared to be perfectly sober, and there was nothing whatever about his appearance or conduct to suggest that he was drunk or had been drinking.

16. I am informed and verily believe that the said Arthur Sullivan, barrister-at-law, did not tell the said A. McMicken that he appeared for the prosecution in connection with said case.

17. That on Thursday, the 17th day of October, I went to the Provincial Police Court, and, after stating who I was, requested the clerk of the court and Magistrate McMicken to permit me to make a copy of any record in court in connection with said information, but said clerk and said magistrate refused to permit me to inspect any record or to make a copy thereof, and also refused to permit me to make a copy of said information.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, Chap. 145, Sec. 36.

HUGH MACKENZIE.

Declared before me at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, this 14th day of November, A.D., 1912.

M. A. MACQUEEN,
A Commissioner, &c.

Now, there are one or two points in connection with this to which I would like to draw the attention of the House. One is that, on the affidavit of Mr. Mackenzie, the Conservative scrutineers in this particular poll were absolutely parties to these personations, proving beyond question that personation was a part of the scheme of

this election. The other point is that whereas two men who were found guilty of personation, a serious offence under the law, and fined for it, were given bail immediately upon their arrest, while free citizens of a supposedly free country, for the exercise of the elementary right of free speech, were committed to jail and refused bail, refused counsel, their friends refused access to them, and treated as though they were convicted criminals. But the two men who were criminals were given every consideration—were released immediately on bail, and were conveniently tried half an hour before the witnesses who were subpoenaed were present to give evidence on their trial.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this case establishes beyond any question the fact that in the province of Manitoba the administration of justice is absolutely in the hands of the provincial government for the party purposes of the Provincial Conservative party, and equally for the party purposes of the Dominion Conservative party. We have the evidence of the Minister of Public Works himself upon the subject, and, while we have not the words of the Minister of the Interior, we have his presence at the meetings at which the announcements were made, and he has made no protest then or since against that condition of affairs.

I need not say, Mr. Speaker, that this remarkable condition of affairs in the province of Manitoba has produced some comment. It is a matter that has effect far beyond the boundaries of the constituency of Macdonald, far beyond the boundaries of Manitoba. For, if the right of free speech, if the liberty of the subject, can be denied in the province of Manitoba, then the right of free speech and the liberty of the subject can be denied in any part of this Dominion. This is a matter that touches every man, certainly every lover of fair play and liberty, throughout the Dominion. I find that this state of affairs has attracted the attention of the Presbyterian Synod of the province of Manitoba. And I wish to say here and now that, of all religious bodies in the world and of all councils of religious bodies in the world, a synod of the Presbyterian body requires the least apology for declaring itself for the right of free speech and liberty of the subject. For, whatever may be said against that body, it cannot be said but that it always has stood for human liberty and the right of free speech. The Synod of Manitoba sitting in Brandon on November 14, agreed to the following resolution:—

> Under a painful sense of duty, this Synod deeply deplores recent evidence of the deliberate prostitution of justice to personal or party ends, and the trampling under foot the sacred rights of citizens to individual liberty and fair trial.

A meeting of residents of the province of Manitoba was held in the city of Winnipeg on Friday night last, and the following resolution was adopted:—

> That the Canadian citizens here assembled regard with abhorrence and alarm the conduct of the Manitoba authorities charged with the administration of justice, in arresting, by executive order, British citizens, holding them in prison by refusal of bail, and finally abandoning the case without the preferment of charges to which they might make answer according to the law.
>
> That this action, for which the Prime Minister and Government of this province are responsible, was subversive of freedom, was an exercise of absolutism repugnant to the letter and the spirit of British law, and constituted such an offence against the lawful rights of the individual as to impose upon the people as their first duty the obligation of vindicating the law and re-establishing in this province the liberty of the subject.

Now, may I allude in a general way to the conditions which prevail in the province of Manitoba? The Government of that province has seen fit to enter the arena of Dominion politics, has seen fit to use its governmental and judicial machinery for the purpose not only of affecting a Dominion election but of denying to free citizens the rights of free speech and personal liberty. Therefore, it seems to me that the Government of Manitoba fairly brings itself within the range of, at any rate, the notice of this House and its members. And I will take the liberty of saying this, Mr. Speaker—that in the forty years during which Manitoba has existed as a province and has had the benefit of provincial government and of Dominion subsidies, there has not been as much to show for the direct benefit of the people, being the result of the work of the Government of that province, as is to be found in the province of Saskatchewan or the province of Alberta, the result of their seven years of provincial existence. I take the liberty of saying that the school system of Manitoba is a crime against the rising generation of that province. There is not a ten-mile stretch of good, substantial, permanent road within the province of Manitoba, the work of the Government of that province. There is no substantial, permanent bridging in that province for the benefit of the people by the Government of the province, as there is in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The province of Manitoba took over the telephone system some years ago. They have run it for a number of years, and have run it into bankruptcy according to their own statement. They established an elevator system and operated it for one or two years, and ran that into bankruptcy and were compelled

to dispose of it. On the finding of the grand jury, their institution for the insane at Selkirk—

Mr. BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman dealing in the proper place with the provincial administration of every province in Canada, but I do not think the time of this House ought to be wasted in that way. I think it is out of order.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to establish—

Mr. BORDEN: I would like to have it decided whether, in the debate on the Address it is competent for any hon. gentleman to discuss the merits or demerits of provincial administrations over which this House has absolutely no jurisdiction.

Mr. SPEAKER: While usually there has been great latitude allowed in the debate on the Address, I think the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) is wandering a little from the subject, and perhaps it would be well to keep closer to it.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to trespass against the rules of the House. But there was a certain state of facts, bearing entirely upon what I have placed before the House, which I wish to establish beyond question, and had got almost to the point of establishing.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not object to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) establishing whatever he desires to establish, so long as it relates to any matter over which this House and this Government has jurisdiction or control. But if we are going to discuss the provincial administration of Manitoba, we shall have to discuss that of every province in Canada, I suppose, and I do not quite understand why this House should take upon itself that burden.

Mr. OLIVER: My point, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of Manitoba has interfered directly in the election of members of this House and I want to establish——

Mr. BORDEN: I do not object to the hon. gentleman doing that if he thinks there is a point in it, though I cannot see that it is relevant; for the amendment, I understand, is directed against this Government and not against the Government of Manitoba. I object to the hon. gentleman dealing with the administration of highways, of insane asylums and matters of that kind which are purely subject to provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not dwell on the point at all. I had reached a conclusion on the statement I wished to make, that the condition of affairs which I have placed before the House in regard to the province of Manitoba is arrived at because the revenue of that province to-day are systematically diverted to the maintenance of a standing army of thugs, whose principal employment is in connection with elections, under one name or another, and this is evidenced in the army that they could bring to bear, under the name of detectives, scrutineers, or whatever name you like, in the constituency of Macdonald. I wish to deal with another matter that I think has some bearing upon the question. I have tried to show to the House the absolute injustice that has been meted out to the men who were connected with this election in the constituency of Macdonald. I want to draw a comparison between the action that was taken in this case in the constituency of Macdonald, and the action which was taken in the province of Saskatchewan a few months previous, where many of the same men were concerned, and where many of the same interests operated.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member cannot follow that out, it would be going too far from the debate.

Mr. OLIVER: Then, Mr. Speaker, if I am permitted, I desire to open up the question of the administration of justice in the province of Saskatchewan in connection with the recent provincial election. If I am not permitted, I presume the question does not pertain to this discussion.

Mr. BORDEN: In respect of this Government?

Mr. OLIVER: In respect of this Government.

Mr. BORDEN: The hon. gentleman is quite at liberty, so far as I am concerned, to go ahead and say what he likes in regard to that.

Mr. SPEAKER: With due regard to the rules of the House, I think the hon. member would be ill-advised in opening up this discussion.

Mr BORDEN: I want it to be distinctly understood that I raise no point of order against the hon. gentleman in proferring a complaint in respect to this Government, and I desire to place absolutely no restraint upon him in respect to anything he desires to say in that regard. All that I do object to is the discussion of provincial administration——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MACDONALD: The hon. gentleman for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has the floor.

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend from Edmonton, as I understand it, suggested some question as to his being in order. I want

him to distinctly understand that I raise no point of order against him.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have only to say, in regard to any observation that may be made in connectioin with this subject, that it must be within the proviso of this amendment. This amendment refers particularly and only to the election in Macdonald, therefore, I think that dealing with anything in Saskatchewan would not be fairly connected with it.

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to press the point. I was prepared to deal with a subject involving the connection of this Government with the provincial elections in Saskatchewan. I have no desire to wander from the subject under discussion, and I am quite willing to accept your ruling. I shall probably have another opportunity of bringing the matter to the attention of the House, but I thought perhaps it was just as well to make the comparison now, so that it would be clearer than it might be later on. While I miss the opportunity of further emphasizing the point I desire to make in respect of the unwarranted and improper interference of this Government in the course of justice in the province of Manitoba, and in the actual conduct of provincial elections in the province of Saskatchewan; while I am unable to carry out my arguments as fully as I would wish, I feel that I have already placed before the House enough facts to establish that there has been a gross trespass upon the rights of the citizen—a most villianous denial of the right of free speech in the election in Macdonald, to which my hon. friend's colleagues were directly a party. In as much as he himself and his government secured the benefit of whatever success those efforts achieved, he himself and his government must either fully accept or effectively repudiate responsibilty.

Hon. W. T. WHITE moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

THE CANADIAN WEST INDIAN TREATY.

On motion of Mr. Borden for the adjournment of the House,

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: When may we expect to have placed on the Table of the House the publication containing the proceedings of the Canadian West Indian Treaty Conference?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): It is expected that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce will return in a few days, and, while I cannot speak for him, I should think that the report would be presented within a reasonable time after his return.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: May I ask my hon. friend when the agreement with the West Indies will be brought down?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): That is a matter which shall receive our consideration also, and I will advise my right hon. friend tomorrow in regard to the matter.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, November 26, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Annual Report of the the Department of Agriculture.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

List of Shareholders of the Chartered Banks; Unclaimed Balances; and the Public Accounts for the fiscal year.—Hon. W. T. White.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 4, to amend the Bank Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. AIKINS: Section 88 of the Bank Act authorizes the bank to lend money to a purchaser or shipper of or dealer in agricultural products on the security of those products, no matter what the quantity may be or where stored; but it does not authorize the bank to lend money to the farmer on his threshed grain, no matter how great the quantity or how well stored. The Act also provides that the bank may lend to a manufacturer of goods, wares and merchandise, on the security of the goods, wares and merchandise; but it does not authorize the bank to advance money to the producer of grain, although it is perhaps the best security that can be given, because so readily convertible into money. The Bill is intended to remedy this by providing that the bank may lend to a person engaged in farming upon the security of his threshed grain, an agricultural product.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: What about live stock?

Mr AIKINS: A great many people desire that the bank should be authorized also to advance money on live stock. I am in entire sympathy with that, but the urgency is not so great, nor are the reasons so apparent. We all know that the farmer needs money, especially the western farmer, immediately after the thresh-

ing has taken place, for the purpose of paying liabilities incurred in respect of that threshing, and his other farming operations, and also for the payments of accounts incurred during the summer.

In the West the period between the termination of harvesting operations and the commencement of the winter is short. For that reason the farmer ought to be permitted to devote as much time as he can to fall ploughing and to preparing for his next year's crop. At present the only way in which he can pay his liabilities which ordinarily amount to perhaps fifty per cent of the threshed crop is by selling that crop; and, in order to do that, he must during the time I have mentioned haul his grain to market, and that takes up a large portion of his time. This Bill is intended to obviate that, and give him the opportunity of taking his grain to market when he thinks proper. It gives the further advantage that all these loans are made on the pledge receipt, which is a very simple document, and thus obviate the necessity of chattel mortgages, legal and registration fees, the cost of discharges, and such like. It will also obviate the necessity of the farmers hauling hurriedly their grain to the railway stations to be disposed of there, which, as we know, creates congestion, not only at those railway stations, but all along the line. Moreover, it gives the farmer the opportunity of disposing of his grain when he thinks proper, and he is best able to judge of the time when it should be disposed of. Meanwhile he can store it without cost on his own farm.

Mr. MACLEAN: Does the hon. member include live stock in his amendment? There are a great many farmers in the West who do not grow grain, but who raise stock, and if his amendment is of assistance to the grain grower, I think it ought also to cover the raiser of live stock.

Hon. Mr. WHITE: I do not know the purport of the amendment which the hon. gentleman has proposed; but I may say for his information and for the information of the hon. member who has asked in regard to live stock, that both the matters referred to have had the consideration of the Government, and will be embodied in the revised Bank Act which I propose to bring down. That being the case, I leave it to my hon. friend from Brandon either to allow his Bill to go to the first reading, or to be withdrawn, as he may deem proper under the circumstances.

Mr. AIKINS: It should have the first reading at all events, as it is before the House.

Mr. AIKINS.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. CURRIE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 5, to amend the Criminal Code. He said: At present there is no penalty attached to the act of an alien who takes part in our elections either by voting or otherwise. The first clause of this amendment provides as follows:

> Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to a fine of not less than one thousand dollars and, in addition thereto to imprisonment for a term not less than six months, and in default of payment of such fine to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year who, not being a natural born British subject or not having been naturalized as a British subject in Canada: (a) votes or attempts to vote in any election for any public office under the Dominion or provincial law; or, (b) who interferes with or intimidates any person entitled to vote at such election; or (c) takes part in any such election by canvassing, driving voters to the poll or taking part in a public meeting; or, (d) writes, issues or circulates any document pertaining to such election.

Section 2 provides:

> Any fine so recovered shall be payable half to the informer and half to His Majesty for the use of Canada.

This is a matter in relation to which I speak from personal experience. American citizens took part in the last election in the riding I represent. Not only did they interfere with the election, but they had the hardihood to come into my riding and even to stand on the public platform alongside the Prime Minister of that day and call upon the electors in my riding to defeat me. I think a stop should be put to that sort of thing; and, as the Election Law does not make provision for it, we are compelled to reach it in another way. I understand that under the laws of the provinces of the West a man does not have to be a British subject in order to vote. Therefore we must reach these people by the proper means, that is by the Criminal Code.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr Rainville, for an Address to His Royal Highness, the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, in the course of his remarks yesterday, my right hon. friend

the leader of the Opposition, said that Providence had been continuously weeping during the past year over the defeat of his Administration in September, 1911. If that be true—and I entirely disagree that it is true—then judging from the tone of my right hon. friend's utterance and that of my hon. friend the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), Providence is not alone in its sorrow. I think that Providence, in this regard if in no other, has plenty of company among hon. gentlemen opposite. Let me admonish them to cheer up, because for them as an opposition the worst is yet to come. If they feel so badly about it now, how will they feel while still in opposition five, ten, fifteen or more years from now ?

My right hon. friend—and I regret that he is not in his seat—honoured me with his attention concerning the cut which was made in the cement duty during the time of the cement famine last summer. My right hon. friend seemed to be vastly concerned about the principle involved in the reduction in the duty upon cement under the authority of a statute by Order in Council. He entirely overlooked the fact that, only a short time ago, when in power, his government had taken a precisely similar course in connection with the duty upon coal. I rather think that the right hon. gentleman, instead of being concerned as he professed, about the principle underlying the action of the administration, was more concerned about his friend and confidant and chief adviser, the head of the cement merger in Canada. Last year, my first session in this House, this Government was subjected to a constant stream of criticism from hon. gentlemen opposite to the effect that we were identified with the trusts, mergers and combines, and a great deal of such misrepresentation—deliberate and wilful misrepresentation in some cases —was made with regard to myself. Yet the fact remains that this Government has been the first government to serve notice in unmistakable terms, in terms that will not be forgotten, upon the cement merger that, if they desire to retain their market they must be prepared to take care of it, and if they do not take care of it then conditions will be changed so that others will take care of it. My hon. friend made a charge of a very personal nature against myself and against this Government. He charged, in effect, that the Government had made the cut in the cement duty for considerations of what he termed political expediency——

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): My hon. friend says, 'Hear, hear.' Well, when I have finished he may not say, 'Hear, hear.' The right hon. gentleman made the charge that the Government reduced the duty upon cement by reason of the fact that there was an election pending in Saskatchewan and for the purpose of influencing that election. I understood my hon. friend from Edmonton to make the same charge. I entirely repudiate that charge, and I propose to prove to the satisfaction of this House that the action of the Government was founded upon the highest considerations of public interest and that if they had failed to take the action they did they would have been derelict in their duty.

Upon what evidence did my right hon. friend found his charge? He took a very extraordinary course, a course, for which, I think, he is severely censurable, he took the course of making these charges against myself and against this Government without having taken the trouble to inquire—and he could have easily ascertained,—all the documents in my possession were at his service—upon what the action of the Government was founded. Instead of that, what did he do? He read a letter from a manufacturer of cement published in an obscure journal, based upon the grossest misrepresentation as to what had transpired in an interview between myself and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) and the cement manufacturers during last winter. He could have obtained, as I have said, the information for the mere asking. Instead of that, he took the extraordinary course of identifying himself with the writer of that communication addressed to the Prime Minister, and vouched, I think, for the substantial truth of its statements, and in that, I say, he is open to the gravest censure. It seems to me an extraordinary thing that a statesman of his experience, an orator of his standing, should descend to become a collector of clippings upon which to found an accusation against a minister or a government.

I do not propose at this stage to deal further with the question of the cement duties, but I hope to lay before this House such evidence as will convince hon. gentlemen on both sides that the action of the Government was not only abundantly justified but absolutely necessary under the circumstances. My hon. friend from Edmonton said that although he was in favour of cement duty reduction, he agreed entirely with the right hon. leader of the Opposition —and no one ever knew my hon. friend from Edmonton to take any different position. No matter what the exigency may be, it is with him a case of follow my leader every time.

My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition

have had a good deal to say about their sympathy with the plain people. I propose to make this matter an issue between this Government and the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and the hon. gentleman from Edmonton, before the plain people. Is this loyalty to the West in connection with the cement famine a mere lip loyalty, or is it a real loyalty towards the cement merger? What are the facts? The people of this country will desire to know, and will ask my hon. friend from Edmonton to explain his position in this regard. As I understand, in no part of Canada is the question of cement a more important one than in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and yet we find hon. gentlemen opposite repudiating the action of the Government, and criticising what they did to give relief to the people of the West under circumstances of an extreme cement famine.

Mr. OLIVER: I would ask the hon. gentleman to correct that statement.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I will withdraw it if the hon. gentleman will satisfy me in what respect I have made an error.

Mr. OLIVER: The objection made to the action of the Government was as my hon. friend himself stated at the beginning of his remarks that the reduction was made for the purpose of influencing an election, and not for the benefit of the people.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): What evidence has my hon. friend of that? Before I conclude I will convince even my hon. friend that his suspicions are entirely baseless, and I challenge him to prove that the Government's action was not soundly based upon the information before it.

Mr. OLIVER: I am accepting everything the hon. gentleman said before he undertook to state what the leader of the Opposition had said, and what I had agreed with. The hon. gentleman's statements in this respect do not conform to my understanding of what the leader of the Opposition said and what I agreed with.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Does my hon. friend or does he not object to the action of the Government in cutting one-half off the duties on cement last June?

Mr. OLIVER: I do object to the Government having put the duty on cement in October.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Does my hon. friend not know—and if he does not he should know—that the Government's action was taken under the authority of a statute for which the late Administration was equally responsible with the Government which followed it? Does he not know that this Government is subject to law, and can act only in accordance with the laws of this Parliament? Does he not know that permission to reduce the duty upon any commodity is only granted by the statute in cases where the Government considers it advisable, in the public interest, to make such reduction? A certain situation existed in June, and the Government made a cut in the cement duties for the entire building season. At the end of the season the necessity for this no longer existed, and if this Government had done anything else than to allow the cement duties to go back at the end of October, they would not have been acting properly under the authority conferred by the statute.

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, I desire to correct a statement made by my hon. friend, and it is this: that to-day those who require cement in large quantities are making their contracts for delivery next spring, and that those contracts are subject to the duty as it has been fixed by the action of the Governor in Council.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): If the same conditions exist to-day as existed last June, when we were memorialized by boards of trade and building exchanges throughout the West, as well as in certain parts of the East, it is a very extraordinary thing that nobody except my hon. friend has, to my knowledge, raised any protest against the cement duties being resumed as they were at the end of October last.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD: What has the hon. Minister of Finance to say in regard to the imputation made against the Government by his old friend in the cement business from Owen Sound?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Sometimes there is a question as to who is one's old friend. I have no doubt whatever that the gentleman who wrote that letter to the right hon. the Prime Minister intended it for publication, and that it should be made use of by the right hon. leader of the Opposition and some of his followers just as it has been. But what is the evidence apart from that letter? Solely the fact that the cement famine in the West and in other parts of Canada chanced to synchronize with the elections in Saskatchewan.

Mr. SPEAKER: May I ask hon. members to observe the rule of adhering to the question under discussion?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): The basis of the letter which was addressed to my right hon. friend the leader of the Government was a statement to the effect that an assurance had been given to the cement manufacturers by the hon. Minister of

Trade and Commerce and myself, at an interview last winter, that no change would be made in the tariff. It has always been a proper tradition of the Finance Department, and of every finance minister—and I may say one that I have continued, and will continue in the future—that no representations or statements of any kind whatsoever are made, except to Parliament, with regard to any proposed changes in the tariff.

Mr. GRAHAM : What about Currie ?

Mr. WHITE : The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is quite capable of taking care of himself even as against the late Minister of Railways. In order to establish beyond all doubt the wilful character of the misrepresentation made by the writer of that letter as to what occurred at the interview between the Minister of Trade and Commerce and myself, and the manufacturers of cement, I shall read a letter which came to hand three or four days afterwards, from one of the manufacturers, and which shows conclusively that no such undertaking was given as alleged, and that no representations of any kind were made. The cement manufacturers were heard, and they were informed in the usual way that the Government would give consideration to the matter which was discussed. On the 25th of January, 1912, a few days after the interview, I received this letter:

Toronto, 25th Jan., 1912.

Hon. W. T. White,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Can.

Re Portland Cement.

Dear Sir,—As promised I enclose you a copy of the memorandum used by the delegation that waited on you and the Hon. Mr. Foster on Friday last setting out facts and conditions relating to the manufacture of Portland cement in Canada, which we consider furnish good reasons why there should be no reduction in the existing rate of duty on this commodity and why it is necessary in the interests of the industry in Canada that there should be a rigid enforcement of the Dumping provisions of the Customs Act.

Clause 6 of this Act refers to the importation into Canada at a price less than the fair market value of the article when sold for home consumption in the usual and ordinary course in the country whence exported to Canada at the time of its exportation to Canada.

The facts and figures set out in our memorandum show that any cement imported into Canada from the United States at the price at which it is now selling in Canada must be sold at the place of manufacture at a much less price than it costs to make. Surely this cannot be said to be the fair market value for home consumption in the usual and ordinary course of business. It is not most extraordinary? If this is not the kind of thing that the Dumping Clause of our Customs law is intended to prevent, then what are the conditions to which the clause is intended to apply?

Trusting that the memorandum contains such information as may be useful to you in dealing with the matter, and that there will not only be no reduction in the duty, but that the Government will see that the provisions of the Customs Act as to dumping will be rigidly enforced for the fair and reasonable protection of our cement industry.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
JAMES PEARSON.

Does that letter imply that any representations were made ?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Who wrote that letter ?

Mr. WHITE : Mr. Pearson, one of the representative men on that delegation. Is not that conclusive evidence ? Does it not prove beyond peradventure, even to the satisfaction of my hon. friend from Edmonton, that not even by implication were representations made that anything would be done or would not be done. Let me first direct the attention of the House to the clause in the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act, under authority of which the cut was made. Section 92 of that Act provides that the Governor in Council whenever he deems it right and conducive to the public good may remit any duty or toll payable to His Majesty, imposed or authorized to be imposed by any Act of the Parliament of Canada, and such remission may be total or partial, conditional or unconditional, &c. What were the circumstances under which the cut was made ? My hon. friend says that in the letter written by the Acting Prime Minister the statement was made that there was no intention of reducing the duty on cement, and that statement was absolutely true. The statement was made in that letter at that date, because it was true, and my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) need not be surprised to find a true statement in a letter. What happened ? There had been rumours from time to time of a shortage in cement but the matter was not definitely brought to the attention of the Government. On May 31, 1912, we received this :

Winnipeg, May 31, 1912.

We are unable to purchase supplies of cement in Canada for immediate use. We have large paving contracts at Regina and Edmonton. Great loss to ourselves and inconvenience to the public will be entailed unless supplies secured immediately. Can you suspend duty to such extent as will meet Canadian price until situation is relieved.

National Paving and Cement Company.

This was the first time it had been brought to my attention that any particular

firm was suffering, and I lost no time in making inquiry about it. I at once communicated with the president of the Cement Company. I met his general manager the next day in Toronto, and I said : 'It looks like a cement famine in the West ; what have you to say ?' He had frankly to admit that they were unable to meet the cement requirements in the West. Now, the Canada Cement Co. manufactures five-sixths of all the cement used in Canada, a fact which the House will require to remember in order to understand the statement I shall make. The manager of the Cement Company admitted, and I made him write me to that effect, that they could not get cars and they could not get boats for the shipment of cement to the West.

Other representations were made, and I commend them to my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) who is criticising the Government, and my hon. friend from Saskatoon (Mr. McCraney), for I would like to know where these gentlemen stand on the matter. If their position is that they are not loyal to the West, but loyal to the cement merger, I want to know it. I was the target for a good deal of unjustifiable criticism last session, in connection with mergers and combines, and I should like to know where these gentlemen opposite stand to-day. I commend to my hon. friend (Mr. McCraney) this communication from the Saskatoon Building Exchange :

Saskatoon, June 5, 1912.

This city completely tied up for some fourteen days past through lack of cement and failure of the Cement Merger to meet our requirements and position seems likely to continue. Immense losses being caused to the contractors, etc. Cement can be obtained in any quantity and at short notice from the United States. This exchange urges upon you and your Government the necessity of removing the duty on cement and respectfully urges you to take the necessary action to suspend the duty.

They wanted all the duty off, and my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) criticises the Government for taking only half the duty off.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is the date of that ?

Mr. WHITE : June 5th. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say : Why could they not bring in the cement and pay the duty ? I will tell you why. I made a very careful investigation into the subject—I gave this matter as careful consideration as I ever gave anything—and in June last, when this correspondence was exchanged, the price of Canadian cement in the West was from 15 to 30 cents lower than the price of American cement, plus freight and duty. The contractors in the West had quoted certain rates for paving and for building purposes, and this meant that they would have been obliged to pay the higher rate because they could not get delivery from the cement companies of Eastern Canada. You will observe that the first telegram I had asked me to equalize the price of cement in order that these men could get the cement at the price for which they contracted and be enabled to go ahead at once with their building and street paving operations.

Another one from Saskatoon, from the Board of Trade—my hon. friend from Saskatoon is not here, but my hon. friend the member from Edmonton is the leader of the western contingent.

The Saskatoon Builders Exchange.

Saskatoon, June 6, 1912.

Cement shortage rendered situation here critical. Construction work all kinds suspended owing to lack of supplies. This delay serious blow to general development. Over five million dollars tied up in buildings and enforced idleness of labourers causing heavy loss to contractors and others. Strongly urge temporary remission of duty to enable obtaining cement from United States thus obviating further commercial distress.

Saskatoon Board of Trade,
M. ISBESTER,
President.

Let me ask my hon. friend this: Does he slander the Saskatoon Builders' Exchange, or the Saskatoon Board of Trade by suggesting that they were influenced in sending those telegrams to me by the fact that an election was pending in Saskatchewan? I told my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) that I would convince him, and I think I have gone far to do it. He cannot stand up and say, and there is no man among hon. gentlemen opposite who can say, there was any collusion in connection with the cement reduction in the West, having reference to the documents I am presenting to the House.

Mr. OLIVER: If that is intended as a challenge, I will be glad to do it.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Sometimes when my hon. friend is assailing this Government. I congratulate myself that the table is between him and me, and that the mace is not within too easy reach of my hon. friend.

Mr. OLIVER: If my hon. friend wants my answer, I can give it to him now.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Maybe my hon. friend will remember that last year, when interrupted he declared that it was his turn to speak and that he had not finished.

It is my turn now. It is turn about, and they say that is fair play. Now another one from Saskatoon:

Saskatoon, June 5, 1912.

Situation serious regarding shortage of cement. We have five million dollars tied up in this city for want of supplies. Strongly urge remission of duty for four months to enable us to get supplies from the United States. Work delayed during our short building season is a serious blow to development in construction of work of all kinds. City contractors state they are losing one thousand dollars per day by the enforced idleness of their labourers.

JAMES CLINKSKILL,
Mayor, Saskatoon.
M. ISBESTER,
President, Board of Trade.

Then I have another from Calgary—there is no hon. gentleman opposite from Calgary. I think, probably, that if it was known in Calgary that hon. gentlemen opposite were opposing this cut in cement, it would be a long time before there would be an hon. gentleman from the city of Calgary.

Calgary, June 5, 1912.

Scarcity of cement here. Local manufactured article used up. Calgary contractors buying from United States under hardship of duty of contracts awarded this organization petitions your Government to remove duty on Portland cement until the Canadian manufacturers are able to supply the demand for cement.

W. J. RICHARDS,
Prest. Cal. Builders Ex.

That last sentence answers my hon. friend with regard to the cessation of duties on the 31st of October. Does my hon. friend realize the uses to which cement is put? Does he realize that it is a basic commodity, and that it enters into the construction of buildings, and pavements, and works, and involves the employment of thousands of men? And in the short season in the West it is a most vital necessity that they should get the material early in the year. Will my hon. friends have the temerity, upon the strength of a letter, signed, so far as they are concerned, anonymously, to get up in this House and make a charge against me and against this Government of collusion in connection with such an important matter as the tariff?

Now, I come a little nearer home, and what do we find in Edmonton? Do we find Edmonton sharing in the views expressed here by my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver)? Whether he agrees or not with the views expressed by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), he follows his leader, and he is bound by what his leader says. Yet this is what I received from the Edmonton Board of Trade:

Edmonton, June 5, 1912.

A special general meeting of Edmonton Board of Trade called to discuss cement situation unanimously approved action of our president yesterday in signing telegram asking for removal of duty on cement for period of four months to permit building operations here to proceed. It is pointed out unless immediate relief afforded more men will be idle in West owing cement shortage than are employed in entire cement industry of Dominion.

F. T. FISHER,
Secretary.

Now, here is the representative of Edmonton getting up, contending for an action, or at least an inaction, on the part of the Government which would involve the laying off of more men in the West, according to the statement of his own Board of Trade, than are employed in the whole cement industry in the Dominion of Canada. Now, is there not an apology coming to me? I am sorry my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not present, because he could share some of this with my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). Is there not an apology coming to me for the suggestion that, because it happened to be the month of June, and an election in Saskatchewan was in the month of June, we had taken this action because of the election instead of by reason of those telegrams? Does my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) know where that reasoning leads him to? Does he realize that it leads to the conclusion that the Boards of Trade of Saskatoon and Calgary and Edmonton were in a conspiracy to influence the situation in Saskatchewan? Well, what about Winnipeg? It will be a long time before hon. gentlemen opposite will have any representative from Winnipeg, on account of the course they have taken with regard to this cement reduction, and for other reasons. This is from Winnipeg:

Winnipeg, June 7, 1912.

Please refer this Board's resolution December nineteenth and subsequent correspondence re cement merger contending rate of duty on this necessary article is excessive and petitioning Dominion Government for reduction or abolishment of duty. Since your letter March eighteenth stating matter would be laid before Government for consideration this board without any further advice. Serious shortage cement exists throughout western Canada. Building operations at standstill and erection of many postponed indefinitely This board urge immediate action by Government in reduction or abolishment of duty as necessary to alleviate present serious situation.

C. N. BELL.

And then from North Battleford comes this:

North Battleford, Saskatoon,
June 8, 1912.

Cement shortage renders situation here

critical. Construction work of all kinds suspended owing to lack of supplies. This delay is serious blow to general development. Strongly urge temporary remission of duty which will enable us to obtain cement from United States so as obviate further commercial distress.

Board of Trade.

My hon. friend contends for a policy that will retard development in the West. The right hon. leader of the Opposition makes these charges when he might have had the common civility to have walked over to my office and said: 'Will you be good enough to let us see the documents on which you took action in the reduction of the duty on cement?' Is it fair that, on the strength of an anonymous communication, a charge involving my personal integrity should be made against me on the floor of this House? I say there is an apology coming to me in all fairness.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): When the hon. minister speaks about this communication being an anonymous one, is he in a position to say that the Prime Minister did not receive a letter signed by a responsible person in the term published in the Courier?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I am not in a position to say that. All I can say is that he said yesterday, as I understood him, that it was anonymous.

Now, let me say here, because it is not necessary that I should in any way evade these accusations—the case is absolutely conclusive—that there is not a man among hon. gentlemen opposite who will say that this Government could have taken any other course in view of these telegrams and communications. I ask any hon. gentleman to rise in his seat and say that it could, and, not only that, if we had not done it, how the welkin would have rung! The hon. member for Edmonton would have waxed eloquent about the ills of the West and he would have placed the onus upon us of being allied with the trusts, mergers and combines. Talk is all right, but this is the real test. When my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) says we are the representatives of the trusts, the mergers and the combines, the position of the right hon. Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Edmonton will be a sufficient answer on this question.

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker—

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. OLIVER: I asked the hon. gentleman before to correct the statement which he has seen fit to put in the mouth of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition and myself. I understood that he intended to correct it. I must ask him again not to repeat it.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I have no desire to misinterpret what the hon. gentleman said, but I do feel a little strongly about this on account of the reckless way in which this charge was made against me.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There was no charge made against the hon. gentleman. Do not be too sensitive.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Let me make answer to the hon. junior member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean). The leader of the Opposition said distinctly—and I took his words down—that it was by reason of political expediency—

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I hold strong views, and I have some ideals as to the position which I have the honour to occupy in this Government, and if the Minister of Finance, for considerations of political expediency, would do what has been done here, he would be recreant to his trust. If the hon. junior member for Halifax has a different conception then I hope he will change it before hon. gentlemen opposite get into power.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): My only objection is that the Minister of Finance assumes the whole responsibility himself.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): My hon. friend does not, I am sorry to say, keep in tonch with current events. If he had kept in touch with what was happening he would have known that I made the public statement that I had investigated this matter, and that it was in the public interest that this should be done by reason of the cement shortage. Yet, yesterday, it was brought up here as a charge against me that it was for political expediency that it was done, and I am simply meeting the charge as I think I am entitled to do.

Did I rest content with this? I did not. I have a number of press clippings from Western papers, from Liberal as well as Conservative papers, that would have no interest whatever in influencing adversely the Saskatchewan election, impressing upon this Government the absolute necessity of taking some action that would relieve the cement famine which was tying up work in different parts of the West. I have these clippings, but I am not going to put them before the House. What did I do? I decided to look into the matter. I also got into communication with the Canada Cement people, who ship all the cement to the West. The smaller manufacturers in Ontario do not ship any cement to the West. I got into touch with them and with the railways and I endeavoured to get the railways to supply cars in increased numbers to the Canada Cement Company in order to relieve the famine that existed in the West. I am not taking any credit for it, it was

simply my duty, but I did it, and while I do not desire to weary the House by reading all the correspondence I desire to put this in such a way that it cannot be contradicted in view of the charge which has been made. Here is the letter of Mr. F. D. Jones, manager of the Canada Cement Company:

3rd June, 1912.

The only reason our shipments to the West have not been greater is because the transportation companies were unable to supply sufficient boats and cars to carry it. Mr. J. W. Norcross, manager of the Merchants Mutual Line, Toronto, who contracted to transport all our water shipments of cement this year states in his defence, first, they ordered two steamers in England and were promised delivery here on the opening of navigation.

This was in June, 1912.

These steamers have not yet arrived but will be delivered this month. Second, the amount of business offering is unprecedented.

The general manager of the Canada Cement Company had to admit that they were not in a position to make shipments to the West. But, he was trying to exonerate his company and he said further:

If there are temporary shortages these shortages are caused by the transportation companies and not by this company. As an example of this the Government work at Brooklyn and Halifax, Nova Scotia, is held up for want of cement——

The hon. junior member for Halifax appears to be critical of the Government in regard to this and here I would ask the hon. gentleman——

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): You have not heard yet; do not make any such assertion.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I know. If my hon. friend will keep perfectly quiet I will not interfere with him, but if he will interrupt I will endeavour to answer him. There was a cement shortage not only in the West but also in the East. I had it on the authority of a member of the government of Prince Edward Island that during the entire month of June he could not get a barrel of cement for which he had contracted the preceding fall in Montreal because of the great congestion which existed with regard to all classes of freight. There was a three-months' congestion of freight in Montreal and there was a shortage of cement in Prince Edward Island. Mr. Jones said that:

The Government work at Brooklyn and Halifax, N.S., is held up for want of cement and the reason is that the Intercolonial railway is unable to supply us with cars, and the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway and the Canadian Northern Quebec railway will not allow their own cars to go over other lines. We are to-day 35,000 barrels behind shipment to the Maritime provinces on account of not being able to get Intercolonial cars. I beg to quote the following telegrams regarding this shortage for Government work:

Halifax, May, 30, 1912.

Work Brooklyn, Queen's county, hung up account cement organization demoralized causing great financial loss.

Does my hon. friend mean to say that there was a conspiracy among the people as well as among the boards of trade in the East and the builders' exchanges in the West for the purpose of getting this Government to adversely influence the Saskatchewan election? Now, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is in his seat and I will repeat what I said a few moments ago that I consider an apology due me by him and the hon. member for Edmonton for making such unfounded charges against myself as representing this Government in regard to the reduction of the cement duty, and for saying that the reduction was made on account of political expediency. The right hon. leader of the Opposition did not hear me and I desire to say this to him: I have shown to the satisfaction not only of this side of the House, but necessarily to the satisfaction of his own side that unless there was a conspiracy amongst all the boards of trade and builders' exchanges in Edmonton, Saskatoon and Calgary, the Liberal press of the West and these parties whom I have mentioned in the East, his charge that this reduction was made out of consideration for political expediency must be branded as reckless and unfounded.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have only this to say that I did not make the charge, but it was made upon the strength of a letter of a supporter of the Government.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I have long had and still have a very high opinion of the intellectual qualities of the leader of the Opposition and I ask him, in view of the documents which I have submitted to this House, whether he considers it a sufficient answer to me to say that he bases his charge that the Minister of Finance had cut the tariff upon cement in two for the purpose of influencing the election in Saskatchewan on statements in the letter of a man who claimed that he was a supporter of this Government?

I took the matter up with Mr. Jones, the general manager of the Canada Cement Company, to try and help out the situation in the West, for which action these gentlemen are now criticising me. I received a copy of the following letter from Mr. Jones·

Ottawa, May 31, 1912.

The contractors for the Brooklyn breakwater report that work is held up on account of non-delivery of cement.

E. D. LAFLEUR,
Chief Engineer.

On June 12, advised Jones that Grand Trunk and Canadian Pacific railways had stated that they have been meeting the demand for cars.

From Jones' letter 13th June, 1912:

'I beg to state that his (McNicolls') statement is absolutely incorrect.

'In order to show you what the car situation really is I beg to advise you that on June 11, the office of one of the vice-presidents of the Canadian Pacific railway called me up and said they had a telegram from St. Andrews stating that work at the sardine factory was stopped for want of cement and that we were advised that we, the Canada Cement Company, promised we would ship as soon as ever the Canadian Pacific railway gave us cars. The Canadian Pacific railway said they would give us cars if we would agree to ship them to St. Andrews. I told them we would fill our other orders and then ship to St. Andrews. They replied if they gave us cars they wanted them shipped to St. Andrews. I replied we would fill our orders in the proper routine irrespective of their wishes.

'I think this shows you conclusively that the Canadian Pacific railway has not been able to supply cars. In other words they are willing to supply cars for their own work but not for the general public.'

Now, I will read briefly the other letters brought to my attention by Jones.

Letter Jones to Hayes, May 13, 1912:

'At Lakefield the situation is intolerable.'

Is Jones in a conspiracy?—Jones, general manager of a company presided over, I believe, by the chief political adviser of my right hon. friend opposite. Is he in a conspiracy against the Government of Saskatchewan? Did he want the Government to take action that would affect that election favourably to the Conservative party? That requires to be stated but once to show how absurd it is.

'I must draw your attention to the poor dispatch you are giving our business. Cannot something be done to help this out as our customers are complaining bitterly?'

May 8, 1912. Letter Jones to Canadian Pacific railway:

'We are getting away behind in our shipments.'

Letter to Grand Trunk railway, May 3, 1912:

I find that we are short of Grand Trunk cars at all our mills with the possible exception of Port Colborne. Much as I dislike to do so I am compelled not to route over the Grand Trunk when possible to route any other way.'

April 16, 1912.

Jones to Bosworth, Canadian Pacific railway:

'I regret to say that it appears as if our business on Canadian Pacific railway points would be ruined for want of cars.'

That is in April. I received it, of course, in June because I had taken the matter up with the Canada Cement Company, to find out their position. Jones claims that the railway was at fault, and not the Canada Cement Company. I claim that both are at fault—the railway company for not having sufficient cars, and the cement company for not having enough boats. In the meantime, there was a famine in the West; and yet my hon. friend opposite criticises the Government for acting for the public good under the statute which authorizes them so to act, and claims we were doing so for political purposes.

April 11, 1912, Jones to Bosworth, Canadian Pacific Railway:

'I hate to again bother you, but the car supply we are receiving from you at Hull and Montreal is such that our business will be ruined. In fact, we are practically not getting any cars worth speaking of. At the present moment our plant at Hull is over 90 cars short. No. 2 plant at Montreal is over 100 cars short. No. 1 plant at Montreal is about 100 cars short. Since I last spoke to you the conditions instead of getting better have been worse, and as you know from now on the volume of our business will rapidly increase.'

Now, what in substance is all that? I believe in the essential fairness of every member of this House and I would leave it to a jury of hon. members opposite if I have not proven to the entire satisfaction of every man in this House that the Government's action was rightly caused by the state of affairs that existed in the West and in the East by reason of the cement famine, and I submit that this Government is not responsible if it happened that that cement famine synchronized with the Saskatchewan election, the date of which we had nothing whatever to do with fixing. I explained in the absence of my right hon. friend that he could have obtained this information from me. Instead of that, he chose to make an attack upon me, which I think was extremely unfair and highly reprehensible, because he could have obtained the information which would have made it as clear to himself as it is to this House that the Government action had no relation whatever to the Saskatchewan election.

Now, what has been the result? The Government was authorized to take the action, in the words of the statute: 'If it was conducive to the public good.' The result has been satisfactory in the highest degree, and the very action of the Government that is condemned by my hon. friend from Edmonton, following his leader, is going to inure to the untold benefit of the West, because not only will the Canada Cement Company be obliged to increase their fleet on the great lakes, in fact, they have already done so by four vessels, and

not only will the railways be more active in moving cement to the West, but the company will be obliged to establish its industry in the West, as I think all large eastern manufacturers should be obliged to do, because one of the greatest benefits to the West would be the establishment of industries. I am happy to say that I have been able to induce some to locate in the West. I never lose an opportunity of impressing upon our eastern manufacturers the necessity of establishing themselves in those great and growing cities in the West, and I believe they will continue to do so for many years to come.

I have given the matter of freight rates a considerable amount of study, and on cement the freight rate from Fort William is one cent per ton per mile. Cement that was selling in Toronto at $1.45 a barrel was selling at Edmonton at about $3 or a little under, and was selling at Saskatoon at $2.50. My hon. friends seem to have no sympathy for the people or the contractors in the West, in the fact that building construction and paving was interrupted, or that thousands of men would be thrown out of work, but simply criticise this Government for having taken a step in strict accordance with the law.

Now, I think I have dealt with the cement question. I started out to prove to the satisfaction of every member on both sides of the House that the action of the Government was justified, and I should like to invite any member from the West to get up and put himself on record, in view of those facts, as opposing what the Government did last June in regard to cement.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF: I think my hon. friend has been putting the question unfairly to the leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Edmonton in saying that they opposed the reduction. What they said was that it was done for political purposes, but they did not oppose the reduction.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): After listening to the telegrams which I have read and the communications received from the Builders' Exchanges, the Boards of Trade, and others in the West, and knowing the situation as he does, can my hon. friend seriously ask me whether any Government could have refrained from taking the action we did? My hon. friend from Assiniboia would have lifted his voice to high Heaven if we had not taken action. If my right hon. friend had been Prime Minister at that time, he would have taken the same action, because he is an intelligent man.

And if I had been in his position I would have done what I think he owed to me and the Government to do, but refrained from doing,—I would have made some inquiries as to the information upon which the Government took the action which is now complained of by my hon. friend.

By the way, in connection with that, I said before my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) came in that, while this Government had been accused of being in league with the trusts, mergers and combines, it seems that we are not likely to be any longer open to that reproach, for I have said that we are the first Government that has ever taken a merger of this kind in hand and made it have more regard to the duty it owed to the consuming public.

In connection with this I have an extraordinary report of a speech by my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). Let me say with regard to this and other newspaper clippings, that I have been so frequently misreported that I am going to ask my hon. friend, either now or with the permission of the House or later, to state whether this fairly represents a speech he made at Marieville on the 7th September last. Note the date, and remember that Parliament prorogued last April. He was talking very properly about the Government, but not so properly against the Government and its policy. According to this report he said:

> They have formed a tariff commission which is composed of men high up in the Trusts.

The Senate, as hon. members know, threw out the Tariff Commission Bill. And I think hon. members might well consider the names of those who voted against that Bill. I think that would be a conclusive answer to the hon. gentleman's charges last winter that the Tariff Commission was formed in the interests of the trusts, mergers and combines.

> They have formed a Tariff Commission which is composed of men high up in the trusts. The present Government was formed by the trusts and it could not very well refuse to give to those trusts all the protection possible.

You know how much they have got since we came in.

> The Commission was formed but received instruction to ignore the rightful demands of the farmers.

This is real news.

> Why have the workingmen and the small proprietor on the farm no representative on the Commission?

The conclusive answer to that is that the Commission was not formed.

> Have they not the same rights as the trusts? Do not they deserve some consideration at the hands of the Government?

I do not pretend to say that my hon. friend is correctly reported. But he was thus reported in the Montreal Star, and if misreported, I think he owes it to the House to say so.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I beg to state that this report is entirely incorrect. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. White, Leeds) will do me the honour to read the other Montreal papers of the same date he will find my speech reported verbatim. I am sure he will credit me with at least knowing that the Tariff Commission Bill was rejected by the Senate last year. But, as regards the farmers being represented on that commission, he will remember that when he introduced the Bill I asked him if the farmers would be represented. No doubt, it is upon some reference I made to that matter that this report is based. But I am sure he will see that I could not have made the speech attributed to me by the Star. The error may be due to the fact that English papers in the province of Quebec sometimes send reporters who are not familiar with the French language. My speech was reported fully in Le Canada and with considerable fullness in the Montreal Gazette. And I would trust the Montreal Gazette for the accuracy of the report of my speech.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): It goes without saying that I accept entirely the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) that he has been misrepresented. Under the circumstances we can understand how it occurred, for he spoke in French and has no doubt been misreported in the translation. Let me do him the justice of saying that it did not seem to me like him intellectually—that is he would have known that the Tariff Commission had been thrown out by the Senate. But as he has spoken about the representation of the farmers about which he asked me in the debate on the Tariff Commission Bill, no doubt he will remember what I said. I said I would not reject a farmer because he was a farmer, or a labouring man, or a business man, or any other because of his occupation or calling; that my conception of the Government's duty was to appoint the best men that could be found.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Except a free trader.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Why, there are not any left in Canada. We would have to get a man from England. And the first to get up in his place and object to bringing in a man from England would be one of the hon. gentlemen opposite.

Getting away from the cement duty and the 'trusts, mergers and combines,' and getting into freer air, I desire to give attention to some remarks of my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). It seemed to me the hon. gentleman was in what I might call the doleful dumps with regard to the election in Macdonald. He submitted ex-parte affidavits relating to a matter which, I believe, is before the courts, and which I do not intend to deal with, not being acquainted with the facts. It seemed a little curious that the hon. gentleman should bring these forward in connection with the Address. But I think his reason for doing it is obvious. He desired to draw a herring across the trail; he desired to mask his defeat in Macdonald. He and many of his colleagues went into Macdonald and fought under the banner of reciprocity with the United States and free trade within the Empire—absolutely inconsistent things in many ways— and were badly beaten. And I think it was to mask that fact that he brought these charges before us. We cannot sift these charges ex parte. The hon. gentleman files affidavits; some one else files affidavits; how much further on are we in a knowledge of the facts? What progress can we make in criticising the administration of justice in Manitoba which is not within our jurisdiction? I have no objection to inquiring, so far as may be necessary into facts that existed in Macdonald at the time of the election. But it does seem to me that my hon. friend desired to divert attention from the great outstanding fact that the constituency of Macdonald, a year after the general election, by an enormous majority, especially in the rural districts, proclaimed to the world that the great prairie province of Manitoba was forever done with reciprocity. Now, what about reciprocity? (I had almost said, what about Absalom?) My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was strangely silent in his remarks upon the subject of reciprocity. A year ago he said it was passion and prejudice that had triumphed at the polls. And yet on this occasion, he is silent as to reciprocity.

Let me point out to the House that the great issue that still divided the two parties in this country is precisely the same as existed in September last year. The reciprocal legislation of the United States is still upon their statute books, and all that is necessary to make the reciprocity agreement effectual as between the two countries is similar legislation on the part of the Canadian Parliament. I think my right hon. friend owes it to this country and to this House to state precisely what stand he takes to-day upon this question. Would he, if he came over to this side of the House, introduce the necessary legislation to make effectual the reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States? In his speeches throughout the country

my right hon. friend has been saying that the problem still remains, but he is silent as to his own views in regard to its solution. My hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Low), judging from his public utterances in Ontario, holds the same views that he did a year ago, he is still in favour of reciprocity. My hon. friend from Edmonton, from what he said and did in the House last year in this matter, certainly would not now repudiate reciprocity.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend is doing me entirely too much honour in addressing so many of his remarks to me, but I really wish to say that I have no intention of repudiating reciprocity.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I did not suggest for one moment that my hon. friend had any such intention. Referring to the views of the hon. gentleman from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), I remember that last year I formed a very high opinion of his sagacity. I thought he was a good political doctor, or at all events a good political coroner, because he knows the signs of death, he said that reciprocity was dead. I am not sure as to the stand taken by the hon. gentleman from West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) or the hon. gentleman from Norfolk (Mr. Charlton). As to the attitude of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) he is the noblest free trade Roman of them all. I know the stand taken by the hon. gentleman from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and the hon. gentleman from Welland (Mr. German). From the remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, it might be supposed that the members of the Cabinet were daily engaged in mortal combat, but is it not quite reasonable to ask, in the light of the views of hon. gentlemen opposite on the reciprocity question, whether or not they make up an exceptionally happy family? How many hon. gentlemen from Ontario will get up in open meeting and declare that they are in favour of reciprocity? How many from Quebec will do likewise? There is an old saying: What will they say in London? But my hon. friend from South Wellington may well ask: What will they say in Guelph? And my hon. friend from West Lambton may have the same trouble.

Let us see what the Globe of Toronto said about the Macdonald election, and endeavour to ascertain whether that periodical considers that question a real live issue:

> Free Trade in Farm Products.
>
> The electors of the district of Macdonald are face to face with a great issue, on which they will have to pronouce at the bye-election on Saturday next. The issue is not whether there shall or shall not be a change of administration, for whatever the result of the polling the Borden Government will continue to hold office till the next general election, whenever that may take place. The issue is whether the farmers of the West shall have the privilege of sending their grain and live stock into the United States market free of duty, and whether they shall have the additional advantage of the short railway haul and of permanent relief from traffic congestion. If the Macdonald farmers desire to have these benefits they can hasten by their votes at this election the time of procuring them.

What does that mean? That is a straight declaration in favour of reciprocity.

A very distinguished statesman of Ontario, a strong Canadian and Imperialist, has been elected as leader of the Senate in the place of the late Sir Richard Cartwright. I refer to Sir George Ross, and I desire my right hon. friend to read, mark, learn and inwardly digest his views in regard to the question of reciprocity. I think the following words should be deeply engraven upon the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite:

> 'Let us not want to be better unless we are sure of the effects of the medicine. Let Canada continue to sell her merchandise wherever she finds a market, and trusting in a Providence that has always filled her barns with plenty and made her merchants princes in the land; let her not hazard her trade or her independence for expectations that may never be realized, nor place herself under obligations that might interfere with the fullest development of her industries in the years to come.'

It appears to me, speaking without any disrespect, that this is quite a political 'kettle of fish.' Considering the views held by hon. gentlemen opposite, who can conceive the nature of a caucus held by the Liberal party upon this question of reciprocity? It would be like unto a political feast of Pentecost, at which they would speak with divers tongues. I say to my right hon. friend in all seriousness that, in view of the fact that reciprocal legislation is upon the statute book of the United States, it is only fair to the people of this country and to this House that he should declare openly whether he intends to repudiate this pact.

If, on the other hand, he intends to say: I stand as I stood last September on reciprocity, then let him say that, but I think he should say one or the other. My right hon. friend cannot ride two horses. He cannot ride reciprocity in the West and tariff stability in the East. I agree with my right hon. friend to the utmost in saying there is nothing of greater importance to the commercial and general interest of this country than tariff stability.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: In respect of cement.

Mr. WHITE: And coal. Tariff stability —he cannot ride the two horses of reciprocity and tariff stability at the same time. My right hon. friend has criticised me, not very often, but on several occasions, with regard to what he has been pleased to call tariff tinkering. There never has been less of tariff tinkering done by any Government since Confederation. In my budget last year I was criticised by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), but so far as tariff stability is concerned I stand with my hon. friend, and I say that there is nothing more important to the industry of this country and to its general prosperity than maintaining general tariff stability until a general revision of the tariff. I agree absolutely with my hon. friend as to that. I said in my budget speech last year explicitly that there were some tariff items in respect of which much could be said in favour of an increase and others in respect of which much could be said in favour of a reduction, but that, having regard to the fact that we were to establish a Tariff Commission and to the general prosperity and conditions prevailing in Canada, I was of the opinion that no tariff modification should be made last year. I am on record as saying that. But now my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not seem to have the faculty of criticising himself. Does he not know that no possible change or revision of tariff once a year would produce any such condition of instability as the reciprocity agreement negotiated by his Government? I shall tell you why this is so. In the first place that agreement was terminable on short notice. Let me recall something historically interesting to my right hon. friend and to the members of this House. When the old Lord Elgin Reciprocity Treaty terminated in 1866 the Americans were not willing to renew it. It had lasted for 12 years, but terminated in 1866, after the war. The Americans were not willing to renew it for reasons with which many members will be familiar, among those reasons being a certain hostility on account of the war. The coalition government then in power in Canada, sent two commissioners, Messrs. Hay and Howland, for the purpose of negotiating an extension of that Treaty. They were not able to do that but they suggested that there should be an agreement come to precisely the same as was come to last year, to be brought into effect by reciprocal legislation, and the Hon. Geo. Brown, one of the leading Liberals of Canada, one of the stalwarts of the old days and the founder of the Toronto Globe which now talks of obstruction any day you may mention anything against reciprocity, the Hon. Geo. Brown threatened to resign from the Government and did actually resign for that and another reason.

Mr WHITE (Leeds)

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM: Tell us the other reason.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): But he is on record with regard to it. My right hon. friend will find that Hon. George Brown—and no man will have more respect than my right hon. friend for the Hon. George Brown for his judgment in many ways—said it would introduce an element of instability into the affairs of Canada, that we would be kept dangling on legislation at Washington and he could not under any circumstances have put it better than in that expression. We all know that the great trouble in the United States to-day is tariff instability. Tariff changes are threshed out in one House or in the other, they may be amended in one House or in the other, and people dare not make contracts any distance in advance. If there had been such an agreement as this, notice would be given frequently to terminate it, and that would introduce an element of instability. After our plant, our railways, &c., had all been arranged running north and south, after our trade had found new channels, we might have had notice given to terminate the agreement in a few months, to the disturbance of the country generally. That would introduce an instability that we cannot conceive of. Nothing that could be done in the way of altering our own tariff from year to year could produce such instability as would have been introduced into our affairs by such a reciprocity agreement.

What have we lost by the rejection of reciprocity? Let us consider this fairly, what have we lost by its rejection?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: You had better ask George Lane, exporter of cattle.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Mr. George Lane is no doubt a worthy citizen, but after all there are many worthy citizens, and it is the business of statesmen to secure the greatest good for the greatest number. I have never denied that reciprocity would have been of great advantage to many individuals, but what we have to consider is the greatest good for the greatest number from an economic standpoint. And I believe that by bringing into this House legislation giving effect to the reciprocal trade agreement negotiated by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with the government of the United States, we would not have been securing the greatest good for the greatest number.

My right hon. friend will remember that

in August of last year there was a serious depression hanging over this country. Building permits fell off, customs duties were reduced and in October, immediately after the elections, the revenue again became buoyant, building permits increased and we have gone ahead with the greatest year of prosperity in the history of our country. What have we lost by not having reciprocity? Our trade three years ago was about $750,000,000. Last year it was about $850,000,000. This year I hope it will be about $950,000,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Where is the bulk of our trade?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): The bulk of our trade is with the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I have no objection to my hon. friend saying 'hear, hear' to that. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) said the other day that the policy of this party was under no circumstances to have truck or trade with the Yankees.

Mr. OLIVER: That was the declared policy of our friends during the election; that was their slogan.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) says that he never said anything of the kind.

Mr. OLIVER: I did not accuse him of saying so, but I say it was the slogan of his party.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Let us clear that up here and now. What was the objection of my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden), and I think of every other member on this side of the House, to the Reciprocity Agreement? The objection was the fact of the agreement itself, among other things the fact that we would surrrender control of our fiscal policy to a great nation to the south. Nobody in Canada who has any sense has any objection to buying from the United States or selling to the United States if you buy over the tariff wall that has been erected in accordance with the requirements of each country. If my right hon. friend wants to buy something in the United States I have no objection to his buying it if he brings it in, but I do object to his making an agreement which will deliver our tariff in regard to such an important list of products over to the House of Congress of the United States.

Mr. OLIVER: It would enable us to sell in the United States as well as buy.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): We can sell in the United States to-day.

Mr. OLIVER: We cannot.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):—but we cannot control their duty.

Mr. OLIVER: But we had control of it by reciprocity.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): And my hon. friend says we had control of it, but how long could we control it They could control our tariff for an indefinite time by the very force of their importance as compared to ours. However, I shall not argue that now. As I said, we retain control of our own affairs. My right hon. friend was in a critical frame of mind, a very critical frame of mind. This country is prospering as it never has been before, but he is not contented with its prosperity. Its revenues are higher than they have ever been before, but my right hon. friend is not satisfied with our revenues apparently. The real fact of the matter is, my right hon. friend is dissatisfied that he is not on this side of the House. I am afraid it is a case of Dr. Fell. I say that with some reluctance, but I cannot understand the position of my right hon. friend otherwise. He has assailed this Government on the ground that we do nothing. He says that this Government does nothing. If this Government has done anything it has not been by reason of the fact that my right hon. friend has not tried to prevent us from doing it, for he obstructed some of the best measures we brought down to the House last year. Let us take some of the things we have done, though we have only been in power a little over a year.

One of the first things we did was to enlarge the boundaries of Manitoba. A general resolution on that subject was passed in this House in 1907, and though my hon. friend was four years longer in office, so far as I can see, he took no step towards enlarging the boundaries of Manitoba. This Government immediately took the question up. It was not the easiest question in the world to handle; my right hon. friend did not want to grapple with it; he delayed; but this Government carried out its promise, and put Manitoba on the same basis as the other provinces in the West. Manitoba was a postage stamp on the map before it turned it into an envelope, and we put into it a couple of million dollars of arrears of pay which she should have had long ago.

Then, take the naval policy. I am not going to discuss the naval question; but what about our naval policy? Last year, when we had been only a few weeks in office, my right hon. friend complained that we had not brought down our naval policy. What are the facts? The first Imperial conference to consider the question

of defence of the British Empire by land and sea, was called in 1887, 25 years ago, and during 15 years of that time my right hon. friend was in power. What is our position to-day, so far as naval defence is concerned? We have the Niobe in dry dock at Halifax. She has just been repaired to the extent of $300,000 damage to the hull. Then we have the little Rainbow on the Pacific coast. That is as far as we have got. My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) said in 1910, on a similar occasion to this, that he would proceed to London and consult the Admiralty, and bring down the proposals of the Government later. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says this Government does nothing. What more could my right hon. friend the leader of the Government have done? He carried out his pledges as soon as a man could possibly carry them out in that regard.

Then, we provided a subsidy to the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, a railway that has opened up one of the richest areas in Canada, highly mineralized, and with a great belt of agricultural land.

Mr. MURPHY: Thanks to the Liberal Government.

Mr. WHITE: Let me say thanks to the Liberal Government. We shall say thanks to Sir George Ross, whose views on reciprocity I have just given to the House, and thanks to the very able present Prime Minister of Ontario, and to Mr. Englehart, who is head of the Commission. But when the proposal was brought down to this House to give the province of Ontario a subsidy of a couple of million dollars in connection with the building of that road, exception was taken, although my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) took no exception, so far as I remember, to Bills granting subsidies to the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I divided the House twice in Committee on the Canadian Northern subsidies.

Mr. WHITE: Was it on the ground of rates?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was absolutely on the ground of rates.

Mr. WHITE: I will withdraw that, then. I have a fairly good memory, and my recollection is that so far as the subsidy was concerned, $12,000 per mile, my hon. friend said he did not care about the amount, but that what he did care about was putting the through rates under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM: Under the control.

Mr. WHITE: However, I will withdraw that.

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend's memory is partly right and partly wrong. So far as the Canadian Northern in British Columbia is concerned, I forget whether we divided the House; but we divided the Committee twice, because this Government made an exception in granting a subsidy to the Canadian Northern in British Columbia without its being subject to the Board of Railway Commissioners as to rates. I took exception to that on that ground. With regard to the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, I stated distinctly that if I were in the Ontario Government at the present time, I would not think of coming and asking the present Government, or any other, for a subsidy. But as to rates, I went this far—perhaps I did not go so far as some of my friends—that it was a difficult thing, perhaps, to interfere with the provincial governments concerning their own railways; but I urged strongly that as to through rates—this road is linked to a through line, having leased running rights to the Grand Trunk railway—it should come under the Board of Railway Commissioners. Under the statute, that could not be done, even by this House, without the consent of the provincial government, it being a provincial government road; and the Prime Minister, acquiescing, to a certain extent, in my contention, said that before that would become law, he would consult with the Ontario government to see if they would not consent to that jurisdiction.

Mr. WHITE: I accept what my hon. friend has said; but the fact is that the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario subsidy was opposed by hon. gentlemen opposite, and was thrown out by the Senate composed of a majority of Liberals. I think it was thrown out—I am drawing my own inference—because it was known that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was opposed to it. Let me put it alternatively. If my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had supported it, I do not think it would have been thrown out. I do not know whether my right hon. friend influenced the Senate; I have no evidence to that effect; but I do think that if he had been in favour of it, it would not have been thrown out by the Senate.

Then we brought into effect the Grain Act by which sample markets will be established in the West; and this year, we have, in pursuance of a pledge of the Government, let a contract for a three million bushel elevator at Port Arthur. In addition to that, the Government has made large expenditures upon the improvement of the

Montreal harbour, and it is taking up the question of improving Halifax harbour, and Quebec harbour.

This Government has been active to the last degree during the past year, and any criticism as to its not being active, either in bringing down legislation or in carrying out the provisions of legislation, or in carrying on the business of this country, is not well founded.

I have occupied the time of the House very considerably this afternoon. Let me say this, for, after all, I desire to make all allowances, or any allowance that should be made. I spoke rather strongly in regard to my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) attacking myself and this Government with regard to the cement duty reduction without having made himself acquainted with the information in my office. I still feel that it was unfair to me; but I believe, in view of the explanation I have given, and the facts I have produced, that he will come to an entirely different conclusion, and will be the first to say so. I am sorry he was not present when I gave most of the evidence I submitted. I think that neither this Government, nor his Government, if it had been in power, could have done otherwise than was done. This Government may submit its record during the past year with confidence to the judgment of the people of this country.

Mr. LOUIS J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, I must say, at the beginning of my remarks, that it is not from presumption that I ask the attention of my fellow members, but it is from the desire to exercise my privileges as a member of this House. I wish to state the position I will take in regard to the vote which I shall give on the main motion as well as on the amendment now submitted for our consideration. I am at a disadvantage because of my lack of experience in the House and especially because of the language which I am using in discussing the questions of the day and answering hon. gentlemen opposite who have taken the floor since the beginning of this debate. But, I consider that I have a duty to perform, and that this is a time to set aside all bashfulness and natural timidity, and to do my best to do justice to the cause which I represent. Facing the issue immediately, and expressing my regret that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is not in his seat, I will deal with the remarks which have been made by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, Mr. Borden in his speech on the subject to which I propose to devote some attention. I quote the words of the right hon. gentleman. He said that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in retiring was actuated by the highest of motives. I understand that this statement is correct and it is of the same fabric as the editorials which have been published in the newspapers favourable to the present administration since the departure of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier from the Cabinet. The apparent object of these statements is, in plain words, to make the hon. member for Jacques Cartier appear as a hero. If the hon. gentleman was a hero for the reason that he went out of the Cabinet and if he was actuated by the highest motives, was he a hero when he came into the Cabinet? What was the motive that actuated him when he came in? If we refer to the debates of last session, when my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was inquiring as to the position held in the Cabinet by the late Minister of Public Works, we will find the defence of the entrance of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier into the Cabinet from the lips of the right hon. the Prime Minister himself. Then that right hon. gentleman said:

> I have no fault to find with the right hon. gentleman for calling attention to the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) when this matter was under debate two sessions ago did not see eye to eye with me on the question of emergent conditions which at that time I thought confronted the Empire. Those conditions appealed to me in that way at that time by reason of very grave declarations that had been made by the Prime Minister, the Foreign Secretary and the First Lord of the Admiralty of Great Britain. I am ready to admit, in fact we were afterwards taunted in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite with the fact, that these declarations were, to a very considerable extent, modified by subsequent statements made in the British House of Commons by the advisers of the Crown, by the Prime Minister himself, I think, and also by the First Lord of the Admiralty. It is true that the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and I did not see eye to eye, but the point that divided us at that time was not a question of policy, but a question of fact.

If I understand the remarks which I have just cited, when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier went into the Cabinet, he was on the same platform as the right hon. leader of the Government. They had the same policy, the only difference between them was as to a question of fact. The leader of the Government thought that there was an emergency and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier thought that there was none. That was the question as it was stated before the House by the leader of the Government last session.

What do we see now? We see that, during the electoral contest in the constituency of Hochelaga, the Secretary of State (Mr. Coderre) had to submit to an election contest and there was a letter published over

the signature of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. The letter is addressed to Dr. Lalonde who was organizer for Mr. Doyon and it is dated November 18, 1912:

My Dear Friend,—You inform me that certain ones are causing a rumour to be circulated to the effect that I am opposed to the contest which is now going on in Hochelaga division. I am surprised to learn this, and I regret the fact such reports have gained currency. I am not taking any part in the contest, believing that in following such course I am acting rightly. I gave up my place as a member of the Cabinet for the reason that the Government has decided not to institute a plebiscite on the question of a naval contribution.

So, taking together the declaration of the leader of the Government at the last session, his declaration here yesterday and the document which I have just cited, if the hon. member for Jacques Cartier was a hero when he went out, it will be very hard for the people of the country to believe that he was a hero when he came in because the people are under the impression that the late Minister of Public Works, when he went into the Cabinet, had had promises which enabled him to live up to the pledges that he had made to the electorate and, if he had no such promises, how is it that, over his signature, we now have the fact ascertained that a plebiscite on the question was only refused when he resigned?

Considering that the condition of affairs at the opening of last session was the same as yesterday, the people of this country will come to the conclusion that during the last twelve months the Cabinet has not arrived at a conclusion on the fundamental question of the naval policy. But there is another side to the question. If the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is a hero because he went out—and he went out because he could not live up to the pledges he had given to the electorate—with what name shall we qualify the act of the others who are remaining ; who were returned because they made the same promises which bound the member for Jacques Cartier, and by which these hon. gentlemen do not seem to be much bound ?

With regard to the paragraph from the Evening Post of New York quoted by the leader of the Government, I do not object to it being cited, but I object to the intent with which it was cited. I think it ill becomes a statesman like the leader of the Government, who has the confidence of the majority of the people of this country, who has been in communication with the Imperial authorities during last summer, and who has a standing before the world, to make such statements as he did.

Is it the preparation for another ultra loyalist campaign, to have the Imperialists of this country swallow another contribution scheme ? I cannot approve of anything of the kind. We on this side of the House do not boast of our loyalty, but let me remind the House that when the annexation manifesto was signed in 1849, it was not signed by Liberals ; that when Canadian aid was refused to the Mother Country by the Government in 1884 it was not a Liberal Government that refused it ; and in 1897, when the Empire was suffering from the South African war, it was a Liberal Government that sent volunteers to the aid of the Empire. When the preferential tariff was established, giving a preference in the market of this country to English goods, it was the act of the Liberal party. When the Transcontinental railway was engineered for linking up the different parts of the Dominion, it was engineered by the Liberal party ; when the naval stations of Halifax and Esquimault were accepted for the Government, they were accepted by the Liberal party ; when the naval question was settled, it was settled by the Liberal party, and, more than that, it was settled with the consent and under the advice of the Imperial authorities.

These are deeds that we have done, and I think it ill becomes a member of this House, even if he be the Prime Minister, to insinuate that loyalty is the sole appanage of the gentlemen who sit on the other side. We claim that we can be Liberals and be loyal, and we have proved it. It is all very well for the hon. gentlemen who sit on the other side to wave the flag and claim that they are the only saviours of the Empire. We do not boast as much as they do, but we claim that our deeds are recorded in the statute books of this country, and we can stand on what we have done.

I now come to the two by-elections of Macdonald and Richelieu. I was one of the fortunate or unfortunate gentlemen who fought for the Opposition candidate in the electoral contest of Macdonald. It may be very well for the hon. gentlemen who are sitting in their offices or at their desks in this House to treat in a humorous vein the attacks that have been made by gentlemen on this side of the House in regard to the Macdonald bye-election. After having sat in the Legisative Assembly of my province; after having practised at the bar of my province for twenty-three years, after having been elected a member of the House of Commons, and, more than that, being a free man in a free country, insulting nobody, trying to do what I thought was right, speaking from the platform and trying to give to those who heard my remarks the

confidence that there was in my mind, fighting for the triumph of my ideals and principles, I was shadowed for eleven days in the riding of Macdonald. The hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House may laugh as much as they please. It may be that the people of this country will not laugh when they know all the details of this election. The key of my room was taken away; my grip was searched; my room was ransacked. I have had proof of employees of the provincial govrnmnt of Manitoba, salaried detectives wearing the badge, trying to put under the influence of liquor a free citizen of the parish of Notre Dame de Lourdes, at the station of Cardinal, on the day there was a joint meeting at Notre Dame de Lourdes.

And when I drove to Notre Dame de Lourdes, the man who had been compelled to drink and had been given money to sign a complaint that I had wanted to bribe him did not have the courage to stand by what he had said. It may be very funny for certain members of this House. But let me say this: I am not in communion with the ideas of the Government of the day, but I think that in the party that now administers our affairs there are honest men. Now, is it necessary for those in that party who are honest and clean to be in the same case with those who have committed such crimes and outrages as have been described? I say, no. I represent not only the Liberals of St. Hyacinthe, but also the Conservatives who voted against me. And speaking for the Conservatives of the county of St. Hyacinthe who voted in favour of my opponent, I say that they have confidence in the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) who now leads the Government. They listened to the attacks he made upon the late Government. They heard him say that that Government were wrong-doers and that if he were entrusted with power he would do better than they had done. But now, when the case of Macdonald is brought to the attention of the House, what does he answer? In his official capacity he says: My predecessors did the same. I say, we never did the same. But, even were the hon. gentleman's charge true, the electors of this country who have expressed confidence in the party now in power will be shocked when they hear all the details of this election in Macdonald. Let me give barely one instance. Last session hon. gentlemen sitting on this side of the House asked the Government day after day to interfere to reduce the tariff rates for the western farmer. But the Government answered that that question was out of their hands and was in the hands of the Railway Commission. But during the contest in Macdonald, a Minister of the Crown who was stumping the county made a speech in the town of Somerset and declared that the Government would reduce the tariff rates. I suppose he thought this a means of inducing the people to vote for the Government candidate.

In the by-election in Richelieu, the electors were threatened. But those electors voted according to their conscience. And what was the result? Before eight days had elapsed after the result of the election was known, eighty-three workingmen who were supposed to have cast their votes against the Government of the day were thrown out of employment, and they are now in the city of Montreal, at this time of the year, trying to earn bread for their wives and families.

When the Government cannot win by-elections by bribery and corruption, they can at least strangle the electors. For you can be loyal in this country if you are willing to be a Tory. You are entitled to live, you may remain under the shadow of the British flag, but first you must be a Tory, otherwise you are liable to be deprived of the means of earning your bread. It is very well for the Government, with a great majority in this House, to minimize the accusations that have been brought forward and to meet with ridicule the assertions of those who have suffered from the condition of things that is exposed. But the people of Canada, who know what it means to have representative government, the people who have read their own history and know the value of their institutions; the people who are glad to live under the British flag because it affords to everybody freedom and fair play; the people who are patient because they are strong and know their strength, will crush the men who think that they are the people's masters though they have been elected only to be their servants.

Mr. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): I have no intention of unduly claiming the attention of the House. But I feel, as a citizen of this country, that it is necessary to look into the charges that have been made against certain members of the Conservative party with respect to the conduct of an election in Manitoba. I think it can be pretty generally admitted that the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) has wiped off the slate all the objections that have been advanced, so far, to the conduct of the Government of the day. But it is not by any means easy to wipe off the slate—and it is fortunate that it is so—charges of misdoing compromising the liberty of the subject in Canada. And, as it is no joke, it is not for us or anybody else to treat it as a joke. I think, therefore, that we must give it due consideration. For, if the liberty of the subject in Canada is not guaranteed, and

guaranteed to the utmost limit, life in Canada is not worth living and citizenship is merely a name. I think hon. members will agree with me that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) is thoroughly capable of presenting any case that he thinks should be presented. I think they will agree that when he has set before the House the facts concerning this election in Manitoba, and in this case has done it presumably to convince us that some great wrong was committed, we are at liberty to judge of the seriousness of the case by the success with which he has presented those facts.

It is impossible for any reasonable Canadian to entertain the idea that elections in this country have always been conducted as they should have been. I come from a constituency where—and I say it with all reverence—I would to God that at the time of the Federal election I had been Attorney General, for I would have arrested large numbers of men in that constituency, who are a disgrace not only to West Peterborough, but to Canada and to humanity. Whisky is their natural beverage, cigars decorate their mouths at all times, they regard every vote as purchasable, and they make a jest of everything that is decent. But, on my own behalf, I will say that there has not been one whisper of wrongdoing in connection with my election. If hon. gentlemen opposite are prepared to make a joke of that statement, why should they blame others if they make a joke of the statement of the hon. member for Edmonton? Why can we not treat these things seriously? Those gentlemen who are laughing at the present time have not heard from the riding of West Peterborough one charge against me or my supporters in this respect.

If the hon. member for Edmonton has in any respect proven his case, it is necessary for this House to take notice of it, in order to protect the liberties of the people of this country. During the opening remarks of my hon. friend, I expected that he would strike the key-note of his sincerity, and I was somewhat disappointed to find that he charged the right hon. the Prime Minister with juggling with words, whilst he himself was charging the Government with failure to implement their promises with regard to the Tariff Commission, the Highways Bill, and other measures which depended entirely upon the Liberal majority in the Senate. He cannot possibly be acquitted of insincerity in this respect. I was not disappointed, however, in his later remarks with respect to the balance of trade —something that in the Liberal ranks not many years ago was regarded as another huge joke. When the Conservatives in those days urged that the balance of trade was increasing as against Canada, the Liberal party ignored that important question, and treated it as an absurdity, and a Conservative heresy. Now, however, we find them urging the balance of trade as a justification of their objections to certain policies of the present Government.

The hon. member for Edmonton admits that the success of the Conservative party in the late election was due to the reciprocal policy of the Liberal party, and that the waving of the old flag was a factor in the defeat of the then existing Government. That being so, it must be acknowledged, notwithstanding the fact that all the Liberal leaders were in favour of reciprocity, and that many Conservatives for a time were also in favour of the agreement, that the people of this country were wiser than both. They knew what they wanted, and a triumphant democracy returned to power the opponents of the reciprocity pact.

Referring again to the matter of the alleged misdeeds in Macdonald, I wish to call the attention of the House to a statement made by the hon. member from Edmonton which knocks the foundation from under the supports of the allegations made. The hon. gentleman said:

> I do not suggest that, upon any statement of facts I can place before the House to-night, the House will be required to take certain action, but I do say that it is possible to place before the House such a case, such evidence that, unless the House is prepared to go further and make inquiry for the protection of its rights and dignity, this country has entered upon an entirely new political phase the results of which no man can prophesy.

Here is an allegation made against a respectable party, and yet, notwithstanding all the complaints that may be made in regard to the matter, the hon. member for Edmonton says he does not suggest that upon any statement he can make the House will be called upon to take action. That being the case, why go on? It is extremely satisfactory, after hearing these general allegations, to read the affidavits of the men who are most aggrieved. I am not prepared to say for one moment—and I do not suppose anyone else is—that justice was completely done in every particular; but, as indicated by the speech of the hon. gentleman himself, and especially by the affidavits which he at different times has read, I think that reasonable justice has been done to the persons concerned. The attitude assumed by the provincial government of Manitoba seems to be one of suspicion towards a large number of the alleged workers from other parts of the country who flocked in there at election time. I do not refer to those well-known men, of course, whom we see every day in

connection with such elections, but to those persons who flock into a constituency at such a time as to give rise to the conclusion that they are not there for any good purpose. Men who have no record of well-doing in their behalf are usually viewed with suspicion, and I think, if we consult the records of Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, or any district outside the jurisdiction and control of the Conservative party, we shall find that these men are arrested as irresponsible vagrants and handled without ceremony ; yet no outcry is made. And why ? Because by their improper conduct and irresponsibility they have justly drawn upon themselves the suspicion of the community, and may reasonably be said to have been deserving of the treatment they received. This, however, is not the case with all men, and those who are above suspicion could not be treated with impunity in this or any other similar way. Does any one suppose that men who admit they have been bred in the very mire of political dishonesty, as did the late lamented and valorous Cap. Sullivan, and others who infested Ontario many years ago, can pass as angels and claim that injustice has been done them because they have been suspected ?

By no means. That is drawing too much upon the credulity of the people. While sometimes a little injustice may be done, the general tenor of the opinion of the people is that if we did not exercise some rough and ready justice, in a word, knock down without ceremony the ruffians who attempt to terrorize us, we would be under their domination, and would become the laughing stock and butt of the whole lot And that is true. Human affairs are extremely complicated; human institutions at best are weak but we must justify our conduct before the bar of public opinion and if the people of this country think that the general reputation of this Government is such that it cannot be relied upon they will turn this Government out, but if they think that the actions of this Government in Macdonald and other places compare with the actions of certain governments and certain men say in Saskatchewan where the poll indicated that the votes were all one way and the returns only came in at a very late date or something of that description, of course there will be dissatisfaction.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What does the hon. gentleman say as to the resolution of the Presbyterian Synod of Manitoba in regard to this matter?

Mr. BURNHAM: I say that the action of the Presbyterian Synod of Manitoba is a most serious thing and one that calls for prompt action on the part of the people of this country. I should like very much to have had that resolution in more definite terms. I should have liked very much to have had that resolution charge the Conservative Government, charge the government of the province of Manitoba or some other body of people with wrong-doing. But instead of doing that they have left a blissful imputation to go broadcast over the country without denouncing any particular body. There is an old saying: If the cap fits put it on. And when people have been called liars it is not the honest man who stands up and puts the cap on. In this case I question very much whether it would be proper for a Conservative Government, either here or anywhere else, who remained uncharged, to get up and put this black cap on.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Did the hon. gentleman read what Ralph Connor and other clergymen in the Presbyterian Synod said as to the people in this resolution?

Mr. BURNHAM: I am reading the evidence put before this House by the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and I suppose he knows his case well. I have not been able to read all that the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) speaks of but if there has been any serious discrepancy in placing this evidence before the House, if the case is imperfect as indicated by my hon. friend, I shall sit down and allow somebody else to go on with it and put it in proper shape. If it is necessary to supplement the presentation of the case so far made, as suggested by the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald)—and to this I am quite prepared to agree—then by all means let it be done; but so far as the Presbytery for Winnipeg has thrown out imputations of the most serious and searching character, these imputations apply equally to the Liberal and to the Conservative party. Nobody can say that these men, if they intend to impute wrong-doing to the Conservative party had the courage of their convictions, and I must say if we are to look impartially into these things we must agree that where a body of people like the Presbyterian Synod of Manitoba have shown a disposition to consider a question but did not feel able and were not willing to place the responsibility upon anybody in particular, it is because they did not know that they could do so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I would ask the hon. gentleman whether in his judgment the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) yesterday made a prima facie case at least which would justify the appointment of a parliamentary committee to investigate these charges.

Mr. BURNHAM: I may say I do not think he made out a case at all. I will say this, that if it would tend to clear up a matter of such importance by all means appoint a Parliamentary Committee. If the general opinion of a large proportion of the people of this country is, rightly or wrongly, that a Parliamentary Committee should be appointed, by all means appoint it. I am asked if on this statement of the case by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) I think a prima facie case has been made out. I say frankly that I believe in all sincerity that if this is all that is in the charges that have been made there is nothing in them at all. There are three affidavits. What does one man say?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not surprised that the hon. member never observed any irregularities in Peterborough.

Mr. BURNHAM: We observed the irregularities all right. They will not occur again. I promise you that. One of these gentlemen says that after having spent his time more or less I presume in political organizations in Ontario, he went into Manitoba in or about the month of September and found himself in the course of his travels in the constituency of Macdonald, where, being a strong party man, he put himself into communication with the executive and straightway was employed in good, sharp, smart electoral work in Macdonald.

Mr. PARDEE: The affidavit does not say so.

Mr. BURNHAM: Oh, yes.

Mr. PARDEE: He does not say good sharp, smart work; he says employed in organization work.

Mr. BURNHAM: Certainly, I admit that I used those words, that is comment on my part, but I thought possibly they did not understand an awful lot——

Mr. PARDEE: They seem to have understood more than the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BURNHAM : The Liberals have had a bad day to-day. However, as a humble member of the back benches of this House and with some sense of honour, I hope I am entitled, to the best of my ability, to analyse an extremely serious case; because, if the allegations are at all to be justified, something undoubtedly must be done. This man Sullivan came forward and, it is stated on the authority of no less a man than the Premier of the province of Manitoba, that he registered under a false name. I do not want to know anything more about any man than that.

Mr. PARDEE: The Premier of Manitoba did that.

Mr BURNHAM: I am not discussing that part of it. If he did, I certainly may not——

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) did it once.

Mr. BURNHAM: If you have evidence of that fact, why not bring it forward? However, I see that the hon. gentlemen are not disposed to discuss this question; they want to discuss something else.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Will the hon. gentleman tell the House why it was that the prosecutors who laid the informations and arrested these gentlemen did not furnish some evidence at a hearing to show that they were guilty of some offence under the law?

Mr. BURNHAM: I think the prosecutors were extremely silly. I think they certainly indicated that there was no evidence. That is fair.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: That is only a fair assumption. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) as a lawyer knows that he has gone into court before this and told the court that he had no evidence to offer, not because he had no evidence, but because that is the technical phrase you use when you wish to discontinue a prosecution. That is a fact. I say that if I had been the prosecutor, I would have prosecuted.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What would you have done if you had no evidence ?

Mr. BURNHAM : If I had had anything to do with the arresting, I do not think the man would have been arrested.

Some hon. MEMBERS : Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: I do say this, that when the deponent, as disclosed in the affidavit, has treated the matter as a joke, and laughed about it, and in another case said he was quite willing to have a verdict of acquittal if it could be got, and in another case admitted he had brought suspicion upon himself by saying such words as, 'I did not say I gave you that money for your vote,' it is all very well to laugh, but when people are in the midst of trying times, and war's alarms, they had better walk circumspectly. When men are so outraged with regard to their liberty that they can treat the whole matter as a joke, I for one, believe they are guilty. When they were arrested and put through a course of thin porridge and thin soup and all that sort of thing, as outlined in detail in a very

humourous way by the men who drew up the affidavit, and when at the end of it they add their appreciation of the institutions of this country, and their appreciation of liberty, and laugh about it and say, 'if you can get an acquittal, get it,' I would have a very poor appreciation of the outrage which these gentlemen are endeavouring to place before the people of this country as having been inflicted upon innocent youth, which is, I think, what the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) called the gentleman. What is the sum total of the outrage inflicted upon these people? The sum total is, that three or four men, who came into the constituency and drew upon themselves, justly, a very large measure of suspicion, were arrested, and a certain amount of punishment was inflicted upon them, but not enough. That is the objection: not enough punishment was inflicted. With regard to the provincial police of Manitoba, the ex-Minister of Public Works asked the hon. member for Edmonton if these men were all provincial police, and he did not know. He said they might have been, but he did not know. These men are duly accredited minions of the law, if you choose so to call them. We have all the witnesses summoned before a justice of the peace, and the trials and preliminaries were conducted before the regulation appointees of the Government. Some of the men who were concerned in these may have been, and likely were, appointees of the late Dominion government, though we have no evidence of that. We must approach this subject, and treat it as a serious subject, and with some regard for propriety. The hon. member for Edmonton cannot be coerced or cajoled into saying he knows a thing he does not know, and he does not know, as he said at the beginning and at the end, that there are any facts to justify action by this House. The Synod of the Presbyterian Church felt that they had to justify the insinuation. They stopped there for the good of this country. I wish they had gone further.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What were they talking about?

Mr. BURNHAM: I would like the hon. member for Pictou to tell me what they were talking about.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): You are doing the talking.

Mr. BURNHAM. I am, but I am not prepared to say what the Presbyterian Synod were talking about, because they left it in a very vague way—almost inarticulate, I might say. I think it behooves the people who are making charges to strike out straight from the shoulder, to make these charges in detail, and not merely to say that So and So were treated so and so. The Government of Manitoba actually arrested, at the request of a leading Liberal, two men on a charge of personation. Just fancy that. These minions of the law, who perpetrated such an indignity on such innocent guileless youths, had the temerity to arrest them at the request of the Liberal party.

Mr. CARVELL: And immediately let them go.

Mr. BURNHAM: They were not allowed to go. They were fined $50 and costs. I agree that they should have been stuck in jail for a couple of years. I am not saying that full justice has been done in this case. I am not saying that, but I do say that the present Government in Manitoba, and the Conservative member now sitting for Macdonald, had to fight against a gang that required all their ingenuity, boldness and resources to handle. I think I am voicing the opinion of the people of this country when I say that neither side can boast of their political virtue, and it behooves both sides to improve considerably in that respect. Were it not for the fact that the leaders on both sides have the implicit confidence of this country, it would be impossible to conduct government another hour. It is not for one moment to be supposed that any one is so stupid as to give a complete certificate of character to either party. The circumstances are there, we all know them. We all know the suggestions made by both parties. Some men cannot win fairly, they do not know enough, they have not got the courage, and when they excite suspicion by crawling through the cracks in the fence or under the canvas, and when they get spanked a little bit they cry about the liberty of the subject being infringed, and they call down high Heaven to bear witness to the outrage that has been inflicted upon the political heroes of this country. Well, to do them justice, and it is probably one of the safeguards of the country, to do them justice, they laugh in their sleeve. What is that man who drew up that affidavit talking about when he laughed at it, and what was he talking of when in another affidavit he admits that he was quite willing to take an honourable acquittal. What is the Presbytery talking about? If one man thought it was a joke, why did they not laugh? If the deponent himself laughed at it, what is the matter with the Presbytery?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): It was the Synod, it was not the Presbytery.

Mr. BURNHAM: Well, the Synod.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): We had better investigate.

Mr. BURNHAM: I do not think that is necessary. The Opposition is disposed to joke about this matter. It is not a matter for jocularity, and if the people of this country become impressed with the idea that either side can treat it as a joke, they will find, when they have reported to their constituents, that it is not half the joke they supposed. I am sure on further investigation—and there is plenty of room for investigation—that if it can be shown to this House that the allegations are really made, if it can be shown that there is a prima facie case and that it is of such importance as to warrant action, there is not a man in the House who does not say, for the protection of himself, let alone for the protection of the House, that it will be necessary to hold a court of inquiry. There was one thing I was very much surprised at in the language of the hon. gentleman and that was when he said that this Parliament was above the courts.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BURNHAM: As soon as the people of this country understand that a body of men, 221 in number, are arrogating to themselves superiority over the courts I think they will give themselves up for lost. We have to do with the appointment of the members of the courts and with the making of laws, but those who compose the judiciary are put to one side for the purpose of interpreting those laws fairly, and I think for us to hold the sword over their head and say we are above them, that we control them and that, if necessary, we will chop off their heads, is to say that which is unwarranted and improper.

The allegation has been made indirectly that there is in this country a conspiracy for the extinguishing of the French-Canadian race, a race that has borne itself with all the honour and distinction that we should look for in one of the foremost races of the world. There is at the present time a conspiracy on foot to deprive them of their language, and to deprive them of their language is to deprive them of their customs, their history, their traditions and of their institutions. Whether it is proposed that this shall be accomplished by means of the Government, or in some other way, let me say, representing a large number of English-speaking people who, I know, hold the same opinion, that, much as we have been inclined to differ from them in the past, and often as we have had to meet them in keen debate, nevertheless, bearing in mind their loyalty to the Empire in the past and their loyalty in the present, and their recognition of Imperial needs, we will never even at the sacrifice of the English language go back upon or prove recreant to such a people. As far as I am concerned I would prefer never to speak another word of English if it meant that the French-Canadians should be deprived by force of the right to speak their language whenever they feel so inclined.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, in rising this evening I wish to give thanks to the Prime Minister, as the senior Acadian member representing the people of the Maritime Provinces. I have at various times during the year, entreated him to replace the one Acadian Senator departed from the province of Nova Scotia with one of the same race from that province. We have been waiting for a long time; but knowing, as we all do, that applications for such positions are made by everybody, I had occasion to doubt the success of our application. I wish to express to him the desire of the people, whom I have had the honour to represent in this House for the last twelve years, and, in the absence of the Prime Minister I will ask one of his colleagues, perhaps the Postmaster General, to kindly take my message to him.

I wish also to express some sympathy and gratitude for the few words spoken by the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), in regard to the French teaching in the province of Ontario; more so do I admire his conduct and his expressions, coming as they do from one belonging to the Conservative party, and I trust that the uncomfortableness which may perhaps reign between us will be of short duration. I speak more particularly in behalf of the French people who, as the hon. member for Peterborough has said, like to stand by the spirit of the constitution as well as by the letter.

I wish to draw the attention of the House for a few moments to matters not contained in the Speech from the Throne. In the province of New Brunswick, we are, as hon. gentlemen all know, much interested in the Intercolonial railway. It has been expected for a long time that the Parliament of Canada would acquire the branch lines of that railway which in the Maritime Provinces, and more particularly in the province of New Brunswick, has a large territory to itself. The ex-Minister of Railways and Canals in the session of 1910 brought in a Bill providing for the acquisition of those branches, but owing to the erroneous judgment of the election on the 21st of September, 1911, we were not able to accomplish our project. But we expected from day to day that the present Government would lose no time, and would bring in a similar Bill during last

session. I called the attention of the Minister of Railways last session to this matter, and he told me that he had not yet had time to consider it, but that he would do so during the recess. The recess has been six long months, and I am still at a loss whether or not the hon. Minister of Railways has given any consideration to the subject. It is a subject of vital importance to the Maritime provinces, and I hope that the session will not be long protracted before we have some expression of policy upon this question. We are perhaps more interested in having the matter settled at once, because we often hear rumours that are disquieting to the people of the Maritime provinces. Some few years ago the Canadian Northern Railway company wished to have running rights over the Intercolonial and even to acquire possession by long lease of that road. We hear the same rumours again and, when coupled with the long silence of the Government, they are disquieting.

This afternoon I heard my hon. friend the Minister of Finance express some opinions in regard to the policy of the Liberal party in the past, more particularly in regard to the great question of reciprocity with the United States. My hon. friend asked the Liberal party if we had not decided to let reciprocity alone. If by reciprocity with the United States my hon. friend meant the arrangement concluded by Mr. Fielding and President Taft, which still stands for the acceptance of the people of Canada, an arrangement which is not a treaty, which is for the exchange of the natural products of Canada for the natural products of the United States, I wish to say that the right hon. leader of the Opposition has no more devoted supporter, no more sincere admirer than the modest member for Gloucester, and, if the leader of the Opposition were to say that we do not want the arrangement any more, even if we can get it; then I would have to take issue with my right hon. friend. The experience of the last year has only served to make that arrangement dearer to the minds and hearts of the Canadian people, because they have been in a position to study it; and, comparing this year's experience with that of previous years, they have come to the conclusion that it is one of the best possible arrangements that could be offered to the people of Canada. It was not a treaty binding the people of Canada for a number of years, as the Minister of Finance and the Conservative party at large are always so anxious to urge claiming that we would not be able to command our tariff, and that we would become an adjunct of the United States. The fact that it was only an arrangement which could be upset by the Parliament of Canada or the Congress of the United States, gives us perfect assurance that nothing of the kind could happen. Therefore my great admiration was for the ex-Minister of Finance when he came back from the United States with such an arrangement, for I had never anticipated that he could have obtained for Canada an open market for our natural products without affecting the tariff on manufactured goods; and what do I find? I find that the manufacturers are always insisting that we would not be able to command our tariff in future, if such an arrangement had been made.

The opening of the markets of the United States to our agricultural products would have greatly benefited our farmers, and this in turn would have benefited those engaged in our manufacturing industries. For everybody knows that agriculture is the foundation of our prosperity and that the more prosperous our farmers are the greater will be their purchases from the manufacturer. Increase the quantity of farm products by opening wider, quicker and more profitable markets and you will necessarily increase, by that very fact, the quantity of farm implements and tools that have to be used. Thus the iron manufacturers first and more particularly would have found their interests advanced by this reciprocity arrangement more than they could be advanced by any tariff that we can make.

But one of the speakers to-day asked: Why should we consider this extension of commercial relations with the United States when it involves danger to our loyalty to the British Empire. Personally, I consider myself as loyal as any British subject that ever lived. I have been represented at times in the Nationalist press as being more British than the King. Well I do not expect to be more British than the King, but I am as British as any King who ever sat upon the Throne. Let us hear no more of these charges about disloyalty to British institutions. British institutions mean before the world civil, religious and political liberty. And they mean also intelligence. I should consider myself less than a true British subject if I had not sufficient intelligence to be able to go to a foreign country to buy or sell without affecting my loyalty. And if there is a nation in the world that, more than any other has proven to the world that economic matters have nothing to do with loyalty it is the British people. These solid business men of the Motherland have shown by their extensive relations with the German, Oriental and American people, that a true British subject does not sell his loyalty with his goods. And I would not be a true British subject if I could not trust my children or my

neighbour as well as myself to go to the United States or any other country and trade in goods without trading in loyalty to the Crown. I wish we could hear the last of this talk of loyalty. For I am sure everybody knows that among the French people, of whom my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) has spoken so eloquently, as among the English, Irish or the Scotch, there are none to-day who would sink their allegiance. If there ever were those at any time inclined to forget their own duty and their own best interest in this regard, they were to be found among the supporters of the party now in power.

Now, I wish to say that my people have suffered during the last year for the want of reciprocity. We have in New Brunswick to-day large quantities of lumber piled in the yards adjoining the saw-mills, which lumber could not find its way to the British market because of low prices and because of the difficulty of securing ships which are used by the British importers to carry lumber from other countries. Had we not had some access to the American market last year and this year, half our lumber camps would have been closed. In my own county we have one of the largest saw-mills in the province of New Brunswick. And the whole product of its operation, 25,000,000 feet of lumber cut during last season, has to find sale in the American market. That important company in Gloucester county, the Bathurst Lumber Company, has to-day 600 car loads of lumber awaiting cars on the Intercolonial railway to be shipped to the United States. On that lumber they must pay a duty of $1.25 per 1,000 feet. Their product, as I have stated, is 25,000,000 feet a year, and I leave to you, Mr. Speaker, the calculation of the amount they have to pay to the United States, which under reciprocity would have been kept among the people of New Brunswick.

We talk of loyalty, but I am sure the Liberal party has shown its loyalty by offering at once on coming into power in 1897, a substantial preference on British goods. Nor was it a small favour which was offered to the people of Great Britain through her industries, for ever since then a marked increase has gone on in the importation of British goods into Canada. In 1897, as shown by the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, our total importations from Great Britain amounted to only $29,328,576. This has been increasing by leaps and bounds, and last year, these imports amounted to $110,585,000. When we consider that this increase is due to the preference granted on British goods by the late Government, we cannot but realise that we have expressed our loyalty in trade as well as in words.

I believe that with the reciprocity arrangement with the United States and a still further increase in the British preference, we might have secured the permanency of tariff of which the Minister of Finance (Mr. White), has spoken so highly to-day; we might have secured enormous benefits to the manufacturers of Canada while also benefitting our farmers and consumers and favouring those engaged in the industries of Great Britain.

As to the United States, we have to deal with them anyhow. Our dealings with the United States are greater than our dealings with any other country and double our dealings with the United Kingdom. We have to send to the United States our lumber and our fish. For a large part of the products of the Maritime provinces fisheries especially our smelt, salmon and mackerel, there is no other market than the American market. We have increased our exportation of fish to the United States by over half a million during the last year, and in my own county the export of fish to the United States was nearly doubled. A few years ago large quantities of our dry codfish had to be sold in the West Indies, Spain or Italy. But to-day fully half of this product is marketed in the United States and brings to the people from $1.50 to $1.75 a quintal more than they have ever been paid by dealers in these other countries.

Our total trade with Great Britain during the year 1911 amounted to $247,551,912, and with the United States $413,812,003. That trade consisted of raw cotton to the amount of $12,000,000, and manufactured cotton to the amount of over $6,000,000.

I understand that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce some time ago advised the Canadian Manufacturers' Association that the manufacturers of Canada should look for foreign markets for their products, and should not be content with the markets of Canada. If it is advisable for the manufacturer to look for wider markets, then why should not the farmers of the West also have the benefit of that large and profitable market which the United States offers?

The Speech from the Throne makes reference to the trade agreement which has been entered into with the West Indies, and I wish to congratulate my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce and the Government of the day on having consummated that ambition of the Liberal party. But the treaty with the British West Indies can only be appreciated to the extent of the advantages of trade and commerce which it offers, and the benefits to be derived in that respect cannot for a moment be compared to those offered by access to the markets of the United States. The population of the West Indies is but four million, as compared with ninety million in the United

States. It must be remembered that a large majority of the people of the West Indies exercise in their daily life the greatest possible economy, and the annual sum expended by one family might not exceed $50 a year. But the ninety million people of the republic to the south are living in comfort and luxury, expending large annual sums on such natural products as are produced in Canada in great abundance.

I will not say anything on the naval question, as my views upon it are well known. In addressing this House during the last session, I had the pleasure of telling my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, when I was informed that he intended going to England to consult the Admiralty in regard to a naval policy which would be in the interests of Canada and the Empire, that if he came back with a policy which would provide for a Canadian navy built in the shipyards of Canada, with the iron and steel produced in this country and manned by Canadian seamen, no matter what the size of his vessels might be, I would give him my hearty support. The people of Canada have had time to consider this matter, and their cogitations have, I am sure, resulted in a sympathetic attitude towards the hon. leader of the Opposition in his views regarding the Canadian naval programme. If there are Liberals who may have differed with the right hon. leader of the Liberal party in some respects, they are the first to give him their support upon the question of a Canadian navy, and are ready to assist him in the establishment of a policy which will give aid to Great Britain not only in times of emergency, but at any time such assistance may be deemed advisable by the Canadian Parliament.

In the debate yesterday the hon. member for Edmonton made reference to the Macdonald by-election held in Manitoba in the month of October last. I was speaking a few moments ago of the privileges granted by British institutions, and, as my friend the hon. gentleman from Peterborough said this evening, the liberty of speech is one of those great privileges that are so much appreciated by the people of this country.

In corroboration of what has been presented to the House by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), I shall ask leave to add a testimony which came into my possession as a matter of accident by the expression of the affections of a son toward his father. In corroboration of what has been stated of the position assumed by the provincial government of Manitoba in giving instructions to police and to court officials I would cite the experience of one of my own children who gives me the information simply to express to me his surprise at what he had heard of doings in connection with provincial elections in Manitoba, but could not believe before, was confirmed by his own experience when he was almost subjected to imprisonment or arrest for walking very quietly in the streets of Winnipeg a few days previous to that election. I have a son in the province of Manitoba, a very young man, the youngest of my children, who has scarcely seen five and twenty summers, a student at law in the province of Alberta, who had just left Laval after his course in philosophy a couple of years ago and went there to settle for life. He went into the constituency of Macdonald last October to help in the election and I wish to read to you what he writes me in reference to his experience in the Macdonald election. His letter is in French and I shall read the portion of it which I wish to lay before the House in French and then shall endeavour to translate it for the benefit of those members of this House who do not understand French.

J'ai fait connaissance de M. Bover, député de Vaudreuil. J'ai adressé, avec lui, une assemblée à Fannystelle, dans le comté de Macdonald, où j'ai eu l'occasion de constater la perversité de l'organisation conservatrice manitobaine. Quand je lisais dans les journaux les rapports d'arrestations faites sans cause et sans prétexte, je n'y croyais qu'à moitié, mais je n'étais pas plus tôt rendu dans le comté que j'avais moi-même un policier à mes talons. Naturellement, comme je ne faisais rien de mal ni d'illégal, je ne le craignais pas. Cependant la veille de l'élection j'ai été averti par ce monsieur policier, que si je ne cessais de parler aux gens en faveur de la réciprocité, je serais arrêté et emprisonné. Je lui ai demandé quelle était son accusation? Il me répondit: je n'en ai pas, mais j'ai mes instructions. Naturellement je lui ai dit que je ne pouvais suivre ses conseils que j'étais venu pour travailler et que je travaillerais. A ce moment il est arrivé quelques bons Français, et mon homme eut vite abandonné son idée de m'arrêter.

I shall now give you the exact translation of those few lines.

I made the acquaintance of Mr. Boyer, member for Vaudreuil, and addressed with him a meeting at Farnystelle, in the county of Macdonald, where I had occasion to realize the perversity of the Conservative organization in Manitoba. When I used to read in the papers all the reports of arrests made without cause and without evidence I only believed half of it. But I was scarcely in the county until I had myself a policeman at my heels. Naturally as I was doing nothing wrong and nothing illegal I did not fear him. Nothwithstanding on the eve of the election I was notified by this gentleman of the police that if I did not cease to speak to the people in favour of reciprocity I would be arrested and imprisoned. I asked him what was his charge. He replied to me: I have none, but

I have my instructions. Naturally I told him that I could not follow his advice, that I had come to work and intended to work. At this moment a few good Frenchmen came along and my gentleman of the police soon abandoned the idea of arresting me.

Here, Mr. Speaker, is a young man, not one of those whom the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) wants to represent as old mischief makers from Ontario, who have gone to the West, but a very simple young man who has not yet seen his five and twentieth winter, his first experience perhaps in public life. He goes sincerely to speak to the people of Macdonald on behalf of wider markets, and he is followed by a policeman and threatened by that policeman with arrest and no doubt he would have been arrested only that somebody happened to be around and to divert the activity of that policeman. When it comes to this in a province of Canada, which is all united and which must be all united, in which but one citizenship can exist for the French and for the Irish, for the old and for the young, and more particularly for the young who are to be the rulers of this country after we are gone to a better or a worse world, it is time for the people of Canada and the Government of Canada to investigate such action on the part of the government of Manitoba, whether you call it the Roblin Government or by any other name; when any government abuses its authority for its own purposes, it is time that we should call a halt. We must never forget that the strength of our constitution is for the happiness of the people and that the repetition of such courses in elections, by a provincial government, whether in Richelieu or Macdonald, as have been described here to-day, gross infringements on the liberty of the citizens of Canada, cannot be permitted again under the sun of the British Empire.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, it was on the 26th of February, 1910. Rigaud the small town of my county where I reside was all thrown into consternation. A storm was evidently drawing near, the elements which brought it were, in the afternoon, to reach our land, so quiet as a rule. In fact it was about three o'clock when one of the Canadian Pacific Railway trains landed a group of wild Nationalists who came there, some said, to upset the minds and to set their political opinion, henceforth, against the leader of the government of that day. That was the first gunshot of the campaign against the Canadian navy law. The question was to strike hard, to frighten the electors and, above all, to make an impression

I have a sweet remembrance of the member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Rainville) being one of the first among those who were to speak that afternoon.

How great was, on that date, my colleague of to-day! And if the same audience who then listened to him had heard him yesterday what a wretched man they would have found him to be!

He spoke with vehemence on that occasion; yesterday we could hardly hear him. He was wild. Rouget de Lisle did not reach to his heel. How faint his courage has grown since that time! Let us see what the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères said at Rigaud. I have extracts from the Montreal Gazette, from the Star and from Le Devoir. I shall first quote the Montreal Gazette of the 28th of February:

Mr. Rainville added a few observations. He pointed out Sir Wilfrid's volte-face on the Imperialism question, and denounced, as at Longueuil last Sunday, the falsity of the national character of the proposed navy.

The scheme of a naval force to be put at England's service, he said, was a violation of the Militia and Defence Act, drawn up by Sir George Etienne Cartier in 1868, in which it is expressly declared that our militia force should never have to fight outside of Canada or for other cause than the defence of Canadian soil and Canadian interests.

As to the Montreal Star of the same date, it published what follows:

Mr. J. H. Rainville said that the navy would belong to Canada in time of peace. In time of war it would belong to England. The question of a creation of a Canadian navy has arisen, he contended, as a consequence of the preaching of Imperialists of the Chamberlain School. These Imperialists had found that they could not tax the poor people of England any more. That source of revenue was becoming exhausted. So they were now turning their attention to the colonies. What they could not get out of the English poor, they hoped to extract from Canada, Australia and Cape Colony.

Evidence was shown of this in the war which the Northcliffe papers had made on the Lloyd-George budget during the recent election in Great Britain. Lloyd George too had recognized that the poor could not be taxed more heavily, and he had turned his attention to the wealthy.

Now, here is an extract from Le Devoir of the 28th of February, 1910:

I am sure, said Mr. Rainville, that there is here a great number of Liberals who admire Laurier because he knew know to 'stand up' in 1912, when Chamberlain tried to find out what the Canadians thought of Imperialism. 'What is it that may have happened since 1902, 1905 and 1907 to give rise to such a change of attitude in the Liberal party?' He foresees that Mr. Boyer will quote the Militia Act, drawn up by George Etienne Cartier and which prescribes the creation of a Canadian Militia bound to take part in the wars 'in which Canada would be interested.'

Amendments to that text have often been proposed, but George Etienne Cartier, Charles Tupper, John A. Macdonald and Mr. Laurier have always opposed them strongly. But there is an eel—some say a snake—in the grass (laughter). Chamberlain and his disciples, who have the most authority on the press, are making, in favour of Imperialism, a campaign which is well organized. 'As it has become impossible to make the English people sweat more money by means of taxes, they wish to tax Cape Colony, India, Australia and Canada, and if we protest against that, La Presse and La Patrie say that we are uttering the race cry.'

He concluded by a fine burst of eloquence: 'Our only country is Canada, and we must fight but for its progress and prosperity.'

That is what the press has reported of the speech delivered by the honourable member. But he said something else, and our English speaking compatroits who cheered him yesterday would surely have found no attraction in the remarks he made on their account and with respect to Great Britain. Two years have elapsed since that meeting took place, and to-day I am in a position to tell the honourable member for Chambly-Verchères that the vulgar abuse with which he loaded Sir Wilfrid Laurier on that occasion is now falling upon himself and crushing him forever. It is not the leader of the Liberal party who has been unable to keep standing on his feet, but it is his own legs which have given way until he sank to the most degrading abasement.

The honourable member for Chambly-Verchères has been able, within three or four years, to deny his party, to adopt another party, to deny this latter also, to preach a doctrine and to deny it, the whole with an impudence which sickens the honest people, as Le Devoir would say.

Now, let us see what his new profession of faith is. Let us see what he said yesterday in this House:

In fine, Sir, one of the great questions which interest our country to-day is that of a contribution to the Empire which Canada is part of.

The ideas are different as to the way of making this contribution, but from one end of the country to the other, the same feeling exists in favour of the necessity of maintaining England's maritime supremacy, in the interest of the whole Empire.

And note that the existence of this feeling has just come to his knowledge! Is this what he said at Rigaud? Is this what he said to the electors of Drummond and Arthabaska?

And he goes on:

And to those who would doubt it. I could quote the resolution of 1909. I could even quote, should it be necessary to go further, an article written by the editor of the newspaper Le Devoir, on the 12th of October, 1912, in which we read: Never have the Nationalists claimed that Canada should do nothing for the security of the Empire.

I read somewhere that the Nationalists had expressed their views concerning the defence of the country through the voice of one of their leaders, Mr. Lavergne, who stated that he was in favour of the reconstruction of fortifications and of the establishment of defence works on land, &c.

Here is a further extract from the speech of my hon. colleague:

However, Sir, let me state very plainly my mind in this connection. Europe is threatened with a general war. It is not yet known whether the great powers will allow the small Balkan states to extend their boundaries. The decisive victory won by the Bulgarian army has unexpectedly set diplomacy on the alert. Inevitably the powers will have to foresee, and it is a difficult matter to intervene and it is a difficult matter to foresee what will be the outcome as regards European intercourse.

England is not a disinterested onlooker; she will likely have to take a stand, and if war breaks out, an array of all her forces will be in order. Under the circumstances, the stand taken by the Government will be readily understood.

The hon. member was opposed to the building of a navy because, he stated, in time of war it would be under the control of the British authorities. Now here is a question which crops up in which our country has no interest whatever, and the hon. member contends it is urgent for us to give out millions. He winds up with the following statement:

If we are rightly informed the Government propose introducing this year a provisional measure of assistance, reserving the right to consult the people when the time comes to provide for a permanent contribution, and such contribution, if and when it is granted, to be made dependent on the right of representation in the councils of the Empire. That is the purport of the statements made in England and in this House on behalf of the Government by the right hon. Prime Minister who has the support of the country.

They will consult the people when there is no longer any occasion for doing so, that is after the Government will have attained their purpose; and then if the people continue to grumble they will, I presume, grant them a plebiscite, to soothe their feelings Such is the wonderful disclosure or rather justification which the hon. member had in store for us. Is it not laughable to hear him state that the reason which prompted his change of front was accidently suggested to him by the Balkan war? Indeed, had it not been for the gallantry of those small nations who are fighting for the maintenance of their liberty and their rights, the member for Chambly and Verchères would have without compunction let Great Britain fight her own battles alone. But, on a

sudden, the roaring of the guns in the Balkans changes his disposition. He takes heart once more and willingly endorses now the proposal for the giving away of millions. If that is what the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères calls standing by one's principles, I must say he is a first rate acrobat.

The hon. member for Chambly and Verchères congratulated the Government on having provided an annual grant to the provincial legislatures as an encouragement to agricultural pursuits. I willingly join my congratulations to his for it is only fair that Cæsar should have his due. However, I think he is mistaken in stating that the Government proposes granting an amount of $500,000 to each of the provinces. Such a division of the grant would be unfair. Some if the provinces, in consequence of the extent of their territory or the numbers of their inhabitants, are surely entitled to a larger grant to enable them to overcome difficulties and spread a knowledge of improved methods in rural husbandry. If my memory serves me right, the increase in the Dominion subsidy to the provinces, as granted by the late government, had also as part of its object, to assist in the agricultural development of the provinces.

As a mater of fact, the special grant to agriculture which the present Government propose to give is a mere revival of the late government's policy; the only difference is in the name, not in the thing itself. Nevertheless, I am glad to see the Conservative government following in our footsteps.

The hon. member for Chambly and Verchères calls for the establishment 'of special agricultural classes in the business college's throughout our province.' I do not concur with him. To my mind, our commercial schools should remain as they are to-day, should continue improving on the same lines and endeavour to make their curriculum more and more up-to-date, but without meddling with agriculture. Let our commercial schools stick to their primary object. If it is desired that agriculture should be taught, let there be established special schools for that purpose, whose curriculum would comprise the teaching of some of the matters taught in commercial schools. Let us not confuse things. Experience has shown that farmers who send their sons to commercial schools are not desirous that they should take up farms, but that they should engage in trade or industry.

Again experience shows that in rare cases only do boys take to agriculture after going through a course at a commercial school or college. To my mind, the teaching of agriculture in such schools would result in a waste of time for the pupils. If it is wished that the theory of agriculture should be taught, let special schools be opened in addition to those already in existence. I may mention the Macdonald college of agriculture at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, where hundreds of young men and girls are continually receiving the instruction which will be helpful to them in after life. The teaching which is given there is wholly in connection with farm husbandry and household science. However, a number of commercial subjects are included in the curriculum. The same might be said of the schools at Oka and St. Anne de Lapocatière, though their organization is on a smaller scale. I have every day occasion to notice the large numbers of young men and girls from various localities in my constituency who attend the courses at Macdonald college. We might be content with schools equipped on a smaller scale. I for one think that agriculture should be taught in agricultural schools, in the same way that commercial and industrial subjects are taught in business or technical schools, the classics in classical colleges, and the liberal arts in the universities.

On the other hand, I am in accord with the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères when he requests the establishment of a larger number of model farms, and I might add the appointment of a larger number of qualified professors, in a position to give field demonstrations of the new methods and improvements, a knowledge of which is a source of profit to the farming community at large.

The hon. member for Chambly and Verchères states that he has been requested to obtain from the Government grants towards enabling agricultural societies to improve their exhibition grounds and buildings, in order to impart to farm boys an adequate idea of the importance of the agricultural fair at which from year to year in every county farmers congregate, compete and compare notes. The views thus expressed by the hon. gentleman if he be sincere, are worthy of praise but at the same time they indicate on his part very little knowledge of the question. Exhibitions are under the control of the provincial governments. The Dominion government subsidizes, by special vote, a small number only of central exhibitions.

Mr. RAINVILLE: (Translation.) Allow me to say one word. I am well aware that agricultural exhibitions are under the control of the provincial governments; my idea was simply this, that the Dominion government might take occasion of the agreement to be entered into with the provincial authorities to give effect to my suggestion.

Mr. BOYER: (Translation.) I hope the hon. member will rid himself of that habit into which he has fallen of continually and recklessly offering suggestions. He should abide by past experience. Once more, agricultural fairs are under the control of the local governments, the Dominion government has nothing at all to do with them.

If district and county exhibitions were under the control of the Dominion Government, I would give him this warning: Before venturing to offer grants, however good your motive in doing so, see to it that the moneys which you are about to distribute are spent so as to give the results which you anticipate. Indeed, the slightest acquaintance with the manner in which things are managed in connection with some of these district exhibitions throughout the country will convince one that they are mere business ventures subsidized by the Dominion or provincial governments. Then again, a large number of those county exhibitions are in no sense whatever doing the practical illustration work to which the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères referred, and young men do not congregate there to obtain inspiration from the achievements of their elders. They are rather an annual meet for amateurs of horse-racing and other various sports which agricultural societies allow on their grounds. I myself visited last year in the province of Quebec agricultural fairs which were agricultural in name only, and were nevertheless attended by thousands.

Mr. RAINVILLE: (Translation.) Not in Chambly-Verchères.

Mr. BOYER: (Translation.) That may be. Chambly-Verchères is already in a pretty bad plight. The hon. member will pardon me but I am not enthusiastic as regards exhibitions. I say again that I would rather favour a measure whereby our parliament would assist in establishing model farms throughout the country, and give field demonstrations. Exhibitions give satisfactory results, provided they are properly managed, and some counties profit immensely through them. But to ensure such results in every case, a campaign would have to be carried on by the provincial governments with the assistance of practical farmers, so as to find out what is the cause of the unrest prevailing and apply the proper remedy.

The hon. gentleman from Chambly and Verchères deplores the exodus of the country people towards the cities. He is certainly right, and in this connection he quoted the following verse:

Remettez en honneur le soc de la charrue;
Repeuplez la campagne au dépens dela rue;
Grevez d'impôts la ville et dégrevez les champs,
Ayez moins de bourgeois et plus de paysans.

The hon. gentleman designates as place seekers the country people who flock to the cities. But if he really wished to detect the reason for this exodus, we would not be long in ascertaining what it is. If the country is deserted, farm houses abandoned, left untilled, it is an easy matter for him to discover why. Let him go through the factories in Montreal, for instance, he will see that ninety per cent of the hands have come from the country places. Industries and the various municipal services have appealed to the country for more labour. It seems that salaries are higher there and the exodus has begun and continues in the absence of any counteracting influences.

The hon. gentleman grew enthusiastic yesterday over the country's wealth, its immense industrial possibilities, and then turning around he wept over the sad fate of the farmer. He might properly have insisted on the immense fortunes accumulated by manufacturers, through the dogged labour of those country people who have given up the plough shares to confine themselves in factories. Excessive protection by enriching manufacturers has impoverished the country folks. In the first place, it made farm labour scarcer; and then, through excessive duties on the necessaries of life, it made life dearer to them.

In 1911, the Liberal government submitted to the people an equitable measure towards correcting the evil, I mean reciprocity. Now, would not that hon. member, who worries over the fate of these humble workers, have been more consistent if at the time he had sided with the farming community? He might then have parodied the verses he quoted in the following manner:

Remettez en honneur la base de la nation;
Repeuplez la campagne au dépens de la protection,
Grevez d'impôts la ville et degrevez les champs.
Ayez moins de millionaires et plus de paysans.

Sir, while I am on my feet, I am anxious to inform the House of the infamous practices I have been the witness of during the Macdonald by-election. Indeed, I am one of the poor victims who almost left their bones in that constituency. I had been invited to take a hand in that election. I proceeded thereto in a very peaceful mood. I was there as a free citizen in a free country, and believing I had the right in that part of Canada to emit untramelled my political views before the electors of Macdonald

I had gone into that constituency to support Mr. Richardson, who was the recipro-

city candidate; that was my only reason for being there. I was not opposing Mr. Morrison on racial or religious grounds. I am in favour of reciprocity in the East, and I claim the right to express my views in the West as well. On my arrival there, some unedifying reports were made to me in regard to the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). I put no faith in them. However, after all I have witnessed and heard in the meantime, I feel inclined to think that all those misdeeds were committed to his knowledge. An inquiry before the committee on privileges and elections would clear up the matter.

I have taken part in contests in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, some of them, hard-fought batles; but never before had I experienced on the part of the Conservative party such marked contempt for the electoral law. Should such proceedings be resorted to again, a downright system of anarchy would be preferable, the constitution should be torn to pieces and the reign of sheer force substituted for that of right.

Sir, you would have been horrified at the impudence exhibited by the ministers in the Manitoba provincial government. About the same time, an election took place in the county of Richelieu, and not a single provincial cabinet minister interfered. Such is the rule generally followed by the local cabinet ministers in Ontario and Quebec.

When I saw Manitoba's prime minister and his colleagues entering the constituency, addressing very small audiences, endeavouring to influence and intimidate them, I realized that they were animated by some other motive than the desire of showing the superiority of their policy. In this connection the Government relied on the assistance of an army of employees who had recourse to a variety of means quite sufficient to explain why we were defeated. And to this very day I am satisfied that it was not reciprocity that suffered defeat. The people of this country should be made aware of these wicked deeds, and I now propose, Mr. Speaker, to acquaint the House with some of the fraudulent and shameful tricks which were resorted to. Of course, I do not hold the residents of that constituency responsible for such doings; I throw the whole blame on the provincial authorities and their confederates, including the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers).

To begin with, I may refer to an incident personal to me. One afternoon while I was staying in one of the parishes of the county, I was informed that steps were being taken for my arrest a quarter of an hour later. And what reason have they for causing my arrest? I inquired. Because you propose addressing a meeting to-night against a friend of Mr. Morrison. Was not that something outrageous? The person who reported the fact to me held the news from a third party who had overheard a telephone message between a government official and a partisan of Mr. Morrison. The former, whom I do not intend to name, but whose identity I shall willingly disclose before a committee, had instructed the latter to call on a certain local magistrate, whose name I know but do not propose to give, and there to have warrants signed in blank and sent back to him. That outrageous deed was to be perpetrated against me that very night before the meeting took place. You will admit, Sir, that such a proceeding was not evidence of very much bravery on the part of the opponent which I was to meet. And to think that I was spared the prisoner's cell, through the mere kindness of a supporter of Mr. Morrison who absolutely condemned such a proceeding.

I should make plain to you Mr. Speaker, that I was not upset by the news; nay, more, I regret that the deed was not perpetrated. For it would have enabled me to satisfy the electors of other counties, as well as my own, as to the corrupting influence exerted over elections in the province of Manitoba, under the kindly eye of the Government of that province and particularly of the hon. Minister of Public Works. That same plan of arresting Mr. Richardson's friends, those who supported him by word and deed, was carried out in every other part of the county and the whole story has been revealed to us by the affidavits which the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has read to the House. I shall not dwell any longer on that subject. However, let me point out how grievous it is to have recourse to such means or tolerate their use in this twentieth century and in this Canada of ours. Readers of history will remember that in the France of old lettres-de-cachet were granted by the Sovereign just to satisfy the whim of some woman or for some such futile reason, and by this means innocent people were sent to the Bastile, or beheaded, without having had an opportunity of defending themselves. The people at last revolted, and rightly so. Is it not aggravating to find that in this beautiful country of ours, at the very moment the Government propose sending millions to Great Britain, ministers should busy themselves winning elections through terror and the contempt of all liberty recognized and guaranteed by the law.

Sir, there is another infernal machine which has been doing service in the hands of the organizers of that election; I mean the drinking house. Of course, I do not mean to throw blame on all the hotelkeepers in the constituency, for there are some very honest people among them. But every

one is aware that licenses in the province of Manitoba are granted direct by the provincial government. The latter, in consequence, has them under its absolute control. Honest hotelkeepers must like the rest take their cue from the provincial government, otherwise they would the very next day be deprived of their license.

To my personal knowledge, a member of the provincial legislature entered a bar room at twenty minutes past midnight, accompanied by a number of voters, and peremptorily ordered the hotelkeeper to open the bar. The latter answered that he could not do so as the law forbade it. I am the law, replied the member, and I then witnessed a drinking bout which lasted till morn. That is a fact among a hundred. I was informed that the hon. Minister of Public Works at the time he was a provincial cabinet minister, had not scrupled to act similarly. No wonder then that such bad example should afterwards be followed.

And, Sir, to satisfy you once more that they had resolved to resort to all the unlawful practices which I have pointed out, I may say that on the morning of polling day, a prominent Conservative, interested in the election, stated to a friend of mine that even should Mr. Richardson be returned, Mr. Morrison would that evening be declared elected. Thus it is, Mr. Speaker, that money and whisky played an important part in that election, and some people, in spite of all, will persist in holding that reciprocity is not popular.

I read in the Manitoba Free Press an interview given by the hon. Minister of Public Works on the day after that election, wherein he stated that the Liberals who had come from the province of Quebec had appealed to racial and religious prejudices. I deny it, the only time we had occasion to deal with the school question, was when replying to Mr. Morrison's supporters, who did not hesitate to revile Mr. Richardson on account of his stand towards Catholics, and on the other hand praised very highly the so-called great spirit of fairness evidenced by the Prime Minister of Manitoba and the hon. Minister of Public Works.

I repeat it, appeals to race prejudices have not come from our side, but from our opponents who distributed during the contest a pamphlet comprising editorials which has appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune, Mr. Richardson's organ, in regard to the school question. As we know, Mr. Richardson had some trouble with Archbishop Langevin with whom he disagreed on the school question.

I taunted my opponents for having raked up these matters which were already several years old, pointing out at the same time that we were not making it a matter of reproach to Mr. Morrison, for his being, as the Telegram has stated, a prominent Orangeman.

Again I say, we of the province of Quebec who took part in that election, we dealt solely with reciprocity, as serious men addressing intelligent people.

Apart from the shameful practices I have put on record, the issuing of blank warrants, the interference of the provincial government, the work performed by hotelkeepers, and others, there were numberless little tricks worked by the telephone and postal services in Mr. Morrison's interest. We are all aware that the Manitoba telephone system is in the hands of the local government. Now, knowing beforehand as we do to what extent the government of that province controls its employees, it is easy to surmise how the friends of Mr. Richardson must have fared in many instances.

As regards the postal service, I may say that I never received, within five days after notification by the sender a letter which had been addressed to me from Winnipeg, forty miles from my location at the time. I might have inferred that the letter had gone astray by accident, but similar accidents happened in the case of friends of mine located at other points.

The other day I witnessed the presentation in this House of the newly elected member for Macdonald (Mr. Morrison), and noticing how frantically he was being applauded by government supporters, I could not help thinking that if some honest Conservatives had been aware of those facts, they would have blushed at the thought of that victory won through fraud, cynicism, coercion and the nefarious influence of unscrupulous men. Several imagined that they were applauding the defeat of reciprocity in the person of the newcomer, while it was simply one of the greatest political crimes committed to this date that they were being made to endorse.

It only remains for me to lay a document before this House. I hope hon. gentlemen will bear with me. It may perhaps not be entirely in order to do so, though it certainly has a connection with the said election, since we were accused of stirring up racial and religious feuds.

To show once more to what lengths the cynicism of some politicians will go, as Mr. Bourassa would put it, I may recall that during the last provincial elections, with a view to putting in a better light the stand taken on the Keewatin school question by the then hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) and the

hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel), our opponents, both Nationalists and Conservatives, distributed right and left throughout the country the circular which I am about to read.

In order that every one may enjoy its full flavour, and also in order to unmask the hypocritical and treacherous practices of those who designate themselves the saviours of racial and religious interests, I give herewith verbatim that henceforth memorable document:

Messrs. Monk, Pelletier and Nantel are right. Mr. Roblin, Prime Minister of Manitoba, does away with the most objectionable grievances, the most intolerable hardship resulting from the outrageous Laurier-Greenway settlement.

The hon. Messrs. Monk, Pelletier and Nantel, and the members who supported them, in connection with the carrying of the Keewatin Bill, showed their absolute faith in the Hon. Mr. Roblin and his government, as well as in his legislature and the people of Manitoba.

They were not mistaken.

The Manitoba School Act has just been amended, and our compatriots are at last relieved of the double tax which weighed so heavily on them since the passing of the iniquitous Laurier-Greenway settlement.

Our three distinguished compatriots who are the only representatives of the Catholics and French-Canadian minority in the Manitoba legislature are loud in their praise, as expressed in the following letter, addressed to the delegation from the province of Quebec which reached Winnipeg on the eleventh instant with a view to thanking the Hon. Mr. Roblin for what he has done in behalf of our compatriots.

Winnipeg, April 12, 1912.

To Messrs. Armand Lavergne, M.L.A., Louis Coderre, M.P., J. Rainville, M.P., Dr. E. Paquette, M.P., P. E. Lamarche, M.P., C. P. Beaubien, C.R., and Alleyn Taschereau:

Gentlemen,—You have come from Quebec especially to honour in the Hon. Mr. Roblin the just and righteous man, the faithful friend and protector of the minority in this province; and it behooves us more especially as being the only French-Canadian members in the Manitoba legislature to thank you for your generous undertaking. You have come from afar to help us in better acquitting ourselves of a debt of gratitude, and you may be sure that all the French-Candians and Catholics of Manitoba are deeply grateful to you on that account.

In return for your generous move, we beg of you to take back to our dear province of Quebec the assurance that our situation in Manitoba has 'since undergone marked improvement.'

We are at last relieved of that double tax which weighed so heavily and so unfairly on us. Thanks to the man whom you have come to honour by your presence, one of the greatest hardships, the most objectionable feature of the iniquitous Laurier-Greenway settlement, is done away with. Those who put their faith in the Hon. Mr. Roblin were not mistaken, and you may be sure that they will not be disappointed.

We remain, gentlemen, &c.

JOSEPH BERNIER,
AIME BENARD,
ALBERT PREFONTAINE.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I may state that this document was false, and that the three members of the local House who signed it were perfectly aware that such were not the facts. I may say further that those who took it home from Winnipeg knew that the local government had not done justice to the Catholics in that province. It was nothing more than a political trick set on foot by unscrupulous people who, by such action, imperilled the cause they were supposed to defend. Now, during the electoral contest in Macdonald, a member of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Aimé Bénard, went so far as to contend at a public meeting that if the action outlined in that letter had not as yet been taken, it certainly would be within a short time; that he, Mr. Bénard, had seen Archbishop Langevin, who had not rebuked him for signing that letter. But I did not take any stock in the statement made by that member who mumbled rather than spoke out that evening. However, before long the trickery of these three members was discovered, and the people are posted now as to the reliability of statements emanating from them.

Let us read together the editorial which appeared in Les Cloches de St.-Boniface, the organ of His Grace Archbishop Langevin, on the date of October 10, 1912, while the contest was going on in Macdonald.

We see by that editorial that the statement signed by Messrs. Joseph Bernier, Aimé Bénard and Albert Préfontaine was false from beginning to end, and deliberately planned to deceive the electors of Quebec as to the state of the school question in Manitoba. But let us see what Les Cloches has to say:

The Winnipeg and Brandon Schools.

Nothing as yet has been done to improve the conditions of Catholic schools in Winnipeg and Brandon. We are content with mentioning the fact and abstain from making any comment, as the public are awaiting explanations which are to be given by the Hon. Mr. Coldwell, Minister of Public Instruction, in connection with the recent amendments to the school boards of those two cities.

The Catholic Federation committee has been very active and very cautious at the same time. They are in no way responsible for the present state of things.

It has been figured out that Winnipeg Catholics will pay this year at least $80,000 of school taxes for public schools to which conscientiously they cannot send their children. Besides these same Catholics are bound to pay for the maintenance in each parish of a Catholic school, and at Ste. Marie and L'Im-

maculée Conception, that condition of things has lasted twenty-two years. One may judge thereby of the extent of the injustice done by the Protestant majority.

On the other hand, were the public school board to take up our schools, that is 'to rent' our school houses—we have never thought, and will never think of 'transferring' them—and paid the salaries to our certificated teachers of both sexes, that would be of great material help to us, but we would lose greatly as regards religious liberty and the fixing of the curriculum.

We make bold to point out that the new curriculum for candidates to bi-lingual school diplomas shows an intention of putting difficulties in our way. The Government is at times badly served by too much zeal and eagerness on the part of certain people. We are all anxious that English grammar and literature should be taken up, but we need a freer hand in regard to some other matters.

And that is how the delegates from the province of Quebec mentioned in the above circular were fooled and then became the accomplices in that gross misrepresentation! That is how a false document was circulated in the hope of influencing the people of the province of Quebec at the last provincial elections!

Mr. LAMARCHE: I wish to state before this House, Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Ask a question.

Mr. LAMARCHE: I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Boyer) if he is ready to state before this House that I have received, as he had stated, a document such as he has read before the House a few minutes ago?

Mr. BOYER: (Translation.) I do not say that the hon. member for Nicolet took back that letter, but I find his name printed in the document. If he did not take that letter along with him, I am glad of it. But may I ask him whether he had it distributed throughout his constituency?

Mr. LAMARCHE: I will answer my hon. friend's question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order. Speak in French.

Mr. LAMARCHE: I would prefer to put my answer in English, because it is more important that I should do so as I want my hon. friends from the other provinces who are more interested in this question than perhaps my friends from the province of Quebec who also understand the English language, to hear my statement. I will say that not only have I not authorized the distribution of such a paper in my county, but the moment I saw such a paper was printed I absolutely prohibited its distribution in my riding.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYER: (Translation.) I am glad to hear that statement from the lips of the hon. member for Nicolet. It shows at least that the hon. member was aware of the falsity of the document, and realized that it should not be distributed in his constituency. But, if that document was of such a nature that he could not make use of it, his colleagues were not entitled to make use of it any more than he was himself. However, they did not have such scruples.

I hope this House will pardon me for claiming its attention so long. I deemed it my duty to fully expose the moral tone of the Conservative politicians in the province of Manitoba, and to show how that election had been won.

If ever I return to that province, I will go accompanied by Conservatives of the province of Quebec. They may be troublesome at times, but at any rate their western colleagues might take lessons from them as regards good manners.

Mr. BARNARD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Hon. L. P. Pelletier, House adjourned at 9.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, November 27, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Roche.

Report of the Department of Justice in relation to Penitentiaries for the same year.—Mr. Doherty.

Return of the Twelfth General Election to the House of Commons of Canada.—Mr. Speaker.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. SAMUEL S. SHARPE (North Ontario) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 6, to amend the Companies Act. He said: The object of this Bill is similar to that of a Bill I introduced in this House two years ago. That Bill received its first and second readings, and was referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce. That Committee referred it to a sub-committee composed of seven or eight members, which sub-committee considered it for several days and whipped it into shape. But by reason of the pressure of business at that

time the Bill was not proceeded with further. I bring it forward now practically in the shape in which it left the hands of the sub-committee. It provides that companies organized by letters patent or by private Act of the Dominion Parliament shall hold annual meetings, make annual statements and have annual audits of their accounts. Under the Dominion Companies Act at present this is not provided for. In most of the provinces companies are required to make annual statements of their affairs. The present Bill provides that companies chartered under Dominion jurisdiction shall make annual statements to the Government regarding shareholders, directors and officials, paid-up stock, assets and liabilities—generally that the information required under the Ontario Companies Act shall be filed with the Secretary of State for the benefit of creditors and others desiring such information. There are minor provisions, but these are the main ones. I trust the Bill will receive the sympathetic consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill rear the first time.

PRIVILEGE—MR. CURRIE.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. JOHN A CURRIE (Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I desire to address the House on a matter of privilege. My attention has been called to an article that appeared in the Toronto Globe of the day before yesterday:

A Question for Mr. White.

Now that Parliament is in session The Globe desires once more to direct the attention of the Minister of Finance to a letter published by John A. McCrae, secretary-treasurer of the Sarnia Fence Company, respecting certain negotiations between himself and Major Currie, M.P. for North Simcoe. Mr. McCrae charges that Major Currie, as an inducement or a threat to influence his company to look favourably upon a proposal to join a merger of wire fence manufacturers, said 'he had inside information that before the end of the present year the Government was going to take wire for fencing off the free list.' When Major Currie, in reply to this charge, said that he was not a member of the Government, and therefore it would not be possible for him to have any such inside information, Mr. McCrae replied as follows:—

'The official list shows Major J. A. Currie as Conservative member in the Dominion House for North Simcoe. Apparently the Major is endeavouring to draw the line very closely by inferring that no member of Parliament is a member of the Government unless he is a Cabinet minister, and we, not being politicians, did not recognize this fine distinction. The Major, however, endeavoured to strike terror to our hearts by stating that before the end of the present year the Government would take wire for farm fencing off the free list, and place a duty on it, which would result in the steel interests getting control of the wire market, and in that event our life would be very short, and we had better accept his offer to take us into the merger. That he made these statements he makes no attempt to deny. In support of our statement we refer you to the Toronto papers of July 13, which referred to the merger being formed. The Imperial Steel and Wire Company of Collingwood is the company whom Major Currie represented when he made the statements to us. There is no question but that earnest efforts have been made to complete this merger. How successful they will be depends largely on the concerted action of the farmers in opposing, through their members, any change in the free entry of wire for fence purposes.'

The Minister of Finance cannot afford to ignore such specific statements. At the earliest possible moment he ought to assure the House of Commons that neither Major Currie nor any other member of Parliament has received 'inside information' as to coming tariff changes. There is no way in which a tainted fortune can be more quickly or more surely made than by the taking advantage of fore knowledge of tariff changes. The Globe does not believe that Mr. White, by any act or statement of his, gave warrant for Major Currie's alleged possession of 'inside information.' The Minister of Finance is an honourable man. But he owes it to himself and to the House to deny explicitly the ugly inferences that will be read into the fence wire incident if no public statement is forthcoming.

I crave the indulgence of the House in making a lengthy explanation. Last summer, I was in the town of Sarnia on business, and took occasion to call upon the Sarnia Fence Company. I met the manager, Mr. McCrae, and another gentleman who was his partner, or secretary in his private office. Now, the company of which I am president, the Imperial Steel and Wire Company, Limited, of Collingwood, do not manufacture farm fencing, nor wire for the same, and I am not interested in wire for farm fencing in any way. We discussed business generally, and the question of a duty on wire and farm fencing was referred to. Within a few months three large Canadian corporations—the Dominion Steel Company, of Sidney; the Canada Steel Company, of Hamilton; and the Frost Fence Company, of Hamilton—had each commenced the manufacture of galvanized wire for farm fencing, also woven wire fencing. Galvanized wire for fencing is on the free list. A strange thing happened just as soon as this wire was made in Canada. The American manufacturers cut their price from $2.20 and $2.25 per cwt., the price that prevailed for many years, to $1.60 per cwt. They did this to put the Canadian companies out of business, not to benefit the farmers. That is why fencing is so cheap this year. I stated that, unless some of these small firms manufacturing woven wire fencing got together and made their own wire, they would

be driven out of business by the fierce competition which I understand they all experienced during the past season. I stated that last year the Canadian steel companies had considered asking the Government to put a duty on galvanized fence wire, but they had only asked for a duty on pig iron, and that, no doubt, from private information which had been given to me, they would make the request at the coming session of Parliament. This information came not from the Government or any member of it, but from a banker who is in close touch with these companies.

The company of which I am president is the largest independent wire company in Canada. We are parts of no merger or combine. We have always stood for free competition. We manufacture over 50 tons of wire daily, and employ over 200 skilled workmen. For instance, the wire for toilet pins, the wire that is used to bind books, and the wire that goes into the spring mattress is no longer imported exclusively from Great Britain or the United States, but a considerable portion is made by our company, by Canadian workmen.

The Sarnia Fence Company buys about three tons per day of finished galvanized wire of the poorest quality and cheapest grade made in the United States, brings it into Canada, puts it through cheap looms run by a few boys. This will give hon. gentlemen some idea of the relative magnitude of the two companies, and their value to the industrial life of this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is rather exceeding the bounds of relevance. The rule is to state the case and confine himself to a denial or explanation, without going into any argument.

Mr. CURRIE: I am very sorry to trespass upon the time of the House, but the Globe and other Grit newspapers throughout the country have made an attack upon me, and I can see no other way of putting myself right in the eyes of the public than by making a full explanation.

Not very long after I had been to Sarnia, the famous green circular was issued by Mr. McCrae, of the Sarnia Fence Company. It was then that I found out he had been in the habit of issuing circulars about his competitors and using them for advertising purposes, as he used me. It was an old story with him. Of course, being a public man, he made free use of my name, and violently garbled what I said. I was in a helpless position. If I denied what he said, I knew that any one so unscrupulous as to issue circulars such as he had issued on former occasions against his competitors, as well as myself, would not halt at anything. He had his secretary with him when I called, while I was alone. I neither affirmed nor denied his statements, preferring to give him enough rope, and his lies would, ultimately, hang him. They did. He saw his chance to get some free advertising out of the Grain Growers' Guide, which, by the way, is the great organ of the American manufacturers in Canada—a journal that is prepared to go any length in misrepresenting any Canadian who desires to see his country prosper.

In the letter published in the Grain Growers Guide, Mr. McCrae gave his whole case away. In his first letter, which was prepared with some skill, he said, speaking of myself:

> He further stated that in his position as a member of Parliament he had inside information to the effect that before the end of the present year, the Government was going to take wire for farm fencing off the free list, and put a duty on it, which would give the merger an opportunity to increase their profits on the manufacture of fence, and he by completing this merger would be able to take advantage of it.
>
> Now, we are not in position to say whether Major J. A. Currie has the confidence of the Government or not, but he seems to think he has, and if he or any other parties could induce the Government to put duty on the now free sizes of wire, for fence purposes, the result would be the same, you would have to pay the shot. The same day this change in duty takes place, the price of fence must be advanced. Do you think it is fair that every farmer in Canada should be specially taxed, that Major J. A. Currie and his colleagues may wax and at your expense?

This was what he said in the Grain Growers Guide. Please note the difference:

> According to the statement of Major Currie, member of Parliament in the Dominion Parliament for North Simcoe, made to the Sarnia Fence Company, that he, as a member of the Government, had inside information to the effect that before the end of the present year the Government was going to take wire for farm fences off the free list.

You will observe in the first place he stated that I was a member of Parliament, and in the second place he has the hardihood to say I was a member of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE: I am not like some hon. gentlemen opposite, who for many years sat on the Cabinet steps and knocked at the door, but did not get in. I have never knocked nor asked my chief for any favour for myself, personally. In answer to the letter appearing in the Grain Growers' Guide, I stated as follows:

> In the first place everybody knows I am not a member of the Government as stated by your correspondent, consequently I could not

have inside information as to what may be the intention of the Government, and even if I had I would not be fool enough to hand it around promiscuously.

Might it not occur to you in all fairness that your correspondent was trying to get some cheap advertising for his fence, at the expense of your paper, other people and the truth?

Now, Sir, I have no desire to continue at any further length upon this matter, except to say a few words in connection with this company of Mr. McCrae's, to show the injustice of his attack upon me. Mr. McCrae, who claims to be the great benefactor of the farmer, started the business first in Port Huron, and did not prosper very well there; so he opened a branch at Sarnia, moving some of his hands and machinery over to Canada. That was a very laudable thing. If a man wants to fabricate wire fencing for Canada the place to do it is in Canada. Now, I do not notice that he asks the Government to take the duty off this woven fencing which he makes.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is entirely exceeding his privilege under the rules by which we are governed, and I hope he will confine himself to the question under discussion.

Mr. CURRIE: I quite realize your desire, Mr. Speaker, to see that everybody is justly dealt with in this House. I also notice that hon. members opposite are endeavouring in every possible way to stifle my explanation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. CURRIE: I have never yet heard any hon. member speaking on a matter of privilege interrupted in such a manner in this House before. I am endeavouring to show how impossible it was for me to do everything that Mr. McCrae said I was going to do. One would think from his letters, and the article in the Guide, that I was engaged in trying to put a duty on the fence which he sells to the Canadian farmers, and that, if there is a duty put on the wire, the price of fencing will go up. As a matter of fact, Mr. McCrae buys his wire in the States and brings it into Canada free of duty. Just the minute, however, he weaves it, by a very simple process, into fencing, he receives a protection of 15 per cent against American fencing. If a duty of say 10 per cent were put on his wire and the duty on woven fence remained at 15 per cent how would that affect the price of woven wire fences? If the price was raised more than 15 per cent could not wire fence be imported? There is no barbed wire now made in Canada, but the price is higher than it was when there was a duty. The same is true of coal oil and binder twine. In none of his letters does Mr. McCrae mention that he is getting 15 per cent protection, and I do not notice that he accuses me of wanting to have that 15 per cent protection which he now enjoys removed. The only trouble with him is that he is like most other Grit manufacturers: they want all the duty themselves; they do not want to divide it with the Canadian workingmen. Now, Sir, I did not use my position as a member in speaking to Mr. McCrae, nor did I, as a member of Parliament, seek to terrorize him to go into anything or to go into any combine. No combine has been formed, no inducement was offered me by him to go into any combine, and I did not, by word of mouth or inference, lead him to believe that the Minister of Finance or any member of the Government had given me any information as to whether or not a duty was to be placed on wire. I did not ask any member of this Government to place a duty on wire fencing, and I have had no communication with them whatever on the subject—and, what is more, it will be time enough for the Toronto Globe to commence reading a moral lecture to me when it pays up the $25,000 which it has owed this Government for postage since the last election.

PETERBOROUGH LIFT-LOCK—CLAIM FOR EXTRAS.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, with the indulgence of the House I would ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) whether it is true, as I am credibly informed, that the large claim for extras arising out of the contract at the lift-lock at Peterborough is about to be paid to Messrs. Corry & Laverdure, contractors of Ottawa. This claim had been referred under the late Government to Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, who had refused to acknowledge the validity of the claim, and I am now informed that this claim is to be paid. If the claim is to be paid, will it be placed in the estimates in the regular way or will it be paid out of a general fund in the Department of Railways and Canals?

Hon. F. COCHRANE: No decision has been arrived at as to whether it will be paid or not. The matter has had a little attention from me, but I have not come to any conclusion on it. If it was to be paid of course the amount would have to be voted in the House.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—RUNNING RIGHTS.

Hon. H. R EMMERSON: I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Cochrane) for information with reference to an item which is being published in the eastern papers in regard to the granting of running rights to the Canadian Pacific railway over the Intercolonial railway, and also with regard to the extension of privileges to certain express companies. The item reads as follows:

It is reported on apparently good authority that after the New Year the Canadian Pacific railway will have running rights over the Intercolonial and the Dominion Express Company will invade eastern Nova Scotia, Cape Breton, Prince Edward Island and the north shore of New Brunswick.

Have any arrangements been entered into with the Canadian Pacific railway with respect to running rights to commence on January 1st next, or at any other time, and have any further privileges been granted, or are they proposed to be granted, to the Dominion Express Company on the Intercolonial railway than those which they now have? If so, has there been given in return by the Canadian Pacific railway, which has control of the Dominion Express Company, like privileges over its railway to the other express companies in the Maritime provinces and in Western Canada?

Mr. SPEAKER : This is one of the class of questions of which notice should be given on the Order Paper. It comes thoroughly under the regular rules for that purpose.

Mr. EMMERSON: This is a matter of very great interest to the people of the Maritime Provinces. If I gave notice on the Order Paper, it could not possibly be answered for some days, and I was asking the indulgence of the Minister ; otherwise I would certainly have given notice. Perhaps the Minister could set the question at rest at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SPEAKER : The item says that the arrangement is not to become effective until January 1st ; therefore it did not seem to me to be so very urgent as to necessitate an immediate answer.

Mr. COCHRANE: No arrangement has been entered into as yet about running rights. As to the Express Company, yes. The Dominion Express Company has the same agreement as the Grand Trunk railway had with the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. EMMERSON : Would the Minister answer that part of the question as to whether the Canadian Pacific railway are to grant similar privileges on their railway to other express companies in the Maritime provinces?

Mr. COCHRANE : I answered that fully in saying they had exactly the same agreement that the Grand Trunk railway had.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER : That is no answer at all.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—FREE TRANSPORTATION OF HAY.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Would the Minister of Railways and Canals state if any decision has been reached on the application made by certain farmers in the eastern part of Nova Scotia for the free transportation of hay over the Intercolonial railway ?

Mr. SPEAKER : I think this is another of the questions that should be on the Order Paper.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN: It is on the Order Paper.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): It is a matter of urgency.

Mr. SPEAKER : If it is on the Order Paper it cannot be asked now. There is a rule which says a member cannot anticipate before the proper time what is on the Order Paper.

THE STRIKING COMMITTEE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER : When is it intended to call the special committee appointed to strike the Standing Committees?

Mr. BORDEN : In the past it has not been the custom to call that committee together until after the Address has been passed. That is the answer which my right hon. friend gave to me on one occasion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER : Yes.

Mr. BORDEN . If there is no practice or rule against it, I have no personal objection to calling that committee together at once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER : That is very true. I took that ground in years past. I understood my friend to take a different ground, but I feel very much pleased that my friend on this occasion follows the practice of the late Government.

Mr. BORDEN As long as we confine our tendency to follow their example to such small matters as that, I am sure we shall go on very well.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER : Small and great.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Rainville, for an address

to His Royal Highness, the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B. C.): Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to intervene in this debate had it not been for some words which fell from the lips of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition in the course of his remark on Monday. Before dealing with those particular remarks. I wish to say that I am sure it is a source of gratification to every member of this House, irrespective of party, to hear that the prosperity of the country is so great. So far as the constituency which I have the honour to represent, is concerned, never in its history has it been as prosperous, and all indications are that this prosperity will continue and constantly increase. The post office returns and the customs returns are increasing at an unprecedented rate. The bank clearings are also increasing tremendously; the tonnage of the ocean-going and coasting trade is increasing to such an extent that the docks and harbours of the Pacific coast province are in danger of being seriously overtaxed. In view of the coming completion of the Panama canal, scarcely a week passes that we do not see representatives of the great European shipping companies spying out the land, and making arrangements for carrying on their trade as soon as the canal is opened; and I am glad to say that the present Government has shown its appreciation of the importance of the harbours upon that coast, and a disposition to assist in the necessary development of the ports of the province.

Coming as I do from the province of British Columbia, I need scarcely say that it was with great pleasure that I heard the reference in the Speech from the Throne to the question of naval defence. I do not propose to-day to go into that question, because I hope to have an early opportunity to try and put before the members of this House the views of my constituents upon it. But I can assure the right hon. Leader of the Government that, so far as the people of the province of British Columbia are concerned, he need have no fear of erring on the side of generosity. He cannot do too much to please the people of the Pacific province. With regard to the land defences of that province, I am sorry to say that matters are not in a satisfactory condition. The land defences of the province have not, for some years past, received the attention they should have received at the hands of the different governments in power at Ottawa. Since the Imperial troops were taken away from Esquimalt, and since this Government undertook to control the land defences the forces have been reduced from 500 or 600, under the Imperial authorities, to barely 100. Now, I am perfectly willing to admit that a Canadian soldier is just as good as, and probably a little bit better than an English soldier, but it is stretching my admiration a little too far to suggest that the proportion is one to five. Esquimalt, where the fortifications are, lies within two or three miles of the capital city of British Columbia. In that city are stored public documents of untold value. Esquimalt is fortified. I have always been under the impression that it is a rule of international law that a fortified city may be bombarded by a foreign force, but that it is contrary to the usages of international law to bombard an unfortified city. If that be so, the capital city of British Columbia, which is my constituency, labours under the disadvantage of having just enough fortifications to be called a defended and fortified place, and yet it has not the means whereby to defend itself. For these reasons, I would submit to the Minister of Militia that his fortifications are a menace rather than a protection, and I would ask him to lose no time in strengthening the land defences at that point.

I wish to deal, just for a moment, with the statements made by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, with reference to an occurrence during the by-election in the county of Richelieu a few weeks ago. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition, in somewhat melodramatic language, accused the Minister of Public Works of having endeavoured to bribe the constituency by a promise of certain public works. I assume that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition was quarrelling more with the words in which the promise was made, than with the substance of the promise, or its effect; and I am inclined to think, judging from some remarks made by that right hon. gentleman at previous elections in this country, that if my friend the Minister of Public Works had couched his promise in scriptural language, the leader of the Opposition might have found less objection to it. For I find, in the Canadian Annual Review for 1911, at page 163, an account by Mr. Castell Hopkins of the recent general election, and the following reference to a speech made by the late Prime Minister at Ste. Julienne in the province of Quebec:

> The speech was notable for one of the Premier's Scriptural references: the Liberal Government is like the Kingdom of Heaven, 'Ask and you will receive.' When St. Donat asked for a railway extension from Rawdon, I say, 'ask and you will receive.' This railway should be constructed to put Montreal in communication with the Transcontinental.

So that it would appear that if my friend the Minister of Public Works had promised his marine railway in the language of Scripture, in all probability the leader of the Opposition would have made little objection. I must say that upon hearing the remarks and the tones—I was almost going to say the anguish, but I shall say the tones of indignation—in which he condemned the Minister of Public Works for promising a marine railway at Richelieu, I could hardly believe my ears. I could hardly think it was the leader of the Liberal party who was so righteously indignant in a matter of this kind. The hon. the leader of the Opposition charged bribery, or an attempt to bribe the constituency, and claimed that his candidate had not received fair play. He arraigned the Minister of Public Works in the following words:

I charge the Minister of Public Works, and arraign him before Parliament, with having tried to bribe the electors of Richelieu.

Well, I am only a humble member of this House, and a follower of the leader of the Government. I do not know just what effect an arraignment of that kind has, but if it is a very terrible thing, I just wish to say, in his own language, I arraign the right hon. the leader of the Opposition before Parliament with having in a general election in 1911 tried to bribe the electors of the city of Victoria. He proceeds:

I call as witness a member of this House, the hon. member for Charlevoix.

Well, I call as a witness a member of this House, the hon. member for St. John, the Minister of Public Works in the late Administration. I also call as a witness the Hon. Mr. Templeman, now, alas! no longer a member of this House. He cites in support of his contention a quotation from La Patrie, which he says is a Government paper. I quote, in support of my arraignment, the Victoria Daily Times, the personal organ of the Hon. Mr. Templeman, and the Liberal organ in the city of Victoria. What were the facts? Just before the general election of 1911, as a matter of fact on nomination day, the 14th of September, 1911, there appeared in the Victoria Daily Times, the newspaper of the Hon. William Templeman, candidate for the Liberal party in Victoria, the following telegram:

Victoria, B.C., Sept. 9, 1911.
Hon. W. Pugsley, St. John, N.B.

I propose issuing an address to the electors in which I will state that the Government will make Victoria a port of first class by building breakwaters and deepening outer and inner harbours to adequate depth to accommodate all shipping. The cost, on Keefer's estimates, will be about $2,000,000 for breakwaters, and about $1,000,000 for deepening harbour, annual expenditure to be about $500,000. These proposed works have been approved of for years, and the harbour work that has been carried out for the last eight years has been with the definite object of securing the results contemplated in above project. At the present rate of progress it will take twenty or thirty years to do what should be done in at the most three or four years. The opening of the Panama Canal three years hence makes this work a national necessity. I will be pleased to have your approval of above.

WM. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I am glad to know the work is going on now.

Mr. BARNARD: It ought to have been done several years before. But it is somewhat peculiar that it was not until nomination day that its urgency occurred to the Hon. Mr. Templeman. In reply the following telegram was received from the Hon. William Pugsley, then Minister of Public Works:

Montreal, Que., Sept. 10, 1911.
Hon. Wm. Templeman, Victoria, B.C.

Your telegram of the 9th inst. re harbour improvements Victoria received. When I was in your city——

By the way that was two years before this telegram was written:

When I was in your city I looked thoroughly into the situation and was impressed with the urgent necessity of the improvements now recommended by you, and will heartily endorse your proposals as contained in said telegram.

WILLIAM PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BARNARD: Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is there anywhere in that telegram the statement made that the carrying on of the public improvements in Victoria was conditional on the electors supporting the Government?

Mr. BARNARD: No, but we have the facts before us, and it is very easy to deduce a meaning from them. We have the fact that this telegram was published on nomination day, we have the fact that the Hon. Mr. Templeman announced to the Hon. Mr. Pugsley one week before the election, that he proposed issuing an address to the electors and asking that these works be carried on. I do not know whether the Hon. Mr. Templeman had some experience which he did not like as regards the promises of the then Minister of Public Works but apparently there was some dissatisfaction in his mind. At any rate Mr. Templeman may not have been quite satisfied with this endorsement of the then Minister of Public Works, possibly the then

Minister of Public Works had the idea that his promises would not be quite satisfactory to the electors of the city of Victoria, or possibly the Hon. Mr. Pugsley and the Hon. Mr. Templeman combined thought that the promise of the Minister of Public Works was not calculated to carry great weight with the electors. At any rate, on the 12th of September two days after this, another telegram was sent by Hon. Mr. Pugsley, reading as follows:

St. John, N.B., Sept. 12, 1911.

W. Templeman, Victoria, B.C.

My wire was sent after I had seen Sir Wilfrid.

W. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear—a statement of the policy of the Government. That is entirely different from the Richelieu affair.

Mr. BARNARD: So much for the consistency of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, and his sincerity in attacking the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) with regard to this Richelieu election. Apparently it is a highly meritorious thing for the Liberal government to promise a public work just before an election, but it is a political crime of the worst kind if a Conservative government should make a like promise. According to the ethics of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, when a Conservative does such a thing it is bribery, but when done by a Liberal it is simply good policy. These gentlemen opposite say when a Conservative makes a promise of that kind, that it is trying to steal the elections, but when exactly the same thing is done by a Liberal government they think it is good ball and the fairest kind of play. Now, Mr. Speaker, if, as is alleged by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, constituencies in Canada have been debauched, then I say that the blame does not lie at the doors of the Conservative party. We have not to go back very far to find instances of glaring impropriety perpetrated by the Liberal party and without going into details there naturally flashes across one's mind the Newmarket canal and the sawdust wharf. Do hon. gentlemen opposite say that these transactions were good public policy? I have not much use for the tu quoque argument, and I am absolutely opposed to anything savouring of debauching the constituencies, but I do say that if in the course of his peregrinations around this vale of tears the devil occasionally finds he is fought by fire, complaint does not lie in the mouth of His Satanic Majesty.

Mr. THOMAS MACNUTT (Saltcoats): Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak at some length with reference to the charges that have been made and scattered broadcast throughout Canada to the effect that the Saskatchewan provincial elections were won by corruption; but you have ruled that as the question is not before the House, it is out of order for an hon. member to deal with it. I may, however, be allowed to state, having been on the ground and knowing something about it, that the Saskatchewan elections were won by the votes of the British electorate of that province, and won upon two grounds chiefly: first the recognition of the merits of the Scott government, and second, that the electors generally preferred to have a provincial administration which was friendly to a wider market and a lower tariff rather than one that was unfriendly to these policies, which are so strongly supported by the people of my province. Mr. Haultain, who as usual, takes his defeat like a man, has borne testimony to this. He stated after the elections that he thought this time he had a good chance to win, but that he found the feeling for reciprocity so much stronger than he expected that he could not succeed. However, I cannot go very far along these lines, as I understand your ruling.

I wish now to defend the fair name of a friend of mine who has been maligned and sent to jail; that is, Mr. J. J. Sullivan. It is sometimes an honour to go to jail. The suffragettes in the old country think so, claiming that they have a good cause. I think myself that Mr. Sullivan went to jail in a good cause. No charge was found against him, and he was practically deported from Manitoba. Manitoba evidently does not think that all should work together, and if anybody comes there whom the government does not like, they simply take them to the boundary and put them across. I think it would be a good plan, if this line of action is continued, that the Dominion Government should set aside a portion of Northern Manitoba where the present government of Manitoba could have a second Siberia to send their political prisoners to.

I was invited by the executive committee at Winnipeg, consisting of Mr. Edward Brown, not long ago the leader of the Liberal party of Manitoba; Mr. Fowler, a very prominent and highly respected citizen of Winnipeg, and Mr. E. D. Martin, who is in the same category, and perhaps better known here as a brother of a late member of this House from the city of Winnipeg. These three gentlemen formed what was called the Richardson committee. It has been stated that these outsiders from Saskatchewan forced themselves upon the people of Macdonald. I do not think that any of the few who were there, were there other than by the express invitation of this committee. I was asked to spend some time there, but I could not put in more than one week. I was

very glad to be able to do so, because Mr. Richardson was standing for what I believe is right, that is, for better markets for the farmers, for the development of the West, and for a lower tariff. The week prior to the election I was not able to be present. I reached Winnipeg on Monday morning, the 30th of September, and I was asked by this committe to go to Carman and assist the committee there, which had nine polls to look after. I accordingly went to Carman, which was the home town of Sir Rodmond Roblin, and the centre of his district. I think I showed some courage in going to Sir Rodmond Roblin's headquarters. A few days afterwards somewhat to my surprise I saw Mr. J. J. Sullivan. He said he had come there at the invitation of the same committee. I did not see very much of him, as I was addressing meetings in one direction, while he was doing the same thing in another. On Saturday evening I took the train home. Mr. Sullivan wished to spend Sunday in Winnipeg, and he was on the same train with me. I did not see him after that. I found out, however, that he had been arrested when he returned to Carman, on a general charge of fraudulently inducing electors to vote for R. L. Richardson. I have known Mr. Sullivan for some years. He has taken a very active interest in Liberal politics; so much so that in my own district he was appointed county president of the Liberal Association. As he was what we call an election oragnizer, I was very glad myself to secure his services a year ago. Very few members of this House will claim that they can do without some organization with somebody in charge. Mr. Sullivan acted for a few weeks as organizer in the district of Saltcoats, and I have never heard that he did anything that was not perfectly correct and proper.

On Friday of that week Sir Rodmond Roblin came to Carman. Mr. Sullivan and I were both there at the time. I was across at the committee room on the other side of the street, and heard a great deal of noise. I found out later on that it was Sir Rodmond Roblin who had discovered our names in the register, and he was holding forth at the top of his voice. He went to Winnipeg that night and gave out an interview. I may be repeating some quotations that have already been made in the House, but do not think that this one was:

> I want to make this further statement, not only to the electors of Macdonald, but also to the people of Manitoba, that in my 31 years of public life I never saw a constituency invaded or infested with such a gang of boodlers and political thieves and thugs as are now wandering around that constituency. . . The gang is from the province of Saskatchewan.

Our late Minister of the Interior fortunately is not from that province, and therefore cannot be included in this.

That province has sent down apparently the whole boodling and bribing brigade of political thugs who appear to have been making Saskatchewan their home.

Members of the Saskatchewan legislature are there. Men who cannot put half a dozen sentences together grammatically, nor have any accomplishments that might give dignity or grace to a threshing gang, are swarming in the constituency and organizing or endeavouring to organize to debauch and bedevil, as far as they can, the honest, intelligent electors of Macdonald. Carman seems to be the centre. The leader apparently is, as far as I can gather, a fellow who is known by the name of Sullen, presumably an alias. . ..

I have instructed the provincial police to arrest these men, and they will be placed in jail at the earliest possible moment when they attempt to do the work they have been sent there to do, and I want to say that because a man is an M.P.P. or an ex-M.P.P. in Saskatchewan or of anywhere else, it will not prevent justice being done.

I was fortunate enough to escape arrest, for, though not an M.P.P., I was present. Mr. Sullivan was arrested on the following Monday. In the interview which I have just quoted, Sir Rodmond Roblin speaks of 'hordes' of election workers. I have always understood that 'hordes' meant a large number. But the only parties from Saskatchewan who were engaged during that week in working on behalf of Mr. Richardson were Mr. Sullivan and myself. So, we are the 'hordes' that Sir Rodmond Roblin speaks of. And three out of four of the men who were arrested were Manitoba people, Mr. Sullivan being the only one from Saskatchewan who was arrested, and he was arrested in a good cause. On Saturday night I was interviewed by a representative of the press and I will take the liberty of reading that interview :

> Thos. MacNutt, M.P. for Saltcoats, who passed through the city on Saturday night, en route home after a week spent in the neighbourhood of Carman in the interests of the Independent candidate, spoke with heat at the Royal Alexandra about an interview given out by Sir Rodmond Roblin in which the premier spoke of 'gangs of thugs and thieves' who had come into the riding from Saskatchewan and were operating among the threshing gangs. Sir Rodmond threatened in the interview to arrest various parties even though they might be M.P.'s and M.P.P.'s.
>
> As I have spent a few days in the vicinity of Carman,' said Mr. MacNutt, 'and have spoken at several meetings largely attended by 'threshing gangs' and as I have also visited various threshing gangs in the course of my work I am probably regarded by Sir Rodmond as one of the 'horde.'
>
> 'I am in a position,' he continued, 'to say as the result of actual experience that the feeling is decidedly in favour of the Independent candidate who stands for what the farmers want and require. Many Conservatives who at the general elections favoured their own party's general record but were also favourable to reciprocity now that their

party is safe, will seek to send a message to their own party by the election of Mr. Richardson, that they desire larger markets and lower tariff through R. L. Richardson. Those who opposed their former party last fall will do so again, and the Liberals are all in line.'

'Saskatchewan, as a matter of fact,' continued Mr. MacNutt, 'is as much interested in the result of this by-election as the electors of Macdonald themselves, including the 'threshing gangs,' and have at least as much right to assist at this Dominion election as the Hon. Robert Rogers and his notorious political machine on a late occasion in Saskatchewan.

'The services of the police may be required, but not along the lines indicated in the interview. I am of the opinion that less than 25 per cent of the electors who compose the 'threshing gangs' (otherwise the farmers) will support the 'big interests' candidate. If the Conservatives win it will be by means of the vote of the purchasable element.'

And I am of opinion that it was by that means they won. I apologize for drawing attention to my own remarks; I do it only because I have been publicly referred to in this connection. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) made a quotation having reference to myself, but there was a little more of it, and that I will take the liberty of reading. This is part of a speech of the late hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers), as reported in the press:

Sir Rodmond Roblin had dealt with the outsiders who had forced the campaign in Macdonald, and in doing so he could not find in the English language words strong enough to characterize the records of these individuals. Foremost in the fight against the Government candidate were representatives of the government of Saskatchewan. It was true, if reports were to be relied upon, that these representatives would be reinforced by the government of Alberta. They were being supported by Mr. Oliver, Dr. Michael Clark, by politicians from the province of Quebec, by Mr. Martin, Mr. Knowles, and Mr. MacNutt, Liberal M.P.'s from Saskatchewan. An individual in the rear of the hall applauded the mention of Mr. MacNutt, and Hon. Mr. Rogers undertook to impart some information as to what that member of the House of Commons was doing in the campaign. Before doing so he referred to a reply of Sir Rodmond Roblin, which appeared yesterday——by Hon. J. A. Calder, of the Scott Government. Mr. Calder was reported as giving out an interview in Regina yesterday. 'But let me tell you,' said Hon. Mr. Rogers, 'that Hon. J. A. Calder has been in the Liberal executive headquarters in Winnipeg all day to-day, assisting Mr. Richardson. Mr. Calder undertakes to make reply to Premier Roblin. He ventures to deny that there are any thugs or political manipulators from Saskatchewan in this constituency at the present time. As far as that is concerned, let me say to you that when Mr. Calder makes that statement he says what is deliberately false.

'I know we have nearly one hundred thugs from Saskatchewan scattered through this riding. They are in this very polling division, and we are watching them. One of the ringleaders of that gang, a special and personal friend of Mr. Calder, was arrested to-day in the town of Carman.

This is the Mr. Sullivan to whom I have already referred:

'In the press of Saturday Mr. MacNutt made the statement that Mr. Richardson was going to succeed. Mr. MacNutt evidently thought he was in Saskatchewan, because he knew he was surrounded by the thugs which Mr. Roblin had described. The thug arrested to-day came into the constituency with Mr. MacNutt. He went to Carman for a week, and registered as Sullivan. He spent his time there for a week, and then came into Winnipeg with Mr. MacNutt. Mr. Sullivan, of Carman, walked down to another hotel in Winnipeg and registered as Sutherland. He was at this hotel on Sunday, and had interviews with Grit election manipulators, and yesterday (Monday) morning, went to Carman again and registered as Sullivan, but the moment he started to operate he was nabbed and was now behind the bars. There are many others who will follow him.'

Mr. Sullivan was arrested and kept in jail for a few days. I have a declaration from him which I am going to read later on, which sets forth the particulars of that affair. But, strangely enough, although there were supposed to be so many political thugs from Saskatchewan, only one man from Saskatchewan was arrested, and they were glad enough to get him to leave without even giving him a trial. There is no disgrace in an arrest of that kind—many a patriot has suffered from such an arrest before now. I would like to read some comments with regard to that arrest. The North-west Review has this to say:

Either J. J. Sullivan is guilty of the charge incorporated in the warrant under which he was arrested or he is not. As our correspondent points out, if he is guilty he is not fit for membership in a religious organization whose proud boast is that its members are chosen from among the best element in the community—men whose honesty, integrity and Catholicity are above suspicion. If he is innocent of public wrong-doing it is not fair to him or to the organization to which he belongs that his character and reputation should be permitted to suffer. A public acknowledgment of his innocence is expected and awaited. The action of the local council, or certain members of the local council, in going to the assistance of a brother in trouble and effecting his release was a very practical illustration of the benefits of organization and should give a great impetus to the work. But the council of which Mr. Sullivan is a member cannot afford to let matters stand as at present.

There were certain accusations made regarding the hordes of political workers from the province of Saskatchewan—thugs and

thieves—who were present, but after all, the only one they could discover was Mr. Sullivan, and they were very glad to let him go. The gentlemen to whom I have previously referred—Messrs. Brown, Fowler and Martin—took this matter up, and wrote an open letter to Sir Rodmond Roblin as follows:

Sir—The attention of the executive committee, acting on behalf of Mr. Richardson's candidature in Macdonald, has been called to your recent repeated utterances to the effect that at the present time the constituency of Macdonald is swarming with a gang of election crooks and thugs, from the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Upon making the most careful enquiries we have every reason to believe that the only persons from those provinces who are taking part in the campaign, on Mr. Richardson's behalf, are: Hon. Frank Oliver, M.P.; Hon. Thos. MacNutt, M.P.; W. E. Knowles, M.P.; Dr. Clarke, M.P.; Hon. Geo. Langley, M.P.P.; Mr. Devlin, M.P.P.; Mr. S. Latta, M.P.P., and Mr. J. J. Sullivan.

On several occasions recently, and particularly in your telegram interview of the 5th instant, you call upon the Liberals of Manitoba to join you in an effort to safeguard the liberties of our citizens. In view of the facts cited above it appears to us that a very plain and important duty lies at your own door, namely, the production of the names of the imported political crooks which you allege are here from Saskatchewan and Alberta. If there are any such men in our midst we can assure you, as well as the electors of Macdonald, that they are not here with our knowledge, or consent, and you may rely on our committee joining you in an effort to rid the province of their presence.

Signed on behalf of committee.

EDWARD BROWN,
FRANK O. FOWLER,
E. D. MARTIN.

The day afterwards this same committee sent the following letter to the same paper, also addressed to Sir Rodmond Roblin, Premier of Manitoba:

Sir—Twenty-four hours have passed by and so far as we are aware you have only made public the names of two of the men whom you describe as crooks swarming into the constituency of Macdonald from our sister provinces to the West. Further careful inquiries on our part convince us that the list already furnished you by the undersigned comprise all the persons from Saskatchewan and Alberta who are aiding Mr. Richardson in his campaign. You furnish no evidence that one of the men mentioned is from Saskatchewan or Alberta, leaving the number of your hosts of crooks at one. You say you are prepared to give further information.

Under these circumstances our duty to the public demands that we should again call upon you to give evidence of the sweeping charges which you made.

Regarding Mr. J. J. Sullivan, we are reliably informed by a prominent priest of this city that he is a member of the Catholic church and that he is a man of excellent character. That there were no real grounds for his arrest is apparent from the fact that the only charges trumped against him was for unlawfully, by false and fraudulent pretenses, endeavouring to induce a voter to vote for one of the Macdonald candidates. The charge itself is preposterous and, besides, is not founded on fact, as will be proven in due course. In the meantime every legitimate effort to secure Mr. Sullivan's release on bail has been flatly refused by the officers under your control.

If, as premier of this province, you consider the ends of justice and British fair play are to be served by such tactics, we are prepared to leave the matter in the hands of the electors of the constituency of Macdonald.

Signed on behalf of Mr. Richardson's committee.

EDWARD BROWN.
FRANK O. FOWLER.
E. D. MARTIN.

Rev. A. Gerritsma, a priest well known and much respected in the West, made the following statement to which the committee refer regarding Mr. Sullivan:

'I have known Mr. Sullivan well for a number of years. When I was priest at Esterhazy he was the president of our church committee. It was due principally to his efforts that our Catholic church was built there.

'Mr. Sullivan is highly respected by the citizens of the place of all denominations. If my memory serves me correct, he was one of the councillors of the village.

'Mr. Sullivan is a man in whom I personally would trust everything. Needless to say I was much surprised to get a message that he was in the provincial jail. As soon as I heard he was incarcerated I went to see him. In speaking to him I became convinced that he has done nothing wrong. Consequently he is not worrying.

'If that's the only way the Conservatives can win the Macdonald election, by putting an innocent man in jail, then I've nothing more to say. It's disgusting—too ridiculous for expression.

'The facts of the case are clear. The man was arrested, having done nothing illegal. He was rushed off to prison, and until yesterday afternoon his counsel was denied access to him.

'I am certain, absolutely positive, there is nothing wrong in his case.'

That I think is stronger evidence than any that has been produced on the other side.

With reference to my visit to the constituency of Macdonald I have nothing to apologize for. I was invited there by this same committee but if, as a citizen of the West, I desire to go into any other province of my own accord and take some platform, I feel justified in doing so. There was not however, one man who went from Saskatchewan to that constituency without the invitation of the electors of Macdonald.

Indeed every one of us was very pleased to have an opportunity of doing something to strike a blow in favour of better markets for the produce of the people of Manitoba and the West.

I do not desire to take up too much time, but I wish to read a declaration made by Mr. Sullivan, which is as follows:

Canada,
Province of Manitoba,
To wit:

In the matter of the election of a member for the Electoral District of Macdonald to serve in the House of Commons.

I, John J. Sullivan, of Regina, in the province of Saskatchewan, clerk, do solemnly declare:—

1. At the request of the committee in Winnipeg in charge of the candidature of R. L. Richardson, the reciprocity candidate in the recent election held in the constituency of Macdonald, Manitoba, I came to Winnipeg on Tuesday, October 1st, and went to the offices of the committee, in the Chambers of Commerce building. There I met Mr. Fred Woodrow, secretary of the Liberal Association, and Mr. J. W. Wilton who had charge of Mr. Richardson's campaign. Mr. Wilton told me that they understood that I had considerable experience in organization work in election campaigns in Saskatchewan, and that they were desirous of enlisting my services for strengthening their organization work. He asked me if I would take charge of the north poll in Carman, and pointed out to me that although there were several willing workers there, they had so far been unable to systematize their organization, and he thought that I would be able to be of considerable assistance to them. He said that it would be my duty to organize the poll and to see that the work was efficiently carried on and that the full vote was got out. I said that I would be very glad to help. I went to Carman on Thursday, October 3, arriving there in the morning. I introduced myself to Mr. Roland North, to whom I was told to report. We went to the Richardson committee rooms where I met workers and had a general discussion as to what work had been done and the steps that should be taken to get our work in ship-shape. On the following day, October 4, Sir R. P. Roblin came to Carman. He returned to Winnipeg. In the issue of the Winnipeg Telegram published on October 5, appeared an interview with Sir R. P. Roblin, in which he is reported to have said as follows:—

I want to make this further statement, not only to the electors of Macdonald, but also to the people of Manitoba, that in my thirty-one years of public life I never saw a constituency invaded or infested with such a gang of boodlers and political thieves and thugs, as are now wandering around that constituency. . . The gang is from the province of Saskatchewan. That province has sent down apparently the whole boodling and bribing brigade of political thugs, who appear to have been making Saskatchewan their home.

It could not be a very big gang when there was only one arrested, and that one not on a specific charge, but a general charge—and they were very glad to get rid of him, to have him leave before coming to trial. There could not have been less than 100 detectives throughout that district, and this was the only man they could find to arrest.

Members of the Saskatchewan legislature are there. Men who cannot put half a dozen sentences together grammatically, nor have any accomplishments that might give dignity or grace to a threshing gang——

This is not very complimentary to the threshing gang who are the farmers of the community.

—are swarming in the constituency and organizing or endeavouring to organize to debauch and bedevil, as far as they can, the honest, intelligent electors of Macdonald. Carman seems to be the centre. The leader apparently is, as far as I can gather, a fellow who is known by the name of Sullen, presumably an alias. . .

I have instructed the provincial police to arrest these men, and they will be placed in jail at the earliest possible moment when they attempt to do the work they have been sent there to do, and I want to say that because a man is an M.P.P. or an ex-M.P.P. in Saskachewan or of anywhere else, it will not prevent justice being done.

2. I am informed and believe that I was the only worker from Saskatchewan in the said constituency of Macdonald in said election, exclusive of certain gentlemen from Saskatchewan who spoke on public platforms during said election, and among whom were the Hon. George Langley, the Hon. Thomas MacNutt, and R. E. Devlin, M.P.P. I deny that there were any persons from Saskatchewan engaged in organization work in said constituency other than myself.

3. On Friday, October 4, I observed and was informed that I was being shadowed by provincial constables, including provincial constable Laughlin. In the evening I attended a public meeting in company with Mr. Roderick MacKenzie, at which he and I spoke in support of Mr. Richardson.

4. On the following Saturday morning I met Mr. Thomas MacNutt, M.P., at the committee rooms. After stopping there a little while, I went out and met Mr. Roland North. As we were going along the street together, we met a person whose name I do not know, and he came along with us. Mr. North spoke to him as to how he was going to vote. He replied that he was a ballot voter, and that nobody knew how he would vote. I asked him to come to our meeting and hear our speakers before deciding which way he would vote. Outside of this party, I did not mention or discuss politics with anyone in Carman, outside of members of the committee whom I met in the committee rooms. That Saturday afternoon I came down to Winnipeg and went to the general committee rooms, where I procured a considerable quantity of campaign literature, polling lists and cartoons and some newspapers.

5. On the way down to Winnipeg I noticed that one of the provinical constables whom I had seen at Carman was on the train, and apparently following me. He subsequently informed me that he was detailed to look after me and that if I had got off at any of the intermediate stations, he would also have got off in order to keep me in sight.

6. I returned to Carman on Monday, October 7. I was met at the hotel by two provincial constables by the names of Hanson and Bertram. Hanson said that he had a warrant for my arrest. I asked him what the charge was. We went to my room and he took out a warrant for my arrest which he read over to me. I do not recollect **the exact** words that he read, but it was to the effect that I had illegally induced or had attempted to induce a voter to vote at the then pending election. The said constables then placed me under arrest, and took me down to another room in the hotel. While waiting in this room, Mr. Thomas Usher, one of the committee men came to me, and asked me for a list of the voters at Brunkild poll, which I had copied from the only available list at the committee room. I was in the act of handing it to him when I was intercepted by Constable Hanson who seized the paper and refused to allow Mr. Usher to have it. Hanson said to me that I was under arrest, and that he would take all papers. A little later constable Hanson asked me to show him all papers that I had in my possession. This I did, and he went through them and made a careful examination of them, and finding nothing that he thought was incriminatory, he returned them to me. He also made an examination of my travelling bag. I was then taken to the railway station by Hanson, Bertram and Laughlin, one of them walking on each side of me, and one walking immediately behind.

I may say that Sullivan is rather a small man, he was unarmed and yet three men had to watch him.

At the station I was taken on board the train in company of constables Bertram and Laughlin. We arrived in Winnipeg at about 4 o'clock in the afternoon, when I was taken to the office of Police Magistrate McMicken.

7. There were present at said police office said two constables, Marsh Jackson, who is a provincial constable, and the clerk of the court, and another man whose name I do not know. The charge was read over to me by the clerk. A man whose name I do not know asked to have the case remanded until Saturday, October 12, at 3 o'clock p.m. The magistrate made a remand in accordance with this request. I was then taken to the provincial jail.

8. On my arrival at the jail I was taken to a room where I was ordered to hand over all effects in my pockets. I emptied my pockets, including private papers, pass books, travelling card and money. The guard then felt all about my person, and ordered me to take off my boots, which he examined to see if there was anything hidden in them.

This must be copied from their methods in Russia.

I was then taken to a cell where I was locked up. During that evening some one came to the cell and laid down on the floor some bread and a cup of tea, and announced that it was my supper. That night after I undressed the guard made me carry my clothes into the corridor where they were placed on a bench in the corridor. He then told me to stand with my face to the wall in the corridor while he made a search of the cell.

9. On the same night that I was brought to Winnipeg, the Hon. Robt. Rogers addressed a meeting at Saint James, Macdonald. A report of his speech appeared in next day's Winnipeg Telegram. He is there reported to have said:

I know we have nearly one hundred thugs from Saskatchewan scattered through this riding. They are in this very polling division, and we are watching them. One of the ringleaders of that gang, a special and personal friend of Mr. Calder, was arrested to-day in the town of Carman.

In the press of Saturday Mr. MacNutt made the statement Mr. Richardson was going to succeed. Mr. MacNutt evidently thought he was in Saskatchewan, because he knew he was surrounded by the thugs which Mr. Roblin had described.

Well, I am a fairly large man myself, and Mr. Sullivan is a fairly small man, and I do not see how he could surround me.

The thug arrested to-day came into the constituency with Mr. MacNutt.

This is not so, but I do not think that I should have been at all ashamed if it were.

He went to Carman for a week, and registered as Sullivan. He spent his time there for a week, and then came into Winnipeg with Mr. MacNutt. Mr. Sullivan, of Carman, walked down to another hotel in Winnipeg and registered as Sutherland. He was at this hotel on Sunday, and had interviews with Grit election manipulators, and yesterday (Monday) morning, went to Carman again and registered as Sullivan, but the moment he started to operate he was nabbed, and was now behind the bars. There are many others who will follow him.

I may say again that Mr. Sullivan was the only man from Saskatchewan who was there in connection with the election as far as I am aware, except myself, at that time.

10. On Tuesday morning some bread and tea were left on the floor of my cell for my breakfast. I refused to take it and demanded some decent food. After some little talk, the guard agreed to get me some breakfast. Some other food was brought me, and for this I was charged 75 cents, which was kept out of the money which had been taken from me. I then asked that I be allowed to see my lawyer, Mr. Hugh D. Cutler. He saw me, and told me that he was making efforts to get bail for me, but that he had been unable to see the information or warrant under which I had been arrested, though he had made efforts to see them. He also told me that Marsh Jackson had told him that it was no use obtaining my release on bail, for if I were released on this charge, I would be immediately re-ar-

rested on another. All day Wednesday no one came to see me.

11. On Thursday morning, October 10, Charles Forrester and Edward O'Connor, lawyer, came to see me at the jail. They promised that if I would go home that afternoon they would get me off. I said I might as well go home, as I will not be allowed to work, and there is nothing else for me to do. I felt that I had been neglected by my friends and that there was nothing else for me to do but go back to my own province. After I got out, I found that the case had excited a great deal of interest, and that it would be neither fair to myself nor to the party to allow the matter to end in this way.

12. I was taken from the jail to Mr. Forrester's office, which is in the same building as the provincial magistrate's court. There were present Mr. O'Connor, constable Bertram, Marsh Jackson and constable Laughlin. When I left Forrester's office it was upon the understanding that I was to leave for home that evening. I left in company with Constable Bertram, whose name I had then learned was Campbell. We went to a barber's shop. There I picked up a copy of the Free Press, and I saw that a great deal of indignation was being expressed over my treatment. Of this I was ignorant when I was in jail. I also saw a statement in the Winnipeg Telegram, which severely maligned me. I made up my mind that I should remain in the city and have the matter cleared up rather than rest under the imputations caused by my arrest and my treatment in jail. In company with constable Campbell I went back to Charles Forrester's office, I told him that I had changed my mind, and that I was going to stand my trial for the charge that was laid against me, and that I was prepared to go back to jail. He asked me what had caused me to change my mind. I said that I had seen the papers, and that if I went back the Telegram would have scare headlines that I had left the province because I was guilty and afraid of standing trial.

Well, Sir, they must have a poor force of police if a guilty man could do that.

I then told him that he could send me back to the jail as soon as he was ready, and that that would relieve me of any obligation to him. Forrester tried a number of times to persuade me to leave for home. I refused to go. Provincial Constable Parr was then called in and took charge of me. We went to the Empire hotel where we stayed for a night in the same room.

13. On Friday morning in company with constable Parr I went again to Forrester's office, and I told him that if he would get a certificate of dismissal from the magistrate that I would return to my home on the Canadian Northern railway that evening. Constable Parr and I left and returned in the evening. Forrester said that he thought that I was to leave on the Canadian Northern railway train. I replied that he did not make any arrangement for me to leave on that train. He said: 'When are you going home?' I said, 'I am not going home until I get my dismissal from the magistrate on Saturday.' He replied, "You are a fool Sullivan, if you do not go home. As sure as you stay here you will be sent down,' and he instanced the case of a man named Chamberlain, I think, who was sent to jail, and who, he said, was no more guilty than I was. I then said, 'I am perfectly innocent of any wrong-doing and you cannot convict me without perjured evidnce.' He said, 'We can get perjured witnesses against you,' and that I should remember that the government, the police magistrate and the constables were against me down here, and that I had better get home while I had the chance.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Who said that? Was it the magistrate?

Mr. MACNUTT: No, it was Mr. Forrester, the lawyer, as I read it.

I refused to go then without the discharge, and after some time, Mr. Thomas Murray came to Forrester's office to see me. He had a chat with me and told me that O'Connor had seen him, and that O'Connor was very indignant of the way I had acted in the matter. Mr. Murray told me that he was a good Liberal, and that he thought under the circumstances I had better go home. I decided in deference to Mr. Murray's representations that I had better leave. I left that evening for home. I was accompanied as far as Rivers, Manitoba, by provincial constable Ross. On the train he told me that he would like to go to his home at Virden. I said he could get off the train at Portage la Prairie, and that he could take my assurance that I would proceed to my home. He said that his instructions were to accompany me to the boundary of the province. He went with me as far as Rivers.

14. In the following week I got word that I should return to Winnipeg as my case was on the docket, and would come up on Saturday morning, October 19, at 10 o'clock. I returned to Winnipeg on October 18, and was instructed to see Mr. Trueman, who was acting for me as my counsel at the hearing of the case. In company with Mr. Trueman I went to the provincial police court on Saturday morning, October 19, at 10 o'clock. I saw the court docket and saw that my case was on the docket to be heard at 10 o'clock. Mr. Trueman stated to police magistrate McMicken that he appeared on my behalf and that we were prepared to proceed with the hearing of the information. The magistrate said that the case had already been disposed of, and he refused to go on with it. Mr. Trueman obtained from the magistrate a paper purporting to be the information laid against me. While Mr. Trueman was reading it, the magistrate demanded it back. Mr. Trueman refused to surrender it until he had an opportunity to make a copy. The magistrate and a number of provincial constables then sought to obtain it by force, and eventually they procured it from him. In the meantime, the magistrate adjourned his court, and no further proceedings have been taken in the case.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of 'The Canadian Evidence Act.'

Declared before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 23rd day of November, A.D. 1912.
WARD HOLLANDS,
JOHN J. SULLIVAN.
A Commissioner in B. R., &c.

That is the statement of those so-called thieves and thugs who took part in the contest in Saskatchewan. I may say that anybody who knows Mr. Sullivan would believe him, even when not on oath, and I myself can certify to the truth of this affidavit up to the time we parted at Winnipeg, a week before the election. I had to go home at that time.

Now, I think these matters speak for themselves, and there is no necessity for me to take up any further time. I have placed these facts before the House, and they are corroborative of what has already been said before the House with regard to the Macdonald election by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). I will only say that, as far as I am aware, the election was lost principally because it happened to be a very fine day. That is a peculiar thing to say, but anyone who was in the West last summer knows that we were visited by continuous rain. The settlers and farmers throughout the riding were, as far as I could see, favourable to the return of Mr. Richardson, but, as far as I could learn, going amongst them, they were determined to take advantage of the favourable conditions to complete their threshing.

When I was there they were threshing from early morning until after dark and I was surprised to find the meetings so fairly well attended. I was present at several meetings and I visited a good many of the threshing gangs in operation and I can say from what I know that the people were decidedly in favour of Mr. Richardson and had it not been a fine day and had they not been compelled to stay at their work they would have come in and voted for him. I believe, Sir, that every effort was made on the part of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) to win that election, assisted by Sir Rodmond Roblin. I won't say they were illegitimate efforts, but every legitimate effort was made, I suppose I will not be allowed to say any more than that. At all events, notwithstanding all that was done by Sir Rodmond Roblin and Mr. Rogers their efforts were not quite so successful as they thought they would be because before the election Sir Rodmond Roblin promised that the Conservative candidate would have at least 1,500 majority, and probably 2,000. I shall not take up the time of the House speaking further on this question, but should the matter of the Saskatchewan elections again come before us I shall have something to say.

Mr. J. A. M. ARMSTRONG (North York): Mr. Speaker, the different subjects that have been referred to in the Address from the Throne have been fairly well covered by the gentlemen who preceded me and it is neither my desire nor intention to occupy the time of the House, nor to fill the pages of 'Hansard' to any great extent in my remarks of this afternoon. I wish, however to claim the indulgence of the House for a few moments for the purpose of expressing my opinion as to some of the utterances that have fallen from the lips of hon. gentlemen opposite during the course of this debate, and also to place myself on record with regard to certain questions which are of paramount interest to the citizens of Canada and which have a direct bearing upon the peace, happiness, and prosperity of our people. I regret very much that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition in observing the time-honoured custom of extending his congratulations to the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the address saw fit to dilute the honey of his congratulations with a certain amount of vitriol. I regret very much that the right hon. gentleman saw fit to make the statement that he saw very little in these addresses with which he agreed. I purpose in my humble way to bring to his attention some of the utterances of these gentlemen which I think will commend themselves to every right thinking citizen of this Dominion. So far as the speeches of the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the address are concerned I am satisfied to leave it to the calm judgment of the Canadian people to judge between the eloquent address of the hon. member for Chambly (Mr. Rainville) the scholarly utterance of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), and the ambiguous airy fairy speech given to the House by the hon. the leader of the Opposition. The House listened to the able and statesmanlike reply made by the leader of the Government in the manner that has always characterized his public utterances, and after he took his seat we were again treated to one of those short, pithy and witty deliverances so often given to this House by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) started out his speech with a classical phrase, and I wish to express my regret that my classical education has been so neglected that I am unable to interpret the meaning of it. In reading 'Hansard' I find that the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) commenced by referring to some friend or supporter of the Minister of Public Works as being afflicted with jimjams. That is undoubtedly a very classical phrase and I shall not attempt to interpret it to this House, but I am gifted with a certain

amount of imagination, as other hon. gentlemen are, and I ask hon. gentlemen in this House to pronounce that word and to see if it leaves any taste on their mouths, and then to study the personal record of the members of this House and tell me if there is an hon. member on either side who is more likely to be inoculated with the germs of that serious disease known as the jimjams than the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) himself. I regret that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) is not in his seat this afternoon. He told us that he had always been brought up with the idea that the Conservative party was a party of iniquity and in my humble opinion that is the first really frank statement I have heard emanate from his lips. I believe that that is the way in which he was brought up. He qualified that statement by telling us that as years went by he was forced to change his opinion, and that the reason for his change of opinion was that certain members of the Liberal party had seen fit to transfer their allegiance to the Conservative party, acting as he claimed as a lever to the party. Let me tell the hon. member (Mr. Oliver) the real reason why he changed his opinion. If he goes back in the history of his party, he might just as well be frank with the House and admit that it was simply because the Liberal party has in the past on a few occasions recruited from the ranks of the Conservative party, and coming in contact as he did with these gentlemen, who so transferred their allegiance to the other side of the House, he was bound to come to the conclusion that there was more honesty of purpose and true principles of Canadian citizenship to be found in the Conservative party that he had ever imagined before.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) as well as others referred to the Macdonald election and I shall devote but a few minutes to that subject. The hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt) read a very lengthy affidavit with reference to a man named Sullivan. For the information of the House and the country I would like to ask him if this Sullivan, who he says is a personal friend of his, may by any possibility be any relation of that notorious Capt. Sullivan, the one time intrepid commander of the Minnie M. I simply ask for the information of the House and the information of the country. Personally I would be inclined to look with a certain amount of suspicion upon any election worker who went around under that name.

The hon. member for Edmonton also stated that during that election the people were terrorized, that it was a campaign of intimidation. I ask the hon. gentlemen opposite to carry their minds back a few short months to the last general election, and I can give them instances where Government contractors called their employees into their private offices the day before the election and told them they must vote for the Liberal party or they would lose their positions. How does that compare with the intimidation that my hon. friend from Edmonton complains about?

I intend to refer to two of the matters contained in the speeches of the hon. the mover and seconder of the Address. The hon. member for Kingston spoke on the question of immigration, and while I do not intend to refer to it in the same strain as he did, I think it is one of the most important questions that the legislature of this country are called upon to face. The hon. member for Kingston pointed out that more strict inspection should be carried on with regard to the great influx of people from foreign lands. I quite agree with him, but I think a graver duty devolves upon the members of this House, and upon Canadian citizens, than simply to see that these newcomers have the means to supply themselves with their daily bread. Every year, according to the census returns, hundreds and thousands are coming to our shores, who speak every language under the sun, and worship every creed. While we must afford to those newcomers the right to venerate the land from which they sprung, the duty devolves upon Canadian citizens to endeavour to inculcate into their minds a hearty respect for British institutions and a love for Britain's King; and until we do that, this country never can hope to occupy her proper place among the great nations of the world.

Now, I would like to draw the attention of the leader of the Opposition to the proposed alterations to the Bank Act. I know practically nothing about the banking system, but I think it is one of the most important questions that any government could ever be called upon to solve. A day or two ago I received from my constituents a petition asking that a Royal Commission be granted by this Government to investigate all Canadian banks; an evidence on the face of it, that, owing to the many failures in the years gone by, the Canadian people are gradually losing all confidence in our financial institutions. It is not necessary I am sure for me to point out to this House the terrible effects upon many of the citizens of this country occasioned by the failure of a Canadian bank. It is not, I am sure, necessary for me to remind the House what failure of this kind means to many of the old men who, after a lifetime of toil, find themselves, through no fault of their own, without any contributory negligence on their

part, forced to depend for their daily bread upon the charity of the community in which they live; and it is not, I am sure, necessary for me to point out to this House what such a failure means to many women and young girls throughout this land who through such failures in the past have been driven in some cases to the grave in sorrow and in shame. It is not, I am sure, necessary to remind this House of the effect of such failures upon the little children, many of whom at the time of such failures were toddling as their mother's knees, and who without a moment's warning have been driven from home and comfort, where they have been served with every need, and practically thrown into the gutter, dependent for a livelihood on the cold charity of the world, growing up in an atmosphere of vice and immorality, and many of them probably winding up within the four walls of those institutions so eloquently described by the hon. the member for Kingston a few days ago. I ask the hon. members of this House, who are responsible for the dying sorrows of these old men? Who are responsible for the shame of these women? Who, I ask, are responsible for the spiritual murder of these little children? In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, every hon. member of this House who fails to do his utmost to reorganize or amend the banking laws of this country, so as to render such calamities utterly impossible, is guilty of spiritual murder. It should be impossible for any chartered bank of Canada to go to the wall on account of misappropriation of funds. There should be some system of government inspection of banks that would render these failures absolutely impossible, and I leave it to the financiers of this House to discover the remedy.

In conclusion, I wish to refer to the naval question. A few months ago the Liberal press in my portion of the country was endeavouring to lead the people to believe that the naval question would wreck the Conservative Government, and that the Liberal party were only waiting for an opportunity to attack us. I have not noticed any great desire on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite to clash with us on this question.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I occupy a rather unique position in this House, as far as naval propositions are concerned, in view of the fact that I have the honour to represent a riding that for thirty-seven years never sent a Conservative representative to this House. I further think that I have to a certain extent the right to say that I represent the old time Liberal party, in view of the fact that I have the honour of coming from a riding that has given to the public life of this country men like William Lyon Mackenzie, Sir William Mulock, and Sir Allan B. Aylesworth. I furthermore have the honour of living in that particular portion of the riding that is looked upon in that part of the province as the birth-place and the cradle of reform. I also have the honour of living practically within a stone's throw of the place where the Matthewes, the Lloyds, and the Lounts, and the Mackenzies were, I am informed, accustomed to meet for the purpose of formulating what hon. gentlemen opposite claim to be the principles of responsible government.

Many words have been said on this question already, but very little of a definite nature has been said. If I do not represent Liberal thought in my riding, I practically take my political life in my hands. But I do not care one iota whether I do or not, I am going to tell this House and this country where I stand on the naval question. My position is simply this—that if the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) who leads this Government comes down to this House and tells us that there is immediate necessity for Canada to do something to help Great Britain's navy, I for one will stand behind him and hold up both hands for the giving of every dollar that the Canadian people can give. It was said the other day—I think by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle)—that some critics of this policy had stated that we owed nothing to Great Britain. I do not know whether that is correct or not. I can hardly believe that there is any citizen of the Dominion who would make such a statement, but if there be I can quickly tell what I think of him. I blush with shame in unison with the Canadian mother of the individual who, when he attains years of discretion—or rather indiscretion—can so far forget what he owes to the land of his birth and to the privileges and liberties he and his fathers before him enjoyed under the British flag and who would try to introduce any policy in this country to stir up racial and religious discord. I will not juggle words on this naval question, I will stand behind any proposition that has for its object to make certain of Great Britain's supremacy upon the sea. Let me tell hon. gentlemen opposite that the policy they carried out last session—my first opportunity of listening to them—was not, in my opinion, calculated to promote peace and harmony among the different races and creeds that make up the population of this Dominion. It is not by stirring up discord between East and West, by endeavouring to draw a line of cleavage between the two parts of the country or between Catholics and Protestants, that Canada is to be brought to occupy the place she ought to occupy among the nations of the earth. In my opinion the question

of race or creed should not enter the minds of public men. To me there is neither East nor West in this Dominion. I do not care whether a man comes from the shores of the Atlantic or from the foothills of the Rockies, for we are all citizens of the British Empire whose flag we love and to whose sovereign we owe allegiance, and are all bound together by community of interest and a common love for the Motherland.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, I am glad to have this opportunity to make a few general observations before the House, for this is one of the occasions when we are afforded an opportunity to deal generally with the needs of the people. My training as a lawyer would lead me to pay some attention to the observations of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong, York) who immediately preceded me. But he did not say anything that seems to require my attention. When he was about half way through his speech he rather reminded me of a character described in a little story I was reading on the train the other day, a new and novel character to me, 'the garrulous mute,' who was described as an individual who makes a lot of noise but says nothing. He has endeavoured to go beyond the Government and beyond the party to mark out a new furrow for himself. He was going to tell us his policy upon the naval question. I for one listened with interest to learn what that policy should be, as the remarks of an hon. member on that side would naturally be indicative of something more than the opinion of an ordinary individual, for I take it that any sane individual supporting the Government would not take it upon himself to give any expression of policy except such as would be in harmony with that of the Government he supports. But while the hon. gentleman started out with a great flourish of trumpets, it turned out to be another version of the old story of the Earl of Marr who, it will be remembered, marched up the hill and then marched down again. The hon. gentleman made no declaration which would enable us to frame any proper conception of what the Government's policy will be. We understand, and I think the Government understands, that Canada's policy on this naval question must be something permanent, something continuous, something to be established and developed. But the only observation we have from the hon. member is that if there is an emergency he is prepared to vote money to meet the emergency. That policy would end in the paying out of the money ; it would not involve the formulating of any permanent or continuous policy for the country. If we are to understand that this is the policy of the Government, it will be no policy at all,

but merely an expedient to meet an emergency. Considering what the hon. gentleman has said, we need not be surprised to find it a policy of emergency, a policy designed to suit everybody but suiting nobody. We on this side are not going to discuss the naval policy at present. We are proud to follow the lead of our chieftain. He laid down, at the opening of the discussion, the course we will follow when he said we would wait patiently until the Government's policy is laid before the House and then would discuss it upon its merits The chief having taken that course, if would not be advisable or proper for any of his humble followers to depart from that course. I think it is the proper course to take, and it is the one we propose to follow. Let me assure the hon. member for North York, speaking as a private member of the House, and possibly as an average member of the Opposition, that, so far as the desire to maintain the strength and integrity of the Empire is concerned, to strengthen the hands of the Home Government and to support whatever is necessary to maintain the power of the Empire, the Opposition will take no second place to any member in this House or out of it. That is what we can promise the leader of the Government so far as this side of the House is concerned.

I said in opening that the present was an opportunity given to members of the House to cover a wide field of discussion and to deal with matters pertaining to the country generally, and more particularly to the constituencies we severally represent. We have listened with a great deal of interest to the words that were put in the mouth of His Royal Highness in the Speech from the Throne, and we are all deeply gratified, as has already been so well expressed, with the information regarding this country which His Royal Highness has acquired in his trip from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I am proud to know that in making a tour of the country, His Royal Highness spent considerable time in the constituency which I have the honour to represent. I may say, by the way, that His Royal Highness was entertained to a very novel sport in one of the harbours of the county which I have the honour to represent. I am told that His Royal Highness, during one of his fishing excursions, had at the end of his line a fish weighing about 865 pounds, and that for three-quarters of an hour his craft was rushing through the waters of the harbour at the rate of about 45 miles an hour.

We are pleased to receive assurance in the Speech from the Throne that the country is in a state of increasing prosperity, to know that the miner, the fisherman, the artisan, and all others engaged in agricultural, industrial and commercial pursuits

are steadily growing in prosperity, that the development of the country is going forward very rapidly. We have passed the stage, I hope, when any unforeseen circumstance may impede or endanger the general prosperity and development of this great country. I could not help being impressed with the fact that had His Royal Highness traversed this country some years ago, in the days of Tory administration, he would have been unable to report such conditions as were so happily set out in the Speech from the Throne. He would have found industrial paralysis and commercial stagnation prevailing throughout the land, he would have found province divided against province, and dissensions, racial and religious, existing in many portions of the country. He would have found the finances of the Government in a most disastrous condition, and that while every dollar which could be wrung from individuals was collected, there was not enough money in the treasury of the country to meet the ordinary demands. I am pleased, Sir, to be able to testify to the change in the general condition of the country that was manifested when the period of Tory administration came to an end in 1896. A new era broke upon this country, the sun that set in adversity in June of that year rose in prosperity on the next morning. By progressive, honest and courageous administration, this country is now in such a position that, as I have already intimated, we have passed the danger point. In the few years which the present administration may be in power, there will be no opportunity for them to impede in any way the momentum which the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave to the prosperity of this country.

I am sorry to say that during the last year nothing has been done in my county to bring to a completion the different enterprises which the late government had undertaken. I hope that better things are in store for us, and that the present administration will be able to give fair consideration to the needs of that part of the country from which I come, as well as of the whole province of Nova Scotia. We are told that we must be loyal to Canada, and that we must confine our trade as much as possible within our own bounds. I come from a country, Sir, where we have many magnificent resources. In our coal mines, lumber and fishing, our iron and steel industries, we compare favourably with any other portion of the continent of North America. But if we are to be shut out from the American market, we should be given an opportunity to send our fish to the great centers of Canadian trade and commerce, and one of the first essentials in that connection is increased transportation facilities. We do not object to the spending of millions in the far West to give the farmer an opportunity of getting his grain to market. You never heard a Nova Scotian, or indeed a Maritime man, making any such complaints, for he is particularly anxious for the general development of this country. But if the foreigner who comes into Canada obtains the benefit of transportation facilities to enable him to dispose of his products, what about the Canadian, who has been in this country for the last 150 or 200 years and is to-day, in some provinces at least, in no better position than he was 200 years ago in respect to the transportation of his fish, lumber, or anything else he may have to send to the different markets of the country? A fair start had been made on the improvement of railway facilities in the Island of Cape Breton, but this Government cut them short. I desire to call the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways to the great responsibility which he has assumed in causing a cessation of the railway developments in the Island of Cape Breton. I am glad that the hon. Minister has had an opportunity during last summer of seeing the magnificent development of that part of the country which I have the honour to represent. He has travelled all over this country, and he must know that in the Island of Cape Breton we can never have fair-play for our fishermen until there is established a belt of steel around that island all along the coast. Unless the fishermen of this district have ample transportation facilities, it is impossible for them to compete with the outside world. If they had access to the American markets, this matter would not be such an important one, as they could dispose of their products through the cities of Boston, New York and other American ports. Railway lines should be established from the Strait of Canso through Richmond and down to Louisburg, from thence around to my own county of Victoria, and back to Inverness or some point in the Strait of Canso, with a view to giving to this portion of the country an adequate and efficient transportation service. It is partly under way and I hope that the Government of to-day and the Government that will soon succeed them will take this matter into consideration and give us the facilities we so much need for the carrying of our trade. We are proud to find that we have the money to do it with. We are proud that under the Liberal party there was the disposition to do this work; it was undertaken and commenced by them and I am sure that the Minister of Railways is not doing any credit to himself as a man or any credit to the party of which he is a distinguished member by dashing from the

hands of the Island of Cape Breton that sweet cup which was almost at their lips. He ought not to be the man to do that and I hope he will reconsider any policy which he may have formed which would do otherwise than ample justice to the honest people of the island of Cape Breton and the other portions of the province of Nova Scotia which are without railways.

We were told by our hon. friends when they were in opposition that our fiscal policy was not a sound one. In my early experience in the House we were told from day to day that although we were counting surpluses in millions, starting some 16 years ago with one million and ending with something like $39,000,000 a year, this was a mere matter of book-keeping, that we did not have the money, that anybody could bolster up books and cook them and produce a return of that kind. But I am proud to say that last year, the first year in which the present Minister of Finance (Mr. White) had charge of the books of the country and had an opportunity of inquiring into the financial condition of Canada, after the most thorough investigation, backed up by every expert assistance he could get, backed up by a former Minister of Finance, who, I am sure, was keen upon the scent of any wrong-doing on the part of the former Minister of Finance, after all that was done, after all that enquiry and that investigation and searching of hearts and every other means by which they could find any fault against the former administration as to its financial standing, the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) was obliged—I shall not say obliged I dare say he was glad to come down to this House and declare: After fifteen or sixteen years of Liberal rule in this country, after paying every legitimate debt we have a surplus of $39,000,000; there is nothing wrong in the administration so far as the finances are concerned, the books of the country are kept in first class condition and we have a real surplus of $39,000,000. That, Sir, is the condition in which we handed over the affairs of the country to our friends. In the expenditure of the money which we have helped to accumulate we are simply asking a fair show and a fair deal in giving us our proportion of it. We are not finding fault because hundreds of millions of dollars are spent in British Columbia. We are not finding fault because hundreds of millions are spent on the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other large development in this country, but we are expecting that, down by the sea, in the older settlements of this country, where we have good men and true, as good as in any other part of the world, no discriminating policy will be used against us but that the Liberal party will receive the treatment in that part of the country which they deserve from the fruits of the labour of their friends and from the proper distribution of the moneys which we have placed or helped to place in the hands of the present administration.

I must pay some little attention to the speech of the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. White). He was rather critical in the position which he took yesterday in his criticism of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. He was not satisfied with the kind of evidence that was brought forward here yesterday in support of the claim that the election in Saskatchewan had anything to do with the cut in the rates of duty on cement. Perhaps it had not. For myself I should be sorry indeed to doubt any statement of fact which would be made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. White). I believe that he means well, that he is a man of wide experience and of proper and good natural instincts. But there is such a thing as a man being deceived. There is such a thing as others having ways that are dark and tricks that are vain. There is such a thing as evidence being put before the Minister of Finance which in the simplicity of his heart, he believes but which is no real evidence at all. We are a little too old in the world to believe that the great performer who had charge of the Saskatchewan election would ask the Minister of Finance to make this cut in rates without giving him some material. That great leader, and I am afraid the boss of the Government, was too shrewd, too calculating, to think for one moment there would be any use in going to the Minister of Finance and asking for a cut unless there was evidence, and such evidence as could with some plausibility be submitted to the House when the crucial moment came. I could imagine to myself such a thing as this boss of the administration, this performer, going to Boards of Trade, going to building combines or associations and telling them: Now I am here for a purpose. I am here to help run an election and to win it. I must have something startling in this province. I must have something that will attract the attention of the people and one of the things would be to cut rates of duty on something that enters largely into the economic consumption of the people of this province. Just now I think cement would be a good subject. What is the matter with you sending a resolution to the Minister of Finance telling him that this must be done. Very good. If that is necessary we are good loyal party men and we will do that, but do you suppose Mr. White will believe that such an emergency exists? Believe? Certainly he will believe; he is a good innocent fel-

low, he knows nothing about these intrigues and he will believe it. This was done all over the country and this deluge of telegrams and resolutions was poured upon the innocent head of the Minister and how well they succeeded was shown yesterday in the vigour and strength of the words with which he backed up this delusion which was heaped upon his head.

Mr. PELLETIER: Does the hon. member suggest that this was actually done or does he only surmise it might have been done?

Mr. GRAHAM: What might have been done is usually done by the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. McKENZIE: If my hon. friend the Postmaster General had asked me how it would be possible to have this done in the Department of the Post Office I would say: Certainly, without the slightest possible trouble. But I would make this distinction between the two departments, that whereas the hon. the Minister of Finance would not know that the thing was coming, I think the Postmaster General would be looking for the letter.

Mr. PELLETIER: Does my hon. friend think that that is an answer to my question?

Mr. McKENZIE: My hon. friend the Postmaster General was rather setting snares, he was not looking for a question.

Mr. PELLETIER: No answer is forthcoming.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am rather too old to fall into his rabbit tracks.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I do not like to interupt my hon. friend, but if he will permit me, I would like to ask him a question. What does he think of the correspondence with the manager of the Cement Company? Is he also in league with the Ministers?

Mr. GRAHAM: He is a very strong Tory, and always was.

Mr. McKENZIE: I have not the honour of being closely acquainted with the hon. the Minister of Finance, but I have the honour of a very close friendship with the manager of the Cement Company.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: He is a very capable young man whom we trained to efficiency in Cape Breton.

Mr. GRAHAM: And Brockville.

Mr. McKENZIE: I believe the raw material came from Brockville. I have followed his answer very carefully, but I see nothing at all in it that leads me to the understanding of his letters which the hon. the Minister of Finance has reached. I do not think that he admits anywhere, as far as I can follow his letters, that they were unable to furnish the material, or that they did not have it to furnish. I think the speech of the Minister of Finance would lead me to believe that they did not have the goods to deliver, but my reading of what he quoted from the letters of the manager of the Cement Company does not lead me to any such understanding. Perhaps the hon. the Minister of Finance has some information from his other than that he put on 'Hansard.' If he has, we are not able to judge of it as evidence, but in what he has submitted, there is nothing which goes to show that there was any emergency. I do not think, Sir, that a case has been made out at all, so far as the consumers of cement in the West are concerned, because the hon. the Minister of Finance undertook to speak for contractors and builders, and not for the ordinary consumer, who, in a small way, requires cement. I take it that those large consumers are business men, that they watch the market, that they provide in advance for their large operations, and that they have contracts for the supplying of cement. I think it is not presuming too much to say that those paving construction companies have contracts with the cement people at Montreal, or at the other points where they manufacture for the supply of consumers. Let me submit to the Minister of Finance—he is a lawyer—that when the letters speak of the loss of the builder, they mean the loss and danger of those who undertook to deliver those goods; if they did not deliver the goods they would have to suffer the loss and make it good to the party who depended on them to perform their side of the contract. If it was necessary to go to the United States to get those contracts carried out, they had a perfect right to go there. We have samples of that sort of thing in the island of Cape Breton, when the Dominion Coal company, or the Nova Scotia Steel company, owing to pressure on their works, are unable to supply coal or steel rails, as the case may be, and have to go across the line, pay the duty, and fulfil their contracts. There is no such thing as coming to the Government to ask them to remove the duty. That was possibly another delusion practised upon the minister. It is quite possible that those combines and trusts, went to the contractors and got them to raise a howl to frighten the minister, saying: 'we know we have to pay you the difference for any loss you may suffer, but we do not want to pay duty to bring in this cement, and if you cry loudly enough it will come in free.' It is quite possible that that was played upon the minister, and that

he was persuaded to let this in free without the necessary evidence being before him. My hon. friend (Mr. White) is not a child in regard to the things that go on in this world, or in regard to the civil or municipal institutions of this country, and he knows that boards of trade are the most delusive bodies that ever existed on the face of the earth. If there is anything to which I would pay little attention it is to the resolution of a board of trade. These boards are the most irresponsible and unrepresentative people that were ever permitted to live in this country. One or two members can pass a resolution; one alone can move and second it, sign it as president or secretary, and send it to the department. That is all the hon. minister has got, and yet he stands up boldly and says: 'Where is the member for Saskatoon, I dare him to oppose the resolution of the members of the board of trade.' The chances are that when he goes up there to look for those members he will be unable to find one that would take the responsibility of saying that he ever saw or heard of a board of trade. That is the kind of evidence that is submitted. We heard it said yesterday, with a great flourish of trumpets, that the leader of the Opposition was making strong bold statements based on nothing but newspaper scraps. I assure the Minister of Finance that he never saw a poorer scrap of any kind than a resolution of a board of trade, and that is the only evidence upon which he based the great case which he tried to make out here yesterday. Now I want to point out to the Minister of Finance some things that the Government did in connection with the accumulation of the evidence that was thrown at his innocent head by the more crafty hand of the boss who was operating from a distance, and the smiles upon whose crafty face could not be seen by the honest and well-meaning juvenile who reigns over the department.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKENZIE: I take back the word 'juvenile,' I will say 'young.' If I say anything that looks in any way disparaging to the Minister, I can assure my excellent friend that there is certainly no 'mens và' behind them. I could point out to the Minister of Finance sources of information to be found in every part of the country and on which he could rely with confidence. Why did he not consult with his own political supporters in the West? One would naturally expect that when a crucial question concerning the West was to be dealt with the Minister of Finance would consult some member supporting his government from the Western provinces. There are municipal councillors in the West who are responsible to the people; there are local governments in the West; there is the government of Manitoba, who are friends of his; why did he not consult them? Well, Sir, if I were before a jury, I would tell them that the Minister of Finance is not entitled to the apology he pressed for yesterday. I believe that when he exercises his mind as a lawyer over the evidence submitted to the House he will agree with me that the very opposite of an apology is due to him. I had it in my mind to say something about the rather flippant way in which the Minister of Finance dealt with this question and with the members of the Opposition. I submit with due deference to my hon. friend of large proportions and splendid calibre that I am an older parliamentarian than he, and I would tell any minister, let alone the Minister of Finance, that he cannot afford to be flippant or smart in trying to deal with a public question. That may be all right for an irresponsible man like the member of a board of trade, but when it comes to a minister of finance dealing with public questions he must keep within well defined limits, and I can assure him that his flippancy yesterday was not in keeping with the dignity of the position he occupies. There is such a thing as a man of ordinary capacity forcing that capacity beyond its proper bounds, and I submit to the Minister that while he may be well trained as a financier I do not think he ever was intended to be a Mark Twain. When the Minister of Finance proceeded to be smart, his performance reminded me of the somewhat clumsy antics of an elephant on a hen roost.

Mr. BURNHAM: May I ask a question?

Mr. McKENZIE: Hast thou found me, oh mine enemy?

Mr. BURNHAM: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that something reminded him of the antics of an elephant on a hen coop; has he ever seen an elephant on a hen coop?

Mr. McKENZIE: I have not, but I have seen things just as much out of place. The flippancy exhibited by the Minister of Finance yesterday reminds me that the Hon. Joseph Howe once said that one had poor taste indeed who would smile at a man with a wooden leg because he limped, but that if a man with a wooden leg undertook to perform the Highland Fling or Sword Dance he was open to ridicule. In attempting to dispose lightly of the leader of the Opposition as the Minister of Finance undertook to do yesterday, he was putting himself in the role of the man with the wooden leg dancing the

Highland Fling. Then, the Minister of Finance in his speech proceeds to lay down a new principle with regard to the trade policy of this country. I have always understood it was common ground with the statesmen of Canada that it was well for us to get trade with any foreign country on the best possible terms and that we should do what was proper in every way to get fair trade with the United States or any other foreign country. But, yesterday a new trade policy was laid down by the Minister of Finance; a new prophet has appeared upon the scene and has laid down new laws. The hon. gentleman laid down the law that it is impossible for us to trade with any foreign country in a legitimate way except over an artificial wall. What he means by that I do not know, but to be absolutely fair to the hon. gentleman I will quote his words as reported in 'Hansard,' page 116:

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Let us clear that up here and now. What was the objection of my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden), and I think of every other member on this side of the House, to the Reciprocity Agreement? The objection was the fact of the agreement itself, among other things, the fact that we would surrender control of our fiscal policy to a great nation to the south. Nobody in Canada who has any sense has any objection to buying from the United States or selling to the United States if you buy over the tariff wall that has been erected in accordance with the requirements of each country. If my right hon. friend wants to buy something in the United States I have no objection to his buying it if he brings it in, but I do object to his making an agreement which will deliver our tariff in regard to such an important list of products over to the House of Congress of the United States.

What are we to understand by this wall that we must cross? The miner who pays thirty or thirty-five per cent duty on the necessities of life is to be told that if he should get those goods in free from the United States, he is not a proper citizen of this country. Does the Minister of Finance wish us to understand, no matter what offers are made to us by any other country, that for his part he intends to keep a wall between him and that country? Is that the encouragement he is giving to the people who are now overburdened with the cost of living? I hope that my hon. friend from Red Deer will some day come up against this wall, and that it will give him such a smashing that the Minister of Finance will be sorry that he ever attempted to throw up such obstacles.

Mr. WHITE: Would the hon. member be in favour of a further reduction on coal?

Mr. McKENZIE: While I would like to see the miner getting the necessities of life as cheaply as possible, I would be pleased if my hon. friend would put a rail or two in the fence where the coal comes in. At the present time we are importing fifteen or sixteen millions of tons of coal annually from the United States, displacing Canadian coal to that extent. I think the tariff on coal should be raised in order to increase the market for Canadian coal. However, I do not think my hon. friend will take any upward flights with the tariff. My hon. friend's position is this, he says: 'Look at my speech of the 26th of November, and you will see there where I stand. My heart is right, and I hope to carry out my intentions later on; stand by me. You have not got the same chance from the Grits, because they are acting for the poor men, but I am for the combines, I am for the wall. When the proper time comes, I will carry out my promises, when the Grits are more or less off their guard, but at present I am too closely watched.'

In reference to this continuous, permanent Chinese wall with which my hon. friend wishes to surround the country, I want to point out to him the doctrines of his predecessors. Sir John A. Macdonald held that whatever treaties the United States would make with us, we would reciprocate, but if they kept up their high walls, we would compete with them. His predecessor in office, the hon. member for North Toronto, held exactly the same views. I understand that in this country and all over the world the general trend of things is to modify tariffs. If that is correct, where does my hon. friend stand on his high tariff wall?

Mr. WHITE: Will my hon. friend kindly read the words after 'wall?'

Mr. McKENZIE: I have read it all in 'Hansard.' If it bears a different interpretation, I will be very glad indeed if my hon. friend will get this wall out of his way.

Mr. WHITE: If my hon. friend will read it again, I think it will substantially represent his views also.

Mr. McKENZIE (reading):

'Nobody in Canada who has any sense has any objection to buying from the United States or selling to the United States if you buy over the tariff wall that has been erected in accordance with the requirements of each country.'

Mr. WHITE: 'With the requirements.'

Mr. McKENZIE: That is what I say is wrong. The natural condition is that there should be no wall at all.

Mr. WHITE: How do you propose to obtain the revenues necessary for the administration of the business of the Dominion?

Mr. McKENZIE: All I said was that the natural condition of trade should be free trade. I am in favour of raising the revenue as we are now doing it. There should be no higher wall than is necessary to obtain the finances of the country. It has always been the view of the Liberal party that we must deal not with theories but with conditions. There may be conditions where theories will not apply—there are conditions in this country where theories will not apply. But I do object to the hon. gentleman who, of all others, represents the trade policy of the country saying that there must be a stone wall around this country and that we cannot legitimately trade except over that wall. We have heard to-day of large quantities of fence wire coming into this country free. What is the position of these people? What about the theory of my hon. friend? These goods did not come over the wall, and surely according to the hon. gentleman, must be subject to confiscation.

Before resuming my seat I desire to say a few words about the amendment before the House. I think this question of the conduct of the election in Macdonald is such that I can appeal to the Government, and particularly to the Prime Minister, with every confidence that, if the facts put before the House are correct, if these affidavits truly represent the case, the strongest possible steps should be taken to stamp out the practices indicated. It will not do for the Prime Minister to do as he did yesterday when the facts were put before the House—for, though, possibly, the affidavits were not read the substance of them had been placed before the House by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The only notice the Prime Minister condescended to take of the matter was to say, in effect: You did similar things in days gone by. I submit that that is not the position for the Prime Minister to take on a question of that kind. We heard a moment ago from the hon. member for North York (Mr. Armstrong) of the responsibility devolving upon the people of this country to show a proper example to the immigrants who come amongst us. I entirely agree with him on that ground. But the only way we are going to impress the immigrant is by showing respect for law and order. If we who profess the Christian religion and have the advantages of hundreds of years of civilization, are going to tolerate the ignoring of the law and the imprisoning of citizens in this high-handed way, what kind of example shall we set to foreigners who come to this country? My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) said we should do everything possible to assimilate these immigrants who come to Canada. Are we going to assimilate them by teaching them that honest people who dare to express their opinion may be imprisoned? Now, there are many people in this country who do not understand what has been going on and what this trouble is all about. So far as my words can reach I propose to let everybody in my own constituency and throughout the country know what is the nature of this alleged crime. They may think lightly of it; they may think it does not amount to much after all; but at least they ought to know the nature of the case.

One of the first principles of citizenship in this country is that every man is entitled to be unmolested, to have his liberty protected and his property safe, until at least a prima facie case is made out to show that he has violated the law and has made himself liable to prosecution. We have been told several times that in this election contest people were arrested simply on the statement that they were guilty of having violated section 269 of the Election Act. I regard it as my duty to put before my people and others exactly what this section 269 provides. Those of us who are lawyers, and a good many others may regard it as a very simple matter—they know what section 269 of the Election Act provides or they can easily refer to that law and find out. But thousands and millions of people in this country have no access to law books. So far as I can reach them, every man in this country shall have the opportunity of knowing what that section provides, and therefore what is the nature of the charge brought against these people. Section 269 of the Election Act provides:

Every one who, directly or indirectly, by himself or by any other person on his behalf, makes use of, or threatens to make use of, any force, violence, or restraint, or inflicts, or threatens the infliction, by himself, or by or through any other person, of any injury, damage, harm or loss, or in any manner practises intimidation upon or against any person, in order to induce or compel such person to vote for any candidate, or to refrain from voting, or on account of such person having voted for any candidate or refrained from voting at an election, or who, by abduction, duress, or any false or fraudulent pretense, device or contrivance, impedes, prevents or otherwise interferes with the free exercise of the franchise of any voter, or thereby compels, or induces or prevails upon any voter either to vote for any candidate or to refrain from voting at an election, shall be deemed to have committed the offence of undue influence, and is guilty of an indictable offence, and shall, in addition to any penalty thereby incurred, forfeit the sum of

two hundred dollars, to any person who sues therefor, with costs.

2. It shall be deemed a false pretense within the meaning of this section to represent to a voter directly or indirectly, that the ballot to be used, or the mode of voting at an election, is not secret.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will see that this crime is put in the category of indictable offences. In degree it is not so reprehensible, and is not punishable in the same way, as the graver crimes, but, being put in the category of indictable offences it is in the highest rank of crimes with murder and the gravest felonies. Now, the criminal law is not different for Manitoba from the rest of Canada,—the criminal law applies the same throughout the country. That being the case, I cannot understand how magistrates undertook to deal summarily with these cases. Let me refer to a provision of the law that is comparatively new. Under the law as it exists, evidence must be given before a magistrate of the nature of the crime alleged before an information can be taken notice of at all. It used to be otherwise, but now witnesses must be examined before any process is issued against an individual. The high-handed manner in which this business has been done will appear when it is considered that since 1909 the law of this country has been such that a magistrate has no right to issue a process for an indictable offence until section 665 of the Act as amended is complied with. This is what that section, passed, as I have said, in 1909, provides:

"Upon receiving any such complaint or information the justice shall hear and consider the allegations of the complainant, and the evidence of his witnesses, if any, and if of opinion that a case for so doing is made out, he shall issue a summons or warrant, as the case may be, in manner hereinafter provided.

3. The justice shall in connection with such hearing have the same power of procuring the attendance of witnesses and of compelling them to testify as under Part XIV.

4. The evidence of witnesses, if any, at such hearing shall be given upon oath, and the evidence of each witness shall be taken down in writing in the form of a deposition, and, subject to the provisions of section 683, which, so far as applicable, shall apply to such hearing shall be read over to and signed by the witness and signed by the justice.

That, Sir, is the course that should have been taken before any person was deprived of his liberty. There is a section in the Act which specifically provides that no legal process, warrant or summons can be signed in blank. It has been rumoured—although not clearly proven—that constables were sent around Manitoba during this election with blank warrants in their pockets. If that is so it is an iniquitous and abominable action, and shocking to the sense of any decent man in this country. If there is an iota of truth in the allegations which have been made, the responsibility of clearing the matter up lies upon the Government. No such action should have been taken against any man unless substantial proof was at hand. It is disgraceful, in a country like this, that any such condition could possibly exist. Our friends on the other side—and some of the ministers, I am sorry to say—laughed at this matter, and rolled it as a sweet morsel under their tongues. But chickens will come home to roost. It may be all right for them to laugh, but the good honest yeomanry of this country will not stand for such conduct. If this Government expects good citizenship, and to receive the respect of the Canadian people for the laws enacted by Parliament, they must respect the law themselves. What is the good of having statute-books if the Government is willing to ignore the laws placed upon them, and to deprive citizens of their rights and liberties in the very face of that law, which they themselves helped to enact? I submit that this matter requires a most careful scrutiny and investigation on the part of the Government and of this Parliament; that the good name and fame of this country is at stake, and I hope nothing will be done to prevent the fullest possible investigation into this matter.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the hon. members of this House for the attention I have received, and I trust that our deliberations in the coming session will be fruitful of much actual benefit to this country.

Mr. R. J. BALL (South Grey): I am glad to have an opportunity of addressing this House in regard to those general matters which are now before us. The Speech from the Throne contained many matters of importance to us all. I am glad to know that the country is in a prosperous and thriving condition. A little over a year ago it was feared that certain circumstances might disturb the steadily increasing prosperity of this country, but the voice of the people averted such a catastrophe, and the old system that was inaugurated in 1878, and which has practically been undisturbed ever since is still extant. As has been stated by the hon. gentleman opposite, we must of course have a tariff for revenue, But I am sure that we must have a tariff for other purposes as well. If all other nations were free traders, possibly it would be wise for this country to adopt the same attitude, but we do not find this to be the case. Our neighbours to the south have a high tariff wall against us and other nations, and it is obvious that we must have a tariff wall for the purpose of gen-

erally regulating trade. If we expect to be a great industrial country, we must take definite steps to foster our industries. Had we listened to the appeal which was made to the country last year, and adopted the reciprocity agreement, we would have found that Canada would have been flooded with the products of the United States. In my opinion England is to-day making the same mistake as has been made by that country for many years. Free trade in the past may have been good for England, but what was good yesterday, or ten years ago or fifty years ago, may not be good under the conditions existing to-day. The resources of the republic to the south, although great, are being depleted,, and they have been looking across to Canada, seeking to obtain the benefit of our vast natural resources, in order that they might increase the revenues of their own country. In the event of such a consummation as was stated by Mr. Taft and corroborated by ex-President Roosevelt, Canada would have become an adjunct of the United States. President-elect Wilson has also concurred in this statement. The tariff, therefore, is something which we cannot discard, and the best proof of that is the fact that although the Liberal party before being returned to power in 1896 had stated that the last vestage of protection would be wiped out of this country, the tariffs were but slightly changed during their fifteen years of administration. A proper adjustment may become necessary from time to time, but the existence of a tariff is still found to be essential.

We are glad to know that the farmers of this country have materially prospered, and that, not only in Ontario and the older provinces, but in the West, the evidences of general development and prosperity are profuse and gratifying. I believe that the question of reciprocity is not dead—it is still a live one with many hon. gentlemen opposite—and I think it is just as legitimate to deal with this matter now as it was a year ago. The more information the people of the country obtain upon the matter the better, and the more light there is thrown upon the subject, the more the people are opposed to it. It is true that last year certain hardships existed in the West, but I am sure that the majority of the difficulties which presented themselves in the prairie provinces are attributable to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. For fifteen years hon. gentlemen opposite were in power, and during that time they had ample opportunity of developing the transportation facilities of the West, but they failed to keep pace with the new conditions which developed in that portion of the country. The late Government failed to keep pace with the progress that was being made in that country and it devolved upon the present Conservative Government to see that the West was properly served. I do not think we need any better illustration of that than the method in which the Grand Trunk Pacific railroad was handled, because the very portion of that line which should have been built to relieve the West was neglected. Mr. Speaker, we find that our industries are prosperous and progressing. Although the furniture industry with which I am connected, as well as other industries, was not in the schedule for reciprocity, yet there was a feeling of uncertainty and doubt that came upon the manufacturers of this country and which prevented them from enlarging and extending their business as they would have extended it. As soon as the reciprocity pact was defeated confidence was restored and the people have since gone forward in hope, feeling secure in their investments and in their enterprises. I belong to the town of Hanover, which is an important centre of the furniture industry and an enterprising town. For myself when reciprocity was before the people, I felt very doubtful about enlarging my business in any way because we did not know what competition we might have from the other side of the line. At the present time we have over one million dollars worth of furniture coming from the United States to Canada even against a duty of 35 per cent. The furniture manufacturers were deeply concerned at the result of reciprocity. Since its defeat my own town, for which I suppose I may more particularly speak, is moving along with confidence, and even those who voted for reciprocity but who I am sure in their hearts were opposed to it, are pleased at the result of the election of 1911. Sometimes there is an idea that the interests of the labouring men and the interests of the employers are different, but at all events both were united in opposition to the reciprocity proposal. Our labouring men were as anxious as we were in regard to the matter. They had their homes in the town and their homes were becoming more valuable and if depression came from any cause whatever their homes would be reduced in value and possibly they might have to look elsewhere for work. Confidence was restored amongst the labouring men as well as amongst the manufacturers by the result of the defeat of reciprocity and to-day all classes of the community are happy and contented. We are glad to know that this year the West has had a good crop and that the wheat growers have been able to garner the harvest better than last year. Transportation is better. The Government has made provision so that grain is being moved a great

deal more rapidly than last year and I am sure that if this Government gets time to carry out its policy the West will be well pleased with it. I look to the West becoming an industrial country after a while. The quarrel between the Western farmer and Eastern manufacturer, if it exists, should not be. We take their grain, and the more industries we can create as the population of the Eastern provinces increases the more of the Western products will be consumed. Personally, I think the interests of the West can be best served by the adoption of a system of mixed farming and with mixed farming and with large industries in the West, the West is bound to become a great country. I understand that Winnipeg is the third largest manufacturing city in Canada, and that is something I did not realize until I had my attention drawn to it a short time ago. Now what can be done in Winnipeg can be done in other places in the West. What you want in Canada to-day is population. Our country is expanding so fast that we cannot get enough people to perform our work. The Western farmer and the Eastern farmer, and the manufacturer are all short of labour and until the population warrants it I suppose industrial progress will be slow. Now, I understand that flax is largely grown in the West and the shed for its seed and the rest of the plant destroyed. We bring our jute, a very inferior product to our flax twine, from the East Indies, and I do not see why that portion of the flax product which is useful for the making of twine should not be preserved and twine industries established throughout the West. As to the cement question about which we have heard a great deal, in my opinion the Government was perfectly right in cutting the duty on cement. The people of the West were suffering under a great hardship. I understand that in Winnipeg the building permits for the present year amount to something like twenty million dollars, and in Regina, Saskatoon, Edmonton, and other western cities building operations are progressing in proportion. In order to enable these building enterprises to be carried on something had to be done towards supplying the demand for cement and I believe the Government took the right course in the matter. Because the Conservative Government is reputed to be a government of tariffs it does not necessarily follow that a Conservative government should be unfair to any portion of the community. Any sensible government whether it be a free trade government or a tariff government will adapt its policy to the varying needs of the people and the Minister of Finance and the Government were perfectly justified in the attitude they took. Then if you look at the figures you will find that very little cement was shipped into Ontario and Quebec and the Eastern provinces, so that while great advantage was conferred on the people of the West by cutting the cement duty, very little if any injury was done in the Eastern provinces. We must remember that it was under the administration of the Liberals that mergers, combines and trusts were brought into existence; they could not have come into existence since the present Government came to power, and therefore the late Government is responsible for them. However, we all know that the cement business in this part of the Dominion is a combine and perhaps after all it is not to be wondered at that gentlemen opposite censure the Government for cutting the duty on cement seeing that the cement combine is apparently one of the creatures of their own administration.

The cement industry is a combine, and combines control prices. I believe that if combines would act properly towards the people, and were properly legislated for, properly held in check, they could produce cheaper than individuals. They want to be regulated, and it seems rather strange to me to find that on the other side, when this matter was under discussion, in the United States, cement at the mill could be sold for 65 cents a barrel, while in our Canadian mills it was $1.08. There must be something wrong in the method of making cement in this country. It may be that our factories are not up to date, but there is some reason why they charge so much for cement, and I think this is a matter which ought to be investigated. I may say we have a cement factory in my own town. Though not very familiar with the methods of making cement there seems to be something wrong.

Now I am glad to see that the country is in a prosperous condition, and I hope that our legislation will continue along the lines it has followed in the past. In regard to the navy, I thought for some time that perhaps a Canadian navy would be all right. That was some years ago when things were peaceful. But things are not peaceful now. It is very difficult to tell what may occur on the continent of Europe, or how the old land may become involved. We do not know what the coming Naval Bill is to consist of, but we have no doubt it will be such as will commend itself, at least I hope so, to the whole House. We must stay by the old land, the land that has done so much for us, notwithstanding that there are those who say she has done nothing for us. Canada owes to her a great deal. We have drawn from her the financial strength which enables us to develop this great country. We owe the old land millions of dollars, she has protected us, and

any navy we could produce would do very little if difficulties arose with another nation. It would take us a number of years to develop a navy, our ships would become obsolete almost as fast as they could be built for I understand they become obsolete in a few years. Whatever the Navy Bill may be, I am glad to be able to say that if it is at all reasonable it will have my support, and I think my people will give it their support also.

Mr. ROBERT CRUISE (Dauphin): It was not my intention to take part in this debate, but owing to the fact that an elector of my constituency was arrested in the recent Macdonald election, I feel it is my duty to say a few words in regard to his personal character. This gentleman who was arrested is Captain W. B. Sifton of Minitonas. He is a man who is held in very high esteem in the constituency where he lives. I have known Mr. Sifton for the last thirteen or fourteen years, and I do not know a dishonourable act that he has ever done. The worst I could say about Mr. Sifton is that he is a perfect gentleman. Mr. Sifton held a very responsible position under the late government for several years, and during that time I did not hear a word of criticism of him, either by Liberals or Conservatives. I might say that Captain Sifton is an old-timer in the province. He has lived in Manitoba for over thirty years. He lived for a considerable time on the east side of Lake Manitoba, but about twelve or thirteen years ago he removed with his family to Minitonas and I have known (Mr. Sifton ever since. I might also say on behalf of Mr. Sifton that he was one of the possible candidates spoken of in the recent election. Now I understood the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) to say yesterday that if he had been prosecuting those men who were arrested in the Macdonald election they would have been convicted. Well, Sir, the administration of justice is bad enough in Manitoba now, but I do not know what it would be like if my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) was a magistrate.

Mr. BURNHAM: I said prosecuting; not convicting.

Mr. CRUISE: I do not wish to misquote my hon. friend, but that is what I understood him to say, I have his words here:

> I say that if I had been prosecutor, I would have prosecuted.

These are the words of my hon. friend. The hon. member for Peterborough also claimed that the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) had not made out a strong case in regard to corrupt practices in the Macdonald election. I do not know that anything could be stronger than the four affidavits of those men who were arrested. So far as the three other men are known to me, I understand they bear honourable characters, and if these affidavits do not afford sufficient evidence to justify this Government holding an investigation, I do not know what would be sufficient. I must say that it is not a very agreeable thing to be arrested, and marched down the streets of Winnipeg with a constable on either side and one behind, and then placed in a jail, without any evidence whatever being produced against you. I trust that this Government will hold a thorough investigation into this matter, deal with it in the way it should be dealt with, and see that justice is done to the citizens of Manitoba in the future. I do not think it would be out of place for me to say that when the present Administration in Manitoba brings on a general election, the people of that province will show that they will not tolerate what was done in the recent Macdonald election.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): You have been telling us that for a long time.

Mr. CRUISE: The hon. Minister of Finance has seen fit to introduce the question of reciprocity. If I understood him, he challenged the members from Ontario and Quebec to say if they were still in favour of reciprocity. As the representative of an agricultural constituency of Manitoba, and a Western farmer, I would like to state that I am more strongly in favour of reciprocity than I was two years ago. It is all very well for the representatives of the manufacturers to get up and ask for protection. They are the men who want protection. The farming industry is the most important industry that we have in this country. They are the men who should get legislation at first hand. They are the men who should have the markets of the world opened up to them to allow them to get full value for their produce.

I would like to give the reasons why I am in favour of reciprocity. We have a great railroad built from the Atlantic to the Pacific known as the Canadian Pacific railway. This road has been built by cash subidies, by land grants and by the credit of this country and it has practically been handed over to the Canadian Pacific railway to operate and on it they receive a large profit. We have another road, the Canadian Northern railway, which will soon be completed from ocean to ocean and the Grand Trunk Pacific will also soon be completed across the continent. But when we have these three roads will we have any competition? It is easy for the presidents of those roads to put their heads together and arrange their freight rates.

Everybody knows that the freight rates are too high in the West to-day, and there is no possible chance of having them lowered in the future.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. member advocate government ownership of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Northern railway?

Mr. CRUISE: I am not speaking about government ownership now. As I said, even with these three railroads we will have practically no competition. Four or five years ago it was proven that the large grain companies in Winnipeg received profits to the extent of 16 cents a bushel in exporting our wheat to the Old Country, while according to their own evidence half a cent or a cent and a half was sufficient profit. If we had reciprocity and allowed our neighbours from the South to come in and bid on our wheat what would the results be? I do not for one moment say our wheat would all go South. We have these railroads built by this country and handed over to these railroad companies, so that these companies are in a good financial position to lower their rates and these men in Winnipeg who take the large profits out of handling our grain could take lower profits; the result would be that our grain would go practically in the same channel as it does at the present time and the farmers would get the benefit of the difference in price. Another reason why I favour reciprocity is that on the other side of the line in the last ten years wheat has been six cents a bushel higher than on this side. That is according to grade, and there is a difference between our grade and the American grade. Grain that would grade No. 3 Northern on this side would grade No. 1 or No. 2 Northern on the other side and this makes a difference of three or four cents a bushel. So you can safely say that wheat is ten cents a bushel higher on the American side than on this side, and has been so during the last ten years. Then barley is 30 cents or 35 cents or 40 cents higher on the American side than on this.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Is it that way now or has it been for the last six months?

Mr. CRUISE: I am talking of what the average has been. Oats have generally run from five cents to ten cents a bushel higher on the other side. I ask you as a reasonable man and as a farmer is it any wonder that the farmers of our West clamour for reciprocity or for an open market in the United States?

Mr. BURNHAM. Where were they clamouring?

Mr. CRUISE: Four hundred or five hundred farmers came to this House from all over Canada two years ago and asked for reciprocity. The Finance Minister claimed great credit for extending the boundaries of Manitoba. I am pleased to give him all the credit. He said the boundaries of Manitoba were raised from a postage stamp to an envelope, and $2,000,000 put in the envelope for the people of Manitoba. To this I have no objection, it was little enough for the province. But he forgot to remind the House that by that settlement 8,000,000 acres of our swamp lands in the province of Manitoba were handed back to be handled by this Government which was a great injustice to the people of Manitoba. He also forgot to state that they gave to Ontario a five-mile strip across our territory and a ten-mile strip down the Nelson river for the purpose of a townsite? What is the result? The result is that Ontario owns the port at Port Nelson. I ask any reasonable man if that was a fair deal or settlement for the province of Manitoba and I think that when the next local election comes around the people will have a voice in that matter.

Another question that came with the settlement of the boundaries of Manitoba was the practical introduction of separate schools in that province. I would ask the loyal Orangemen in Ontario who took such an active part in the last election, who denounced the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) as a Catholic and a Papist and all that sort of thing, how are they going to swallow that pill? The Manitoba school question was settled years ago, we were supposed to have national schools and we must have them. Now the question is re-opened and while we have not straight separate schools we have practically separate schools in Manitoba.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Can the hon. member state what change was made in the School Act last session that makes separate schools any more than we had them before?

Mr. CRUISE: I have not the Act but I will cite one of the Conservative organs known as the Orange Sentinel. I do not think the hon. member will deny anything in that paper. They said: No matter how the politicians of this country smooth over the school settlement in Manitoba there was no getting over the fact that Manitoba had practically separate schools.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Will the hon. gentleman permit me to state the Act? The only change—

Mr. CARVELL: Later on you will have a chance.

Mr. PROULX: Does the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) think it satisfies the Catholic minority in Manitoba?

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Where are you from?

Mr. CRUISE: The Manitoba school question was settled years ago and it was supposed to be settled for all time. If it is to be opened, then the people should be given a chance to vote on it, but it has been smuggled through by a resolution for a change in the School Act and we have now got practically separate schools.

The suggestion has been made that Western farmers should go into mixed farming. That is all very well, but if Western farmers should go into mixed farming where is their market? Only a short time ago I read in a paper that Mr. Lane, a cattle-buyer from the West, had shipped cattle to Chicago and had paid $60,000 in duty this year.

On motion of Mr. Cruise the debate was adjourned.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, November 28, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Department of Naval Service for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Hazen.

Report of the Department of Labour for the same year,—Mr. Crothers.

Regulations under the Destructive Insect and Pest Act.—Mr. Burrell.

Report of the Registrar of Boards of Conciliation and Investigation under the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, for the same year.—Mr. Crothers.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Rainville, for an Address to His Royal Highness, the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. ROBERT CRUISE (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, when I moved the adjournment of this debate last evening I was dealing with the question of mixed farming in the West. The farmers of Manitoba are going into mixed farming to a greater extent than before, they are realizing its benefits and advantages, and its tendency to increase their wealth and prosperity, although, if they go into mixed farming too extensively, they will certainly flood the present market.

Now, Sir, I would like to say a word with regard to the tariff. We were told by the late Minister of Finance that he had no objection to the people of this country buying from or dealing with the United States over a high tariff wall. I do not know how this fits in with the loyalty cry that was advanced during the last election. If a man can buy his goods in the United States, over a high tariff wall, and be loyal, I do not see why he cannot exchange his farm produce without duty and still be loyal.

I am pleased to know that the present Government is bringing in a Bill to amend the Bank Act. It will greatly benefit the farmer to be able to borrow money on the grain stored in his own granary. It will induce western farmers to build more granaries for the storing of their grain upon their own farms, and enable them to haul their grain to market in the winter when they have very little else to do. It will also enable them to prepare their land in the fall for the next year's crop.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. gentlemen, of this House for your kind attention to my remarks.

Hon. ROBERT ROGERS (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, according to the rules of the House, I am obliged this afternoon to confine the few remarks which I propose to make to the amendment now before us, as proposed by the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition, and seconded by his first lieutenant, the hon. member for Edmonton. That amendment specifically refers to two recent by-elections, one held in the constituency of Richelieu, in the province of Quebec, and the other in the constituency of Macdonald in the province of Manitoba. As to elections that have taken place in other parts of Canada, may I be permitted to say that, according with the rules of the House, I propose at a very early date to take advantage of an opportunity to show the means employed by friends of hon. gentlemen opposite in certain other parts of Canada where British law and British justice was set at defiance in such a manner as has never before been heard of in any part of the British Empire.

Referring to the election in the constituency of Macdonald, I am pleased, either in this House or outside of it, to talk about, to analyze, and to discuss the result of that particular contest. I was not much surprised at the remarks of the hon. gentleman who moved this amendment, as giving evidence that he was disappointed and even pained at having to discuss the result of the overwhelming defeat which he and his friends received at the hands of the intelligent electors of that constituency. I can quite understand that it was very hard for

the right hon. gentleman, and those who sit around him, to realize, as well they must, that the day has passed when they can any longer fool any respectable number of the intelligent electors of this Dominion, in any constituency. The old game, in which they achieved a measure of success during the past fifteen years, has been discovered, and they can no longer work it. They attempted it in the constituency of Macdonald, and it failed. They went there it is true, in the guise of respectability, to discuss the great question of reciprocity, but their hope of success in that contest was not dependent upon their being able to make clear to the farming community of that portion of Canada that reciprocity was an advantage to them. Their hope of success lay in their effort to fall back on their old policy, in the feeling that the circumstances and conditions of the locality were such as to cause their operations to meet with success. They went in there knowing as they did that it was a constituency composed of different races, creeds and nationalities, and they adopted their old policy of appealing to the passions and prejudices of the electors. But Sir, they failed in that effort. In that contest, circular after circular and tons of campaign literature were circulated by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, containing such appeals to the passions of the electorate.

I shall not trouble the House by reading many of those articles because if I were to undertake to read one quarter of them I fancy that I could occupy the time of this House from now until our Christmas holidays. I shall undertake to quote at all events a portion of that campaign literature that was placed in the hands of the Roman Catholic people in that constituency two days before the election. This literature bears the mark and the heading of the French Liberal organ in the city of Winnipeg and it gives reasons why the candidate of the Conservative party, Mr. Morrison, should be defeated in that contest. This is the language in which it is presented to the French people of that constituency:

(Copy.)

Why Rogers and his Orangeman Candidate must be defeated in Macdonald on the 12th of October.

(Le Soleil de l'Ouest, 26th Sept., 1912.)

The election which will take place in the constituency of Macdonald on the 12th of October derives a special importance from the present state of things. As is nearly always the case, our people will have to consider their religious as well as their material interests. Day after day dawns a light which must open our eyes on the first point. The close alliance of the Conservative party and Orangeism makes itself more evident every day. It is not even any longer an alliance, it is the slavery of the Conservatives under the whip of the Orangemen. The watchword was given before the last general election by the Orange Sentinel to look after the choice of the candidates. It is therefore not surprising that Mr. Morrison is an Orangeman.

That is the situation, as it has been made so by the Conservative organization. Those among the Catholics who could aspire to the Conservative nomination have been discarded and humiliated. Once more Messrs. Joseph Bernier and Aimé Bénard will yoke themselves to the Orange cart.

And why this zeal? Why this vileness? It is at the very moment when all the hypocrisy of the Conservatives appears in all its hideousness; it is at the moment when the frivolity of their promises is made so clear, both at Winnipeg and at Ottawa, that even Les Cloches cannot conceal their indignation, that this new sacrifice is asked from the Catholics in a constituency where they could rule. What audacity on the part of our enemies, and what a shame for us!

Because, only years of objection will bring such results.

Is it not time for us to raise our heads? What we have to consider is that the Conservative party, after having lived from the support of the Catholics, after having arrived to power in Manitoba with the help of the Nationalists of Quebec, has impudently been false to all its pledges.

What must be borne in mind is that one day the Orange Sentinel declares that the Catholics of Manitoba have nothing more to hope for and the following day the Roblin-Rogers combination hasten to choose an Orangeman as standard bearer; and we say, without fear of raising any discontent from self-respecting people, that it is necessary to punish the Conservative imposture. A lesson must be taught to Rogers, who has scoffed at the Nationalists and would like to still exploit them. Proof must be made that in order to succeed in politics one must first be honest and frank.

And if this is so as regards the religious question, what lesson does not the Government deserve for its conduct on reciprocity, the railways, the elevators and the navy?

The enormous losses caused to the farmers by the refusal of reciprocity are increasing every day. All the gold that the manufacturers can throw in an election will not compensate for these losses. A few dollars to buy a conscience do not compensate for the loss of a big fraction of the crop.

And the inability of the Government to provide means of transportation, to lighten the burden of taxes, to extend the market! what must be said of that?

What must be said of the evident disposition of the Borden Government to give the millions of Canada for the English navy when we have here so many needs to provide for? For his faithless politics, for his ruinous politics, both fanatical and deprived of dignity, Rogers must be given a lesson by the defeat of Morrison. Once more the arrogance of the vanquished of Saskatchewan must be curbed.

I cite this only as a sample of the campaign that was raised in that constituency of Macdonald, and while this literature was being circulated and placed in the

hands of the Roman Catholics of this constituency, a similar work was being carried on in the Protestant portions of that riding, the same policy that they have practiced there for the last ten years in every general election that we have held, in every contest in which we have engaged. They went from house to house in Protestant localities telling the electors there that they would be false to their religion and false to everything if they would go out and vote for a candidate of my choice and of the choice of those associated with me for the reason that they claimed that I had ever been guilty of being too friendly and too generous to the Roman Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba. Let me say here and now that there never was a time and there never was a place in the history of my public life when I did not plead guilty to that charge, and I stand here in the presence of this House and before the people of this country and say I plead guilty to that charge. And I plead guilty, Mr. Speaker, because I do not expect to live to see the day when, as a public representative in this Parliament or elsewhere, I will ever be guilty of anything else than fairness and generosity to the Roman Catholic minority of Manitoba or to the Roman Catholic minority of any other part of Canada or of any nationality or of any creed or of any race in any part of our Dominion.

Not alone did we have these articles, an example of which I have quoted to the House, but we had representative friends of the right hon. gentleman opposite, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, going up and down that constituency, carrying, as they claimed, messages from the right hon. gentleman himself. Let me quote you some of the statements that were made in this connection:

Extract from speech delivered by G. Boyer, M.P., at St. Eustache in Macdonald election.

(Translated from the French).

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I bring to you a message from the province of Quebec the native place of several of you. You all know that the province of Quebec has remained faithful to the great patriot who was, last fall, deprived of power by a wave of fanaticism. More than ever, the Liberal leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier is loved and honoured by all, Conservatives and Liberals, and to-day a large number of French-Canadian Conservatives regret the unfortunate ballot that they have cast against one of their compatriots to sweep him out of power. The message that I am bringing to you from the greatest French-Canadian who has given lustre to our country is the request for your support in his policy of progress and prosperity. We must be proud of our race and vote for the man who has brought such glorious fame to his French-Canadian countrymen. Do not forget, you halfbreeds who hear me, that in years, past, that great champion of your rights has again and again in the House of Commons, expressed his sympathy for you, while all that time, the Conservatives have done their utmost to take away what you held most sacred; they have dragged your beloved chief into jail, they have betrayed him in order to bring him to the scaffold.

When you are making your ballot on the 12th, remember that Riel was hanged by the government of Alex. Morrison.

These were the words spoken by Mr. G. Boyer, M.P. for Vaudreuil. Now, let me quote you certain statements made by another hon. gentleman in support of the candidate of the Opposition; these words were spoken at Notre Dame de Lourdes on October 10, 1912:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, that great statesman, that illustrious leader of the Liberal party, Sir Wilfrid of whom all Canadians are proud and whose name is pronounced with pride and justly so, by all those who have French blood in their veins, has spent the energy of a powerful life in order to better the lot of the farmer. . .

Thank God! the cause for which he fought has not perished. No, reciprocity is not dead. The interests of the farmer in this agricultural country cannot be lost sight of. Those interests can be the object of serious attacks, but the time is not far remote when the defender of the prosperity and liberty of the farmer shall again with increased strength be at the head of the Government. To you, farmers of Macdonald, I am speaking in his name. Let your vote be a message of sympathy and a proof of your co-operation with him in his struggle for the maintenance of your rights. Let it not be said that his French compatriots, who love, honour and respect him, who are justly proud of him, and proclaim him the most eminent of them all, let it not be said that they have forsaken him at the very time when he is the most solicitous for their welfare. Let them rally around him, let them stand by him till the day when again they shall hail him as the leader of our National destinies.

In the same speech the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe said:

The political party that has protected the interests of the citizens of French origin is not the Conservative party, (which is the instrument of the fanatical section of Ontario), but it is the Liberal party the leader of which is the greatest, the most patriotic, the most earnest Frenchman of all the Frenchmen in Canada.

These words were spoken by Mr. Gauthier, M.P. for St. Hyacinthe, at Notre Dame de Lourdes, and they form a sample of the campaign as waged in that particular contest. They made every appeal to race, to creed, and to passion. It is true that they discussed the question of reciprocity, as stated by the member for St. Hyacinthe, who made the speech I have quoted on the occasion named, and

I can understand my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) having very great difficulty in realizing that reciprocity was buried on the 21st September, 1911. It is true, Sir, that the right hon. gentleman undertook, a few months ago, to revive his reciprocity child. He made a little tour in the Province of Quebec, and in portions of the Province of Ontario, and he undertook to assure the people of these provinces that he was going to be able to resuscitate this child, and that his greatest hope of success lay in the nourishment that he could bring to it from Western Canada in particular. He so convinced himself, evidently, that this was possible, that he entrusted that reciprocity child to his first lieutenant, the hon. member for Edmonton, and he instructed him, with a large number of other hon. gentlemen on that side of the House, to go into the constituency of Macdonald, and see what they could do in that regard. They went there, and presented the arguments, as instructed by the right hon. gentleman. They presented the resurrected corpse of reciprocity, but only to stand by on the 12th of October and witness its reburial at the hands of the intelligent electors in that constituency. I am only sorry that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not carry out his intention to visit Western Canada, because, in connection with the issue of the writ for the election in Macdonald, I was particularly careful, according to my understanding of his proposed programme, to fix the date of that election at a time that would be convenient for him to be present in order that he might have an opportunity on the 12th day of October to administer the unholy rites of his party to that baby that was being buried five times deeper than ever before by the intelligent electors of that constituency. We may have an opportunity at some future period, however; because, so far as reciprocity is concerned, so far as the record of this Government is concerned, so far as the general welfare and general policy of this Dominion are concerned, from now on we propose to go before the intelligent electors of this Dominion in every constituency that becomes open, and there we shall be willing and ready to test the will of the people upon the questions of the day. We shall be prepared to meet the right hon. gentleman, and those that surround him, on any question of policy that they will undertake to put forward at any time, and we will do so, not after the fashion of hon. gentlemen opposite, but upon the ground of our general administration. We will stand by the grand old National Policy of Macdonald, upon which has been built the great and glorious Dominion of which we are all so proud to day. By that policy we are prepared to stand or fall, in any constituency, in any part of Canada, be it east or west. We are unike hon. gentlemen in this respect, that they have one policy for the West, and another policy for the East; one policy for one race, and another policy for another race. When we went into the contest in Macdonald, we did not go, as hon. gentlemen opposite expected we would, apologizing for reciprocity. I had occasion to say in Montreal a short time before that election that there was no honest sentiment in favour of reciprocity in Western Canada. This statement of mine appeared to be seized upon by hon. gentlemen opposite, and it was used, in season and out of season, in Western Canada; but we stood by that statement, and our friends in Western Canada stood by it. We went before them and used the same words in Macdonald as we used in Montreal. In my first speech in the Macdonald contest I not only made it clear that in my judgment there was no sentiment in favour of reciprocity, but I undertook to deny in the strongest language possible that reciprocity carried any advantage to the farmers or the farming community of Western Canada. On the contrary, I pointed out that no part of this Dominion had profited more by rejecting reciprocity than that same western country. Those were the arguments which were advanced and upon which we won the magnificent victory which we did win upon that particular occasion. In advancing those arguments with regard to the economic position of the Canadian people as it has been built up and established under the National Policy, I was able there, as I am here to-day, to support my statement with a witness who will carry the confidence in that respect of the people of all parts of this Dominion. I was able in that contest to support those arguments and that statement by speech delivered by Mr. Woodrow Wilson, Democratic candidate at that time, in the great Republic to the south of us, and now the newly elected President of the United States. Speaking at New Haven on the 28th of September last, Mr. Wilson used the following language:

> I was very much interested in some of the reasons given by our friends across the Canadian border for being very shy about the reciprocity arrangements. They said: 'We were not sure where these arrangements will lead, and we do not care to associate too closely with the economic conditions of the United States until these conditions are as modern as ours. When I resented this and asked particulars, I had to retire from the debate because I found that they had adjusted

their economic development to conditions which we had not yet found a way to meet in the United States.'

If we have these favourable economic conditions within our Dominion, then again I claim that it is due to the grand policy laid down by Macdonald and Cartier upon which we have built up the great nation that excites the admiration of our friends to the south of us and draws from the President the language which I have just quoted. That is the policy that triumphed in Macdonald, and that is the policy that will triumph in almost every constituency throughout Canada.

Now, let me come to another point. Hon. gentlemen opposite have tried to apologize for their defeat by making statements which are not warranted by the facts. They undertake, not alone by their own statements, but through their reptile press from one end of Canada to another, to make assertions with respect to certain arrests that were made in that constituency that are unjust, unfair, and untrue. From my knowledge of the conditions, I make the statement that no arrest was made in that constituency that was not fully and completely justified by the circumstances at that time. It is true that a mistake may have been made through the generosity—

Some hon. MEBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROGERS: I will ask my hon. friends to wait and see whether they will say 'hear, hear' when I have finished my sentence. It is true that a mistake may have been made, or that, through generosity, some of the persons in Manitoba who had in charge the prosecutions did not, out of sympathy, carry them to a conclusion. Hon. gentlemen undertook to cite here the evidence of individuals who were arrested, and they dwelt more upon one case than upon any other. I am not going to weary the House by citing long affidavits in all of the cases, but I am going to give one or two in order that hon. gentlemen may understand the circumstances, that the House will have a knowledge of the conditions and circumstances, and that the people may understand the misrepresentations that have been made throughout the country by the reptile press of hon. gentlemen opposite. Especial mention has been made of the arrest of one W. B. Sifton. In order that this House may fully understand the circumstances and conditions, let me tell you who Mr. W. B. Sifton is. Mr. W. B. Sifton is an individual who was employed by the Government of the right hon. gentlemen opposite and paid a handsome salary out of the public treasury for years and who practically performed no service save and except to go about the country debauching the half-breed vote in different localities. Hon. gentlemen opposite occupied the time of the House in reading certain affidavits; let me read one or two in this connection. The first which I shall read is sworn to by Mr. Thomas Stedman than whom no more respectable, no more honourable, citizen lives in the city of Winnipeg to-day. What does he swear to?

Canada,
Province of Manitoba,
To wit:

In the matter of the Dominion Elections Act and of a by-election in the electoral district of Macdonald, in the province of Manitoba, held on October 12, 1912.

I. Thomas Stedman, of the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, merchant, make oath and say as follows:—

That on Thursday, October 10, 1912, I registered at the Lake View Hotel in the village of St. Laurent, in the said electoral district of Macdonald, and received word that several men were located there working in the then existing election campaign in the interests of the Liberal party. The names of these men I learned were Davis, Jerome and Sifton, and I shortly got in touch with the three men when I noticed they were working most energetically among the French half-breeds, of whom there are a great number in that district. I also saw and was convinced that William Sifton was the leader of these men and saw him spending money very freely in the hotel supplying all and sundry half-breeds with liquor, and I was informed by a number of said half-breeds that the said Sifton had promised them money if they would vote for and use their influence in favour of the candidature of Robert Lorne Richardson, the independent Liberal candidate.

I know that the said Sifton remained at the Lake View Hotel, in the village of St. Laurent, all of that night, and early on Friday morning saw him gather together many of the half-breeds whom he had been with the previous day and take them into the bar of the hotel and purchase liquor for them. He remained in the same bar-room and continued all morning until noon to purchase liquor for these breeds. He was talking to them all the time in the native language of the said half-breeds, which is the Saulteux tongue of the native nations.

I questioned a half-breed by the name of William Ducharme on the morning of Friday, the 11th day of October, 1912, as to what had transpired between himself and the said William Sifton, and he, the said half-breed, in the presence of others stated to me that the said Sifton had offered him the sum of twenty-five dollars ($25) if he, the said Ducharme, would use his vote and influence in favour of the candidature of the said Robert Lorne Richardson, the independent Liberal candidate. Subsequently the said Ducharme also told me that the said Sifton had instructed him to rent a house for the use of the Liberal party and that the said Sifton had sent to said house large quantities of intoxicating liquors, food, tobacco, &c.

I saw the said Sifton take a half-breed named Augustian Chaboyer aside and talk to him and afterwards in the presence of others, questioned this said Chaboyer when he

stated that the said Sifton had offered him twenty-five dollars ($25) to vote for the said Richardson, to be paid that evening on arrival of train from Winnipeg, and that the said Sifton had informed him that five thousand dollars ($5,000) was to be spent in that district in the interests of the said Richardson.

I also questioned a half-breed by the name of Baptiste Lagimodière on that occasion and on several occasions since and have been informed by the said Baptiste Lagimodière that the said Sifton gave to him a sum of money and a quantity of intoxicating liquors in order to induce him, the said Lagimodière, to vote for and use his influence in favour of the election of the said Robert Lorne Richardson.

I saw the said William Sifton draw aside the said half-breed Baptiste Lagimodière and hand to him two envelopes. This occurred on the front steps of the said Lake View Hotel and he, the said Sifton, at the same time spoke to the said Lagimodière in the Saulteux tongue.

Sworn before me at the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, this 21st day of November, A.D. 1912.

N. Cox Stewart,
A Commisisoner in B. R., &c.

THOMAS STEDMAN.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me read another affidavit from a gentleman who like Mr. Stedman is a man of honour, highly respected in the city of Winnipeg. This is the affidavit:

Canada,
Province of Manitoba,
To wit:

In the matter of the Dominion Elections Act and of a by-election in the electoral district of Macdonald, in the province of Manitoba, held on October 12, 1912.

I, Herbert Jarvis, of the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba, private detective, make oath and say as follows:—

That on Monday, October 7th, 1912, I registered at the Lake View hotel in the village of St. Laurent in the said electoral district of Macdonald and received word that several men were located there working in the then existing election campaign in the interests of the Liberal party. The names of these men I learned were Davis, Jerome and Sifton and I shortly got in touch with the three men when I noticed they were working most energetically among the French half-breeds, of whom there are a great number in that district. I also saw and was convinced that William Sifton was the leader of these men and saw him spending money very freely in the hotel supplying all and sundry half-breeds with liquor, and I was informed by a number of said half-breeds that the said Sifton had promised them money if they would vote for and use their influence in favour of the candidature of Robert Lorne Richardson, the independent Liberal candidate.

I know that the said Sifton remained at the Lake View hotel in the village of St. Laurent all of that night and early on Friday morning saw him gather together many of the half-breeds whom he had been with the previous day and take them into the bar of the hotel and purchase liquor for them. He remained in the same bar-room and continued all morning until noon to purchase liquor for these breeds. He was talking to them all the time in the native language of the said half-breeds, which is the Saulteux tongue of the native nations.

I questioned a half-breed by the name of William Ducharme on the morning of Friday the 11th day of October, 1912, as to what had transpired between himself and the said William Sifton, and he, the said half-breed, in the presence of others stated to me that the said Sifton had offered him the sum of twenty-five dollors ($25) if he, the said Ducharme, would use his vote and influence in favour of the candidature of the said Robert Lorne Richardson, the independent Liberal candidate. Subsequently the said Ducharme also told me that the said Sifton had instructed him to rent a house for the use of the Liberal party and that the said Sifton had sent to said house large quantities of intoxicating liquors, food, tobacco, &c.

I saw the said Sifton take a half-breed named Augustian Chaboyer aside and talk to him and afterwards in the presence of others, I questioned this said Chaboyer when he stated that the said Sifton had offered him twenty-five dollars ($25) to vote for the said Richardson to be paid that evening on arrival of train from Winnipeg, and that the said Sifton had informed him that five thousand dollars $5,000) was to be spent in that district in the interests of the said Richardson.

I also questioned a half-breed by the name of Baptiste Lagimodière on that occasion and on several occasions since and have been informed by the said Baptiste Lagimodière that the said Sifton gave to him a sum of money and a quantity of intoxicating liquors in order to induce him, the said Lagimodière to vote for and to use his influence in favour of the election of the said Robert Lorne Richardson.

I saw the said William Sifton draw aside the said half-breed Baptiste Lagimodière and hand to him two envelopes. This occurred on the front steps of the said Lake View hotel and he, the said Sifton, at the same time spoke to the said Lagimodière in the Saulteux tongue.

Sworn before me at the city of Winnipeg in the province of Manitoba, this 21st day of November, A.D. 1912.

F. Dobbs,
A Commissioner in B. R., &c.

HERBERT JARVIS.

I may remark that Mr. Sifton was not even a resident of the constituency. He was one of these who are imported by hon. gentlemen opposite for the purpose, as I have said, of debauching the electors and half-breeds of Macdonald. More than that I repeat what I said a moment ago, that for years he was able to live at the expense of the people of Canada, and his principal occupation was carrying out this particular work throughout different parts of the West. He was an experienced individual in that way. I will read an affidavit from a man who was offered money

himself at the hands of this Mr. Sifton. The affidavit says:

Canada,
Province of Manitoba.
In the matter of the Dominion Elections Act and of a by-election in the electoral district of Macdonald, held on October the 12th, 1912, consequent upon the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown by the member elected on September the 21st, 1911.

I, Augustian Chaboyer, of the parish of St. Laurent, in the province of Manitoba, labourer, make oath and say:—

1. That on or about the 11th day of October, A.D. 1912, I, being an elector of the electoral district of Macdonald aforesaid, was approached by one William Sifton, who is well known to me and who in my own language, which is the Soto tongue of the natives of Manitoba known as Indians, offered to pay me for my vote and influence in the election then immediately about to be held, and did give to me in order to induce me to assist him in having elected the candidate Robert Lorne Richardson several drinks of whiskey or other intoxicating liquors.

2. That the said William Sifton offered to pay me a sum of money if I would work and use my influence in the interests of the candidature of the said Robert Lorne Richardson, who was a candidate at the election then immediately about to be held.

Sworn before me at the parish of St. Laurent, in the province of Manitoba, this 24th day of October, A.D. 1912.
J. M. J. MULVIHILL,
A Commisisoner in B. R., &c.
AUGUSTIAN CHABOYER.

Mr. CARVELL: Does that affidavit state that the half-breed took the money.

Mr. ROGERS: He took the whiskey.

Mr. NEELY: Why were these gentlemen not prosecuted?

Mr. ROGERS: I have told the hon. gentleman already why they were not prosecuted, and I will tell him again. Sifton has been regarded as a public nuisance in that province for years, and if he was not prosecuted it was not because there was not abundance of evidence against him on which to base a prosecution——

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Will the hon. gentleman permit me——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not want to ask a question if the minister does not want to give way. I was going to ask the minister why he does not initiate prosecutions now against this gentleman

Mr. ROGERS: If the hon. gentleman will wait a minute I will tell him. The hon. gentleman opposite told us here the other day that a protest had been entered against the election of the member for Macdonald, and I now tell these gentlemen opposite that a counter protest has been entered against their candidate, and we expect that the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite will be revealed to the public, and will not further be tolerated in this country. We are going to see that there shall be placed before the courts of the country a full and thorough examination of the records of the Liberals in that constituency.

I will not weary the House by reading more of these affidavits. Mention has been made of the arrest of a Mr. Sullivan who had been imported from the province of Saskatchewan. I wonder if hon. members from the province of Ontario ever heard that name 'Sullivan.' To those who recollect that name I would like to say that the gentleman who was arrested in Macdonald was no less a person than a nephew of old 'Cap.' Sullivan, the hope of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario for a great many years. And, as 'Cap.' Sullivan was the hope of the Liberal party in days past and gone, in the great province of Ontario, so the Sullivan arrested in Manitoba has been and is to-day the hope of the Liberal party in the province of Saskatchewan. And let me tell them that this man Sullivan operated in the recent elections in the province of Saskatchewan in such a manner as to put to shame all the efforts ever made on behalf of the Liberal party in the province of Ontario by the notorious 'Cap.' Sullivan. And I ask you this: When an individual of this kind would come into the province of Manitoba, register under an assumed name, and undertake to go down into the county of Macdonald and start to operate, was it not the first duty of the officers of the law of that province to place such an individual as that into custody? I say it was. And I say the same applies in the case of every arrest that was made in that connection. But now we are going to have them before the courts, and we will make clear the reasons why these men were arrested. In every case there has been complete justification for the action taken by the officers of the law as I understand it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Let us have some proof.

Mr. ROGERS: Do I understand the hon. gentleman to ask about Richelieu? If so, I shall be glad to deal with that matter.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I never mentioned the word 'Richelieu.' What I did say, and I—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member ought to know that he has no right to interrupt a member who has the floor.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): May I ask the hon. Minister (Mr. Rogers) a question?

Mr. ROGERS: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I merely made the suggestion that it would be quite proper for the hon. Minister (Mr. Rogers) to give us some evidence of irregularities having been practised by this man Sullivan, and not ask hon. gentlemen on this side to accept the minister's word as to irregularities.

Mr. ROGERS: I promised hon. gentlemen in my opening remarks, that at an early day I would discuss everything connected with the Saskatchewan election. I will take advantage of a future opportunity to discuss the record of the hon. gentleman's friend Sullivan to his entire satisfaction.

The other day the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made a rather specific charge against myself in connection with the election held in Richelieu, and I ask the attention of the House for a moment or two while I deal with his remarks in that connection. He said:

> My hon. friend is ambitious in this respect. He had gone to Saskatchewan in the summer; he came to Quebec later on.

In making that statement the right hon. gentleman says what is absolutely incorrect.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What statement?

Mr. ROGERS: That I had gone to Saskatchewan in the summer. I was not in Saskatchewan during the time of the election. Again the right hon. gentleman has been led astray by the reptile press that supports him up and down this country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have some recollection of having read a speech of my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) delivered at a banquet in Regina.

Mr. ROGERS: Quite right. It is true, I was in Regina, but it was long before the writs for the election were issued.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROGERS: Do hon. gentlemen opposite mean to say that I have no right to go to Regina if I please? I did visit Regina, but it was long before the writs were issued. The right hon. gentleman continued:

> He came to Richelieu, not himself, personally, but by proxy; he sent a proxy to Richelieu, and the proxy came with his hands full of promises of public works if the electors would vote for the Conservative candidate, Mr. Morgan. I again charge the Minister of Public Works, and I arraign him before Parliament, with having tried to bribe the electors of Richelieu. I call as witness a member of this House, the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) and I say, on the word of the hon. member for Charlevoix, that he was sent by the Minister of Public Works to Richelieu to try and bribe the electors. I shall not use my own words; I have the words of Sir Rodolphe Forget published in La Patrie.

Now, that article, as quoted by the hon. gentleman and printed in 'Hansard,' will not in any particular bear out the argument he advanced in support of the charge he made on that occasion. It may be true, —it is true—that the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) went to the constituency of Richelieu. That hon. gentleman is quite able to take care of himself either in the constituency of Richelieu or in this House. But the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) charged me with making a promise by proxy or in some other form that a marine railway should be built in the town of Sorel in the county of Richelieu. Let me tell my right hon. friend, and tell this House and this country, what truth there is in that statement. It was not until weeks after the election in Richelieu that I had ever heard that a marine railway was proposed or expected to be built in Richelieu. I had never been spoken to about it,—never heard of it, neither the hon. member for Charlevoix nor anybody else had mentioned the matter to me. Yet we have the right hon. gentleman standing in this House and making such statements—misled again by the statements appearing in his reptile press from one end of the country to the other. It is true that there was a time in the history of Canada when the Liberal press of this country had some sense of decency and were guided in their statements by some sort of principle. But that day was before the right hon. gentleman undertook to guide his party in this Dominion. He would be a bold man who would say that, to-day, principle or truth finds much place in the papers that support the right hon. gentleman in every part of this Dominion.

I am prepared to leave this case before the House and the country. We went into the constituency of Macdonald and carried it by an overwhelming majority. That victory was due to the intelligence of the electors of that constituency.

Mr. PROULX: So was our victory in Richelieu.

Mr. ROGERS: Richelieu was carried by the hon. gentlemen opposite a year ago by a majority of over 750, and they had practically no opposition in the fight; but in this contest the majority fell by over 500 We are all human, Sir, and all make mis-

takes, and the Government made a mistake in not going to Richelieu and advocating the National Policy, which in no part of Canada should be better received than in the constituency of Richelieu. If that policy had been presented by the most humble member of this Government, I am satisfied we would have returned with another scalp from the hon. gentlemen opposite, and when the time comes, if vacancies occur in other constituencies, we will be there, and we will be there at the close of the contest to see the right hon. gentleman and those who assist him play the part of the chief mourners in a further downfall of their unholy policy, by which they have endeavoured to fool the people of Canada for the past fifteen years. I am prepared to leave the amendment to the judgment of this House, and to the intelligent consideration of the people of Canada as a whole.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.): Mr. Speaker, this House has been treated during the last hour to the most remarkable exhibition that it has witnessed I believe, since 1867—an exhibition of blow and bluster, and threats, that the press shall be throttled; that hordes of detectives and police shall be brought into every constituency in the country when elections are taking place; and my hon. friend wants this House to take these statements as argument.

I will try to answer some of the statements of my hon. friend which, to my mind at least, seem to bear a semblance of argument; but before dealing directly with the subjects mentioned by my hon. friend, I wish to deal very briefly with the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which refers to the naval question. I do this, because of a very significant paragraph appearing in the 'Citizen' of this morning and, I presume, in the other papers, although I have not had an opportunity of examining them. I find that in the Imperial Parliament yesterday the Government was asked by a member of the House of Commons certain questions as to the subject matter of the Speech from the Throne delivered by His Royal Highness the Governor General. The answer of Mr. Asquith is as follows:

> Hon. Mr. Asquith's reply was purely noncommittal. Memorandum had been prepared at the express wish of the Canadian Government, which defined with fulness and precision the position adopted by the Imperial Government. This would be laid before the House without delay, but must first go before the Canadian Government.

I do not know whether in the transmission of this statement the word 'government' was used for 'parliament.' However, I presume it is of no great importance, because the British Premier says, 'I will lay them before the British public,' therefore I assume the Canadian Premier will lay them before the Canadian public. When we receive the statement which he has brought back from England, it will be the duty of every member of this House, and of every voter in the country, to judge for himself as to whether or not an emergency exists, and as to whether the policy which the Government intend bringing down should or should not be adopted. I have, therefore, no further comment to make upon the naval question. I am happy to say that this question will be discussed in the full light of all the information which these gentlemen have been parading throughout the country that they have been receiving from the British Admiralty, and which, as my hon. friend the Postmaster General in his paper the other day said, was absolutely confidential—so confidential that it could not be given to the public, 'but,' they said, 'take our word for it, an absolute case of emergency exists.'

Mr. PELLETIER: I never said that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. CARVELL: 'Take it back'—that is a bad habit on the other side, it is chronic. My hon. friend's paper said it, and what is the difference?

I come now to deal very briefly with the amendment proposed by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, an amendment which in, my opinion, contains more real venom to the square inch than any document I ever before heard in the House of Commons—an amendment which says that in the elections of Macdonald and Richelieu there were practices calculated to terrorize and corrupt the electorate, which were connived at by His Majesty's ministers. I am sorry my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) is leaving, because I have a few words to say about this tyranny.

We have listened this afternoon to an hour's defence of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, who without a doubt is charged as being the arch-priest of all this tyranny which has taken place in this constituency of Macdonald. We have listened to his explanation of the matter, and what do we find? We find two affidavits, one by Stedman and one by Jarvis, which would not be admitted for one moment in any court of law—two affidavits which are nothing but hearsay, excepting in so far as one of the affidavits states that the deponent saw Mr. Sifton speaking to certain electors in the county of Macdonald. If that is a crime, that statement would be allowed in a court of law, but everything else in the affidavits is, 'somebody told me something'—somebody told him that they had offered money, and that one man had re-

ceived $25. In the affidavit of one man, it is stated that he was given a drink of whisky and offered some money which he would not take. Think of all the men in the province of Manitoba who would not take the $25 when it was offered to them. But I will tell you what the affidavit did not state: It did not tell how much the half-breed got for giving the affidavit. We are not trying to defend Mr. Sifton. If Mr. Sifton attempted to corrupt the half-breeds of the province of Manitoba, he should be punished. If Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Prince, Mr. Walkinshaw, or any other man attempted to corrupt the electors of the province of Manitoba, they should be punished. What we are complaining of, and what the people of this country are complaining of—and no man knows it better than the hon. Minister of Public Works—is the arbitrary, unfair, unBritish, unCanadian attempt to throttle and control the people of the constituency by a horde of detectives and hirelings of the government, practices which would not be tolerated in Russia, let alone in Canada, and the Minister comes here and reads an affidavit of one of the criminals who says: I saw this man talking to different voters, and I believe there was something crooked.

Let us follow this for a moment. I shall not reread these affidavits, but I shall briefly describe what took place in each case. Take the case of Walkinshaw. The Minister of Public Works put up the biggest bluff I ever saw this afternoon in the House when he told us he had affidavits regarding the arrest of Walkinshaw, Prince and Sullivan, but will refer to them some other time. Mr. Speaker, he has not got them.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): Yes, he has.

Mr. CARVELL: And he knows he has not got them.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): Yes, he has.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, come off. I am talking to the empty seat of the Minister of Public Works. I do not want any of the back-benchers to interrupt when I am talking to the Minister of Public Works. When they have got their affidavits we will discuss them.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario): Do not get excited.

Mr. CARVELL: Now we will discuss the case of Walkinshaw. Walkinshaw was a British subject, a resident of Ontario, a man who entered the constituency of Macdonald. He had as much right there as had the Minister of Public Works or any other citizen of Canada. I am surprised at the doctrine put forward by the Minister of Public Works and cheered to the echo by his followers when he says that this man was not a resident of Macdonald and, therefore, had no right to be in the constituency. We might say that about the Minister of Public Works himself. He is not a resident of the constituency of Macdonald, but we do not deny his right to be there; we do not deny the right of any citizen, let him be British or anything else. I may be running now contrary to my friend from Simcoe, but this is a free country, and any man has a right to go into a constituency and, by legitimate argument, convince people to vote his way if he can. Mr. Walkinshaw went in there, he was shadowed for a number of days and finally was arrested at a place some distance from Winnipeg, I think north of Rothwell. He was arrested by a provincial detective or constable. He was taken to jail, his person was searched, his papers were pilfered from his possession, his money was taken away from him, his watch was taken away from him, he was taken into a cell, and he was stripped to the pelt like a murderer for fear he might have weapons concealed about him. He was compelled to put his clothes on a bench in a corridor and leave them all night. Then he was taken from that town to Winnipeg. He tried to see his solicitor. His solicitor came to the jail and he was told by the jailer he would have an opportunity of seeing his solicitor on his way to the train. He was at once taken into another room, he was taken out of a side door and put in an automobile and switched off to the railway station and the solicitor was left behind. He was brought to the station at Winnipeg and taken to Portage about sixty miles away. There he was put in prison again and there he was measured and photographed and weighed, all particulars were taken of him as they would be of a crook from the city of New York. He was kept there and finally was taken before a magistrate. He demanded bail and they said they could not give it to him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: You should tell the House that he had counsel all this time.

Mr. CARVELL: I tell the House that his counsel were not allowed to see him and his counsel never saw him until he came into court on Saturday afternoon, according to the affidavit.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I had no part in my professional capacity in this matter, but I live in Portage la Prairie, and I am——

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Speaker, if my hon. friend wants to ask a question——

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am aware he had counsel.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. CARVELL: Take what back? He was never allowed to see his counsel and was brought into court on Saturday afternoon, the afternoon of the election. He wanted bail, but could not get it and was sent back to jail, and was kept there till eight o'clock in the evening and after that hour, when the election was all over, he was allowed bail. He was brought into court the next week. The government had no evidence to offer against him and he was dismissed with an honourable acquittal. This is his narrative of what took place——

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Speaker——

Mr. CARVELL: It must hurt my hon. friend or he would not writhe under it the way he does. I do not propose that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) shall make a speech while I am making mine.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. CARVELL: I claim the floor and I want to tell my hon. friend I do not wonder that he writhes under the narration of these facts because I will do him the credit to say that I think he is one man from Manitoba who, under ordinary circumstances, would like to be a gentleman and I do not wonder that he writhes under the narration of this unBritish treatment meted out to another British subject.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am rising to a point of order, if I can make my voice heard above the furore of my hon. friend. I take the point of order because the hon. member made a statement, and of my own knowledge I corrected what he said.

Mr. CARVELL: That is not a point of order, and I object to my hon. friend being allowed to go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CARVELL: It is not a point of order, and I object.

Mr. SPEAKER: If I understand, the hon. member made a statement which the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), of his own personal knowledge, denies, which denial, as I understand the rule, it was not only the right but the duty of the hon. member (Mr. Carvell) to accept.

Mr. CARVELL: I am willing to bow to the ruling of the Chair. If I had made a statement about the hon. member himself, and he rose to make a personal statement, your ruling would be correct, but, Sir, I was not referring to the hon. member for Portage la Prairie at all, but to Walkinshaw, who was put in jail in Portage la Prairie, according to the affidavit. That is all I am doing.

We come next to the case of the man Prince, another man who was not mentioned by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers), another man who he would try to make you believe was a thug and a crook, and against whom he had affidavits which he did not dare to produce. And then he would like you to take his statement and the statement of his comembers and—I will not say reptile press but Manitoba press, which means about the same thing—that these men are crooked and not entitled to the treatment of British subjects in the province of Manitoba. If he could say that because Walkinshaw was a British subject residing in the province of Ontario, he was debarred from taking a part in the election in Macdonald, he could not make that charge against Mr. Prince, because Mr. Prince is a British subject, and a resident of the city of St. Boniface, which is just across the river from the city of Winnipeg, and which, I am informed, is not more than three or four miles beyond the confines of the constituency of Macdonald. Prince was a student-at-law, a man, I should judge, of more than ordinary intelligence, because, when they tried to coerce him into pleading guilty by holding out promises of mercy and pardon, the young man refused to do so, and they did not get a confession from him. This man Prince was arrested at a point near Cardinal—I have forgotten the exact place—and was taken to jail at Cardinal. But before he was arrested, or at the time he was arrested, he attempted to telephone to headquarters at Winnipeg. He went to the telephone and rang up Winnipeg, but the Tory detective, or provincial constable, snatched him away from the telephone, and said, 'You cannot telephone.' It was a Tory Government telephone. Fortunately, or unfortunately for the Tory party, at that very moment, he was called up on the telephone by some other party, and his captors—I cannot use any other word——

An hon. MEMBER: Kidnappers.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, kidnappers is a better word—not knowing who was calling him, and not dreaming that he was called by headquarters at Winnipeg, allowed him to go to the telephone, and he was able to tell his friends at Winnipeg that he had been arrested and was in durance vile at the hands of the political heelers of Manitoba. They told him they were going to take him to Winnipeg, and at Winnipeg friends were waiting for him with solicitors and bail. But he was taken only half way to Winnipeg, to a place called Somerset, and thence to a place called Miami, and from there, by horse and carriage, he was conveyed 18 miles across country and lodged in jail at Morden. He was kept there for two or three

days—two days, I think; he was fed on porridge without any cream or milk, dry bread without any butter, and drank tea without milk or sugar. He was treated as a political prisoner would not be treated in Russia. The night he was put in jail he was waited on by Detective Ross, the man who had kidnapped him, and was charged with violating the provisions of Section 269 of the Election Act, which is the section relating to undue influence, that is, he was charged with making promises to an elector in order to induce him to vote, or to refrain from voting at the election. They told him, 'now, you had better plead guilty, because we have searched your papers, and we find in those papers certain names, and opposite one name the sum of $10, and that is proof positive that you were going to pay this elector $10; therefore, it is a very serious crime.' It is a fearful thing in Manitoba, apparently, for a man to have a document in his pocket with a man's name upon it and opposite it the sum of $10. They said, 'you had better plead guilty,' but he said: 'No, and more than that, you are lying when you say you found that document. You did not find that document among my papers.' A few minutes after that, he was waited upon by another Tory official, the jailer and the jailer pleaded with him to make the same confession, but he gave the same answer. A short time after that the Tory official next in importance, the hotelkeeper, came along. I think, Sir, I should apologize to the hotelkeeper; I think he is the man of first importance in the machine of Manitoba. Well, the hotelkeeper came along, and he repeated the same statements. He said: 'We have got you solid, we have got that name with $10 marked opposite it, and you had better plead guilty, and if so we will let you go.' Remember that this was the day before the election. He said, 'No, I will not do it,' and he was kept in jail all night, and the next morning the hotelkeeper appeared and repeated the suggestion. Still the young man refused to plead guilty when he was not guilty. Then he was taken before the Court, and he wanted bail. They would not give him bail, because they said this was a case of such terrible importance that it would never do to allow him bail. I think I am wrong about that; I think that was Walkinshaw. However, he was remanded then until Saturday, and they held him in durance until the election was over. The following week, on Wednesday or Thursday, he was brought up for trial, but no person appeared against him, and the Crown prosecutor said, 'We have no evidence,' and the man was honourably discharged; he received an honourable acquittal. And all this was done in free Manitoba.

Then we come to the evidence in the case of Sifton, in connection with which my hon. friend (Mr. Rogers) read an affidavit this afternoon. They did not have the nerve to put Sifton in jail, or to search his pockets for money or papers, but they arrested him on Friday afternoon, the day before the election. He had in his possession, and they knew he had, the scrutineer's papers for the polls in that vicinity, and to prevent him from going out to organize the Liberal party, they held him until Saturday night. They urged him to plead guilty, and they would give him an acquittal, but he would not do so; and they held him till late at night, and finally let him go, on the personal guarantee of one of those sleuth hounds that he would appear at 10 o'clock on Monday morning. Then he met one of the Tory organizers, who said: 'I will fix that; I will telephone up to the police office; they will fix it up, and you will get your discharge,' and they gave him his liberty, not his discharge. They would not give him an honourable acquittal and he would not accept it, and he has not got his honourable acquittal yet. They dare not prosecute him.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. CARVELL: He is a cowardly man who says, 'Hear, hear,' when a man has his liberty taken away and they dare not prosecute.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think it is in order to use the term 'cowardly.'

Mr. CARVELL: If that is not a just reprimand—perhaps I should say it is a modest reprimand—I will withdraw it. Now, what does all this mean? I have as hurriedly as possible narrated the different processes by which those three men were arrested; deprived of their independence and their liberty, carried around from one jail in Manitoba to another, refused the right to see their solicitors, refused bail and a hearing, kept in durance until after the election, and then told to go about their business with the statement, 'We have nothing against you.' What does it all mean? Just what my hon. friend the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) at the opening of this debate declared: It means that in no other British country, probably in no other country in the world, would it be possible for a man's liberty to be so taken away as was done in the province of Manitoba on that accasion, and, I believe, on many previous occasions; because, from information I have received, it seems to be the settled policy and line of conduct of the Tory party in Manitoba during elections. My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) shakes his head. He is getting wiser than he was half an hour ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have it in writing. I will show it to you soon.

Mr. CARVELL: What does it all mean? I have no fault to find if a man pleads guilty, or if he is prosecuted; but I want this House and the country to consider what it would mean in any province in Canada, outside of Manitoba, if a man arrested for murder, caught red handed in the act, were refused the advice of counsel. Can you conceive a condition of affairs like that, can you conceive a man being refused counsel no matter what charge might be laid against him? Every practising lawyer in this House knows that the first thing any man charged with a crime does is to send for his solicitor, and here is not a jailer, a sheriff, or a public official in Canada, outside of Manitoba, who would for a moment dare to refuse a man the right to see and have the advice of counsel before he is brought up in court and asked to plead to an indictment. What does all this mean? All this means that there was without doubt an organized attempt in this election by the Tory government of Manitoba, aided, abetted and engineered by the Minister of Public Works to deprive these men of their liberty in order to strike terror into the heart of every Liberal worker in the constituency. It was not for the purpose of doing these men any injury; they had no feeling against these men, but it was to drive every Liberal worker out of the country until the election was over.

An hon. MEMBER: Drive the crooks out.

Mr. CARVELL: No, it was to drive honest men out of the constituency and they did drive honest men out. I ask any hon. gentleman to conceive a condition of affairs like that in his constituency. Take the case of my hon. friend from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier)—shadowed for seven or eight days, his room in his hotel broken open, his grip ransacked and turned inside out! I want every hon. gentleman to try and imagine a condition which would exist in his own constituency if the local government should attempt to arrest every man who was suspected of having documents upon him that might constitute some evidence for or against a political party at the time an election was in progress, and keep him in custody like any criminal until the election was over. Would it not drive every respectable man out of the constituency? Would not every respectable man be afraid to work for his candidate? Human beings do not appreciate being arrested and carried from one jail to another in this way. But, they accomplished their purpose and the Minister of Public Works has the nerve to come down here this afternoon and say that this was a decisive defeat for reciprocity.

I do not find fault with the officials of Manitoba who did this. The magistrates, the constables and all the machine from the leaders down do not want to do this; they are human beings, and they are actuated by the same ideas of humanity and mercy as are other people. I call to witness every lawyer in this House that one of the hardest things we have to do is to get officials to carry out the law sometimes as rigorously as we would like to have them do it. These men are not the culprits; these men are only the gun men who carry out the orders of their superiors. They are only the Lefty Louies, the Gyp the Bloods, the Dago Franks of Roblin and his government and of the Minister of Public Works. That is the ground upon which we complain of this transaction; that is the charge we make against the Tory party. It is that they deprived innocent men of their liberty in order to completely block and break up the organization of their opponents in the election, to drive them out of the constituency and thus to win the election by unfair means. The Minister of Public Works now comes down with his defence and what does he do? He brings the affidavits of two of his gun men and wants to justify his conduct by their affidavits and evidence. He might better have relied on the evidence of Lefty Louie and Dago Frank than to rely upon his gun men.

I have talked longer on this point than I intended to; but I do feel, Mr. Speaker, that this is something unique in the history of Canada, outside of Manitoba, and I hope we shall give this matter such an airing and that the newspapers will give it such an airing that it will never happen again in Manitoba. If reciprocity is not popular in Manitoba, then let the electors say so. If our hon. friends opposite think that their policies are better than ours, they have the right to advance them by every lawful means; but they have no right to deprive any British subject of his liberty in order to throttle the free expression of the electorate of any constituency.

Upon the order paper I find a notice of motion, which is something new, foreshadowing the introduction of a Bill which, to my mind, is a deliberate attempt to introduce the dishonest methods and practices of the Macdonald election into every constituency in Western Canada. I noticed in the Citizen of yesterday morning, and in other Conservative papers, the statement that a Bill was to be introduced by the right hon. Prime Minister to extend the Mounted Police Act. If there is an organization in Canada of which every member of this House and every citizen of

Canada, who has taken the trouble to follow affairs in this country, is proud, it is the Mounted Police. So long as my hon. friends want to increase the Mounted Police I do not think there is a man in Canada who will raise his voice in protest. To the proposal to double, quadruple, or multiply it by ten, every man will say 'well done,' and we will give our hearty consent, but this clipping makes a statement in which I see a danger. In the concluding paragraph are these words:

A new departure will be a clause providing for the use of plain clothes men in connection with the mounted police. The need for this has been very evident in tracking down persons wanted for murder and other grave offences in the scattered western settlements, especially in view of the presence of so many communities of foreigners.

If there is anything in the literature of Canada that stands out to the eternal credit of this country it is the doings of the Mounted Police in the last twenty-five or thirty years in tracking down criminals in that country. I think it was only a year ago that this House voted quite a large amount to the widow of one of those heroes who died at the post of duty in order to carry out his instructions. Every work of fiction that has been written on Western Canada in the last 25 or 30 years has had a mounted policeman as one of its heroes and the boast of Canada has been that no man could commit murder or a crime of any magnitude but he would be brought to justice by the Mounted Police, every member of which force wears His Majesty's uniform and the brass buttons that go with it. In fact, in so far as the foreigner is concerned, nothing will prove a greater terror to those who seek to break the law than the scarlet tunic and brass buttons of the mounted policemen. But these hon. gentlemen say: We want to extend the army of plain clothes men. More gun men, of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to carry terror into the hearts of the people of Saskatchewan and Alberta when an election comes on because he cannot succeed under existing circumstances.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not in order to debate a notice on the paper, and I am afraid my hon. friend is very close to it.

Mr. CARVELL: I shall certainly keep myself within the rules of the House. If the Minister of Public Works just had the necessary amount of sand to sit here and listen to me, perhaps I might say a little more.

As to the Richelieu election, I have very little to say. It is a fight pure and simple between the Tories themselves, it is a fight between two, not back-benchers, but two of the leaders, it is a fight between the Minister of Public Works who is the real leader of the party and the belted knight who is the financial leader of the party in the province of Quebec. The belted knight says that Mr. Rogers sent him to Richelieu, and told him to tell the people that if they would elect the Conservative candidate he would give them a marine railway, and the Minister of Public Works says he did not. I do not care which of them is telling a—it might be unparliamentary to say what I have in my mind; but, at all events, I can say that I do not care which of them is in the error. I think perhaps if we all knew what took place in the Chateau Laurier the night before last, we would be able to discuss this a little more intelligently than we can now. But, it will no doubt come out in due time. Under any circumstances, it was a deliberate attempt to bribe a constituency and win an election by unfair means. I want to say again, that to my mind it is not to be compared with the iniquity of the campaign in Macdonald because there they were interfering with the right of the subject and in the Richelieu case they were only attempting to get people to vote by unfair and dishonourable methods.

There is another branch of the Speech from the Throne to which I wish to refer briefly, and I do so because of its introduction into this debate by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. I refer to the trade question. There is a paragraph in the Speech from the Throne which says the Government have attempted to increase our trade with the British West Indies, and I think British Guiana. I think I voice the sentiments of every Liberal in this House and in the country when I say we heartily concur in any attempt that may be made to increase our trade with the British West Indies or any portion of the British Empire. The only fault I find is that the Minister of Finance is blowing a good deal about what he has accomplished in this respect, and trying to convince the people of Canada that he is conferring on them a great benefit by making a trade agreement with a million or two of people who do not consume much, three-quarters of whom go practically half-naked for nearly nine months out of the twelve, people who do not buy clothing to any extent, because the climate does not require them to use much clothing, people who do not consume our food-stuffs, because they produce their own food-stuffs, a country with which last year our total trade amounted to only about four million dollars. Perhaps I am wrong in that, but that is my recollection.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I think my hon. friend is wrong. Speaking from memory, I think there is a trade of about fifteen million dollars a year between Canada and the West Indies.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, no, not the British West Indies. That includes all the West Indies, and Cuba as well.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): My memory is that it includes just these colonies with which we have entered into a trade arrangement. I think the hon. gentleman will find that there is a very substantial trade between these colonies and Canada.

Mr. CARVELL: At all events, the matter is not worth talking about, when you think of the total trade of Canada. Whether it is four millions or fifteen millions, it is only a bagatelle. However, I wish the Government well in so far as they have gone in this direction. These gentlemen tell us also that they will negotiate a treaty with Australia, and I sincerely hope they may succeed in that. We must remember that Australia is producing largely the same products as we produce, and exporting to the same markets. However, that may be, if the Government can increase the trade between Canada and Australia and New Zealand, I trust they will succeed. In that statement, I believe I am again voicing the sentiments of every hon. gentleman on this side of the House. I have here a very significant statement in the last Weekly Report issued by the Trade and Commerce Department, at page 2138, which says:

Exportation of Butter.

The export of butter to Canada continues on a large scale. The Makura, sailing on October 25 takes approximately 10,000 boxes, and notice has been given by the Union Company that space has been reserved for upwards of 125,000 boxes for this season. It is interesting also to note that this office is constantly in receipt of communications from places as far east as Toronto asking for the name of butter shippers.

There is now a preferential trade to some extent with Australia and New Zealand, and I hope my hon. friends opposite may be able to go further, because when butter reaches the enormous price we are paying for it to-day—thirty-five cents a pound, I think, to the retailer in the large cities—

An hon. MEMBER: Forty cents.

Mr. CARVELL: Forty cents a pound, perhaps, when butter reaches that price, then all that the Canadian producer needs in the way of protection is the cost of transportation from Australia and New Zealand to the centre of Canada. When the Australian and New Zealand producer of butter chooses to send his butter to Canada rather than to Great Britain, to which the freight charges are very much less than they are to Canada, depend upon it, the price of butter here is more than it ought to be, and the consuming people of Canada are entitled to some amelioration in their condition in respect to the high cost of living and the burdens under which they are groaning. Therefore, I say success to the Government in endeavouring to increase our trade with Australia and New Zealand. But what becomes of the argument of the Minister of Finance and his friends just one year ago, that if the reciprocity treaty with the United States would go into force, one of the great troubles would be that this country would be flooded with cheap butter from Australia and New Zealand? Is there a member in this House, Liberal or Conservative, representing an agricultural constituency, who did not have that flung in his teeth on every platform? The greatest cry I met was that if we ratified that agreement, we would allow these articles to come in from Australia and New Zealand free of duty, and the Canadian farmer would be ruined. Now with true Tory consistency hon. gentlemen opposite start out to negotiate a trade treaty with Australia, and my statement to them is that they can extend the trade of this country just as freely as they like, and I will support them. The Minister of Finance interjected into this debate the question of reciprocity for what reason I do not know. It may have been that he thinks it is dead, and he wants to resurrect it. Well, if the reciprocity agreement, which means broader markets, less taxation and cheaper food for the toiling masses, and better markets for the producer—if that is what he wants to resurrect——

Mr. McCURDY: Is it dead?

Mr. CARVELL: If it is dead, as the hon. gentleman seems to think, then why does he want to resurrect it?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Did I not ask the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and hon. gentlemen opposite what position they took now? For legislation here is all that is necessary to bring that agreement into effect.

Mr. CARVELL: If my hon. friend (Mr. White, Leeds) will have patience for about two minutes, he will have the views of one of the members of the Opposition on that subject. I think he interjected this subject into the debate for another reason. I think that in the halo of glory in which he lives, in holy Toronto, and surrounded as he is by his manufacturing magnates, his banking magnates, his commercial magnates, and his transportation magnates, he rather wants us to resurrect reciprocity,

having the idea that it may be to his benefit. Now, let me tell him, that so far as this humble member of the Opposition is concerned, I intend to resurrect reciprocity, and to talk reciprocity every time I get a chance, in this House and out of it, just so long as there is any possibility, in my opinion, of obtaining it. Let me tell him that, from my standpoint and the standpoint of millions of people in Canada reciprocity was good economically in January, 1911, it was good economically in September, 1911, it is good economically to-day, and will be good economically always. I want to tell him that he is living, I believe, in a fool's paradise. He cannot repeat, with all his money——

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Whose money?

Mr. CARVELL: The manufacturers' money, and the transportation magnates' money, and the American money, and the British Unionists' money;—with it all, he cannot resurrect the cry which he raised against reciprocity a year ago. He cannot do what the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) charged the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with doing —he cannot again champion one policy in Quebec and another in Ontario. He will find he cannot again join together the Nationalists of Quebec and the Orangemen of Ontario. He and his friends are in power now, and must have some regard to consistency. He will find that he cannot crucify the leader of the Opposition)Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Ontario because he is a Roman Catholic, and in Quebec because he is 'too British.' The Minister of Public Works talks about Liberals having one policy in one part of the country and another in another part of the country, and brings here garbled reports from his Tory papers in Manitoba to show the appeals made to the French people in that province. And after all what would the evidence show? Something of which every Conservative member of this House was guilty in the last campaign, with this difference, only that what these members said was one hundred per cent worse than could be conceived by any Liberal editor. We want to resurrect reciprocity.

An hon. MEMBER: Do you?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, we do. And we want to resurrect more than that; we want to resurrect the British preference. We want to resurrect any policy which means cheaper food for the labouring classes of Canada; we want to resurrect any policy that will afford us a chance to discuss whatever will make for better economic conditions and a reduction of the cost of living in this country. My hon. friend (Mr. White, Leeds) surrounded by his followers, intoxicated with his own importance, grandiloquently turned to his followers, and, waving his hand as if to say, 'Do not cheer me too lengthly' asked: What have we lost by the rejection of reciprocity? I will tell him a few things that we have lost, but if I were to talk, as the Minister of Public Works said, until Christmas, I could not tell you all that we have lost.

An hon. MEMBER: You lost power.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes but we did not lose honour. We did not have to go down to Quebec and tell our people one story and to Ontario and tell our people there another. We do not have any faction fights in our party. But in the rejection of reciprocity we lost money and we lost it by the million. The people of this country will never know how many millions they lost. But I am going to tell you how a few millions were lost in the last year.

Mr. SPEAKER: It would be more in keeping with orderly debate, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) would address the Chair.

Mr. CARVELL: I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker. I certainly supposed I had the right to address the Minister of Finance through you. But, of course, if you want me to repeat the words 'Mr. Speaker' in every sentence, I can do it. Now, Mr. Speaker, we lost power, and we lost money by the million.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CARVELL: No, we did not lose honour, but we lost power. When the question was raised, the day before yesterday, as to what we had lost, somebody remarked, 'you lost what George Lane lost.' Mr. George Lane is a cattle dealer in western Canada who appeared before a committee of the Senate last year and swore that, in one year's transactions, because of the lack of reciprocity, he himself personally lost between $40,000 and $50,000. The people of the great West lost millions of dollars last year by reason of the impossibility of marketing their wheat at any price, let alone the price they could have obtained had they been allowed access to the American market. During the last three months from the western part of the province of Ontario alone—and if my figures are wrong the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds) can correct me—there were exported to the United States between 200 and 300 carloads of cattle. These cattle must have been worth close to half a million dollars. And the farmers have been compelled to pay 27½ per cent on these cattle in order to get them into the American market, and so on these shipments alone these farmers of Ontario have lost over $100,000. From the province of Quebec and the Maritime

provinces last year we exported hay of a total value of $6,375,000, and of that amount we sent to the United States $5,187,000 worth, upon which we paid the magnificent sum of $2,672,000 as duties into the American treasury. A gentleman sitting in this House to-day tells me that he himself paid into the American treasury in duties on hay alone $40,000 during the last fiscal year. A constituent of mine tells everywhere that during the last fiscal year he paid $50,000 in duties on hay alone which money might as well have gone into the pockets of my constituents.

An hon. MEMBER: Who pays the duty?

Mr. CARVELL: In the case of hay, the Canadian producer every time. And, on that point I call to witness the members of this House from Quebec and New Brunswick who live along the border. They know that what I say is true. The trade reports to-day show that all up and down the border hay is worth just four dollars a ton more in the United States than it is in Canada. I call to witness a statement made last May by a man from Cleveland, who after buying a quantity of hay in my constituency publicly declared that of all the fools he ever met in his life the farmer of New Brunswick was the worst, for fighting against reciprocity, because he himself had paid $20,000 into the treasury of the United States in duties on hay which might have gone into the pockets of my constituents.

I will tell my hon. friends what we have lost in Eastern Canada. We exported last year fish to the United States to the amount of $5,378,661, upon which—I have not got the exact figures, but I am safe in saying we must have paid a million dollars in duty. If the reciprocity agreement had gone through, the fishermen in the Maritime provinces would have saved that million dollars, and it would now be reposing in their own pockets. The lumbermen of Eastern Canada exported to all countries planks, boards, and scantling to the amount of $20,523,005. Of that amount they sent to the United States market lumber amounting to the enormous sum of $14,275,264, and they paid to the United States treasury in duties the sum of $1,031,181. If any man does not believe that, let him go to the border line and enter the lumber business, and he will very soon be convinced that the Canadian producer pays the duty to the very last farthing. We lost in laths alone the sum of about $127,000, which amount was paid in duty into the United States Treasury. We exported of laths to all countries an amount represented by $1,732,294; of that amount $1,654,822 went to the United States, and duty paid to the amount of $127,600. I myself paid some of that, and I know what is meant. If any man does not credit the statement, let him go into the lath business in the province of New Brunswick, and he will very soon find that it is the Canadian producer who pays every cent of the duty. Last year the value of shingles exported from Canada to the whole world amounted to $1,481,878; of that amount we sent $1,451,878 to the United States, on which we paid in duty the sum of $115,433. Again I say that anyone who does not accept that statement may go into the shingle business for himself in the Maritime provinces, and he will soon realize who pays the duty.

Coming to this year, I find the same set of figures existing in proportion. I have been able to obtain the figures for only the first five months of the present fiscal year, down to last August. I find that of hay we exported during that period an amount equal to $2,422,544; that $2,110,153 went to the United States, and on that duty was paid to the amount of $872,120. The value of potatoes exported to all countries during the five months abovementioned was $238,430; $101,203 went to the United States, on which duty was paid to the amount of $20,000. Of laths and shingles the same proportion holds good; of planks, boards and scantling, the same proportion applies, except that the figures are a little greater.

I have tried to give my hon. friends, as hurriedly as possible, some of the things that we have lost in failing to obtain the benefit of the reciprocity agreement with the United States. Will hon. gentlemen opposite tell we what we have gained? I would like to know if hon. gentlemen can direct the action of the House to one solitary point we have gained. My hon. friend says, that if we had adopted reciprocity, we would have lost our transportation routes, because trade would have been directed to other channels. He says further that this agreement would have been repealed in perhaps a couple of years by the United States, and we would have been back in our old position, but with our channels of trade disrupted, and in a worse position than they are at the present time. But I want to point out to my hon. friend that he must either have confined his energies to his own financial associates, or perchance he has forgotten the stock argument of his friends all over Canada as to the probable effect of the reciprocity agreement. From every platform in Canada, from every platform addressed by the right hon. Minister himself, it was deliberately stated that one of the greatest objections to reciprocity was that if we adopted this pact—which they

claimed though only an agreement, was in reality a treaty—Canada would never be able to break herself away from its shackles. I wish to point out to every man within the sound of my voice, Liberals and Conservatives alike, that, in the province of New Brunswick, men holding high positions in the government of that province stated throughout the country, and even in my own county, that if we adopted this agreement, and later attempted to break away from it, the United States would declare war against us and force us to adhere to it. My hon. friend, with true Tory consistency, now says that the great objection to the agreement is that it could have been repealed by the United States in a year or two; that there was no permanency of tariffs connected with it; that, the business of our country being diverted to other channels, the abrogation of the treaty within two or three years would result in disruption of our trade. I ask the hon. Minister of Finance to explain this inconsistency.

Then it is said that we would have lost our transportation routes by going north and south instead of east and west. Does my hon. friend not know that there are over twenty railroads to-day running from Canada into the United States, and vice versa? The transportation routes are there; you cannot find fifty miles of the American boundary line, from the Ste. Croix to Vancouver, which is not crossed by a railway connecting Canada with the United States. The Canadian Pacific railway alone has six lines; all up and down the boarder there are transportation routes connecting Canada with the United States, and all in active operation. And why are they there at the present time? They are there now because, under the economical conditions at present existing, we are compelled to send our produce to the United States even in the face of an almost impassible tariff wall. They are there now because we have to use them. From the figures which I have presented to the House, it will be seen that practically all of our staple products go to the United States—one million dollars worth a day goes there. My hon. friend states that reciprocity would have diverted our traffic, but the very first international act of this Government after coming into power was to go down to these Yankees, and, on bended knees, beg them for God's sake to give them a chance to put their wheat through American territory. Truly they were dilatory about it; it was a bitter draught; but they swallowed the hemlock, and they got the concession. They were allowed to send their wheat into United States channels, but only in bond. It relieved only a part of the difficulty. It did not increase the price to the Canadian producers, but it gave them a chance to get their products out of the country. This year they have been a little wiser—a little bolder, perhaps, and they commenced a little earlier. Even before this Parliament met, they took their hats in their hands, went to Washington, and said: 'Please, Mr. President, give us a chance to send our wheat down here again. You were graciously pleased to do it last year, and it was a panacea for many of our ills; give us a chance to repeat it, and we will try to do better next time.' And yet the Minister of Finance said yesterday: 'Why, we have no objection to trading with the United States; whoever said we did not want to trade with the United States? We are perfectly willing you shall trade so long as you do it over tariff walls.' Their loyalty is oozing out of their finger-tips degree by degree, and I should not be surprised if, before the next election comes around, you will know why the Minister of Finance resurrected reciprocity. You will find him going down to Washington to try and make a reciprocity treaty, because my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is astute enough to know that reciprocity is just as good economically to-day as it was a year ago, and he knows it is the best policy economically which possibly can be proposed for Canada, outside of an increase in the British preference. That is why my friend has resurrected reciprocity.

In order to prevent the people of Canada rising in rebellion against this policy he says we are going to give you a panacea for all your ills, we have negotiated a reciprocity treaty with the British West Indies, and we are going to negotiate another one with Australia and New Zealand. For the edification of the Minister of Finance I shall give a few figures showing the enormous trade which we are doing with these countries, a trade which is going to be our salvation commercially, as compared with this trade with the United States.

Of hay, last year, we sent to the United States, $5,187,727 worth. We sent to the British West Indies and Guiana $16,102 worth, one trainload, and we sent to Australia and New Zealand the magnificent sum of $449. I presume that was a few bales of hay left over in a steamer that had carried prize stock or something of that kind. Fish may give to my hon. friend some comfort. I shall give to him all the comfort he can get in these trade figures. Last year we sold to the United States $5,378,661 worth of fish. We sold to the British West Indies, $1,427,559, or about one-quarter the total amount we sent to the United States, and we sent to Australia $568,232, or one-tenth the amount we sent to the United States. Of laths we sent to the British West Indies $825 worth, to Australia $16,434 worth and to the

United States $1,654,822 in the face of the duty of 20 cents a thousand. Of shingles we sent to the British West Indies a little more than $26,000, we sent $30 worth to Australia, and $1,451,878 worth to the United States. Of planks, boards and scantlings, we sent to the United States $14,275,264, and we sent to Australia, New Zealand and the British West Indies combined, $458,443 worth. The same proportion follows down through the figures for the year 1912-13. For the first five months of that year, of hay we sent to the United States $2,110,153; we sent to the British West Indies $11,522 and we did not send a solitary bale to Australia. Of potatoes we sent to the United States $101,203, to the British West Indies $3,376 and none to Australia and New Zealand. For lath, shingles, planks and boards the same proportion follows.

That is the market my hon. friend is going to get for us to off-set the loss we made by being debarred from the great American market. That is the market my friend is relying on to keep his transportation lines running east and west. That is the market my friend is relying on by which his friends will get rich when they are not engaged in merging manufacturing concerns.

I want to tell my hon. friend something we did gain by recipricity. There are a few figures that might be of interest to him. We got just one little taste of reciproctiy in about one-quarter of the proportion of what it really ought to be, just a taste of it and that is with pulp and paper. As my hon. friend knows, American people put through the schedule or the law regarding pulp and paper up to a certain value which only means the cheaper grades of paper. And during the fiscal year of 1911-12, it could not have affected our production to any great extent because the new arrangement was not made until nearly the time of the elections and it was only four or five months from the elections until the close of the fiscal year, and of course it takes some time for men to change their business arrangements and commence shipping in a new channel. But even then the figures show what we made by reciprocity. In the year 1911 we exported to the United States, $2,075,889 of paper of all kinds. Of this great proportion probably 80 per cent or 90 per cent would be paper. In 1912, we sent to the United States $2,052,711. In the first five months of 1912-13 when they could reasonably have commenced to change their trade relations and to manufacture for the United States market, we sent $1,071,197 worth and if you follow that out and take the proportionate amount for the whole year you will find that this year, without allowing for any natural increase which must take place in the last seven months of the year, we will send to the United States $2,570,868 or in five months after they removed some of the duty on paper, about one-quarter of what it should be, we had increased our trade in paper, $500,000 or 25 per cent of the total output.

I have some other figures which may be somewhat illuminative to my friend on the pulp question. We were able to send pulp to the United States to some extent, not very large quantities because the duty was not prohibitive. In the year 1910-11, we sent to the United States $5,094,589. In 1912, after there had been a partial reciprocity in effect, the export of pulp to the United States dwindled down to $4,419,944 or a reduction of more than $600,000 in the amount of pulp sent to the United States. In the first five months of the present fiscal year, that went down to $1,650,941 worth and if you carry that out to the end of twelve months you will find it reaches only $3,962,256, thus showing that in one year there will be a reduction if over $1,000,000 in the amount of pulp which we are sending to the United States. When we send it out in the form of manufactured paper instead of pulp it is the product of an industry which employs hundreds and thousands of labourers all over Eastern Canada. We are sending it in a form which is of some good to Canada, and I have no doubt that if the United States do not restore the old rate of duty on paper it will not be long until the exportation of pulp, will practically cease altogether and we will be sending all this produce from Canada in the form of the manufactured article. And if the United States take the duty off pulp and paper made from lumber cut from the Crown lands of Ontario and Quebec, I assert that 95 per cent of all the paper we produce in Canada will find its way to the United States markets inside of three years.

These are some of the things we have gained from a mere taste of reciprocity. With a statement of facts like that, borne out, not by any politician or member of Parliament, but by the actual trade returns of Canada, I thank my hon. friend for resurrecting the question of reciprocity. I tell him that I will nail it to my mast politically, so long as it is not turned down by the United States. The people of this country are watching this question with a great deal more interest than they are giving to what he is going to do with his $30,000,000 or $35,000,000 for the British navy. The newspapers in my part of the country are giving in parallel columns the prices of potatoes, hay, oats, and everything the farmer exports, in two towns 12 miles apart. The last report I saw, showed that in Woodstock potatoes were selling at $1 per barrel, while 12 miles away in the town of Hopetown, in the state of Maine they were bringing $1.45.

An hon. MEMBER: What is the duty?

Mr. CARVELL: Sixty-two and a half cents a barrel. The same report showed that the proportion in respect of oats was even greater. The people are watching these things, and I do not think they will be stampeded by any flag waving, or by the church which my friend the leader of the Opposition attends, when next they have an opportunity to vote on this question. I want to declare, as emphatically as I can, that what we must have in this country is broader markets, the trammels taken off the sale of our surplus products in foreign markets. My hon. friend knows that, economically, wealth is created in this country in only one of four ways: From the products of the field, the forest, the mines, and the sea. You can juggle with the stock market; you can amalgamate manufacturing concerns; you can merge and combine all you want to; but you do not make wealth; you do not create a dollar. But the men who go into the woods and cut lumber; the men who go to the sea and bring out fish; the men who break up the virgin prairie; the men in the settled portions of Eastern Canada who raise oats or potatoes; these men are creating wealth; these men are the true patriots. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Ball)—I refer to him with the greatest respect—spoke yesterday; and I am told he has grown rich in manufacturing a pretty poor article of furniture out of green wood grown in Canada with a protection of $35 on the $100. He has not created any wealth in this country; he has only, by means of the tariff, been able to extract the money from the farmer, the lumberman and the fisherman; because if they wanted to bring a piece of furniture from the United States, or any other part of the world, they would be fined to the extent of 33⅓ per cent. So he has gathered in their wealth, and he has not created anything.

These are the things for which we tried to find a market in the reciprocity pact. These are the things for which we would have found a market, if that pact had been allowed to go through; and these are the things for which the powers that be must find a market, and for which the people of this country are demanding a market. I await with the fullest confidence an opportunity when the people of this country, the producers as well as the consumers, will show what they think of the great economic question of wider markets and cheaper cost of living.

Mr. A. MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie): I shall not take any general part in this debate. As the House will remember, I had an altercation, as to a matter of fact, with the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), when he was on his feet. The hon. member had been discussing the recent election in Macdonald, and had made the gravamen of his charge the refusal of counsel to certain persons after they were under arrest. He was dealing with the case of one Walkinshaw, who was arrested in the neighbourhood of Rathwell, in the judical district of Portage la Prairie. To be brought to Portage la Prairie, he had to be taken first to the city of Winnipeg, and then by rail to Portage la Prairie, there being no other method of getting him across. It appeared from the affidavit that Walkinshaw was refused counsel by the policeman in charge while he was in transit from Rathwell to Portage la Prairie. The altercation with my hon. friend took place over this point: He stated that all the while Walkinshaw was in Portage la Prairie he was refused counsel; that on Saturday, the 12th of October, the day of the election, Walkinshaw was allowed to see counsel for the first time. Do I mistake the position?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, you do. He saw counsel in Winnipeg, and he was switched away from him.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does my hon. friend say that that was the only occasion on which he saw counsel up to the Saturday?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Answer.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend has shown the colour of himself. I rose to correct him, because, after four years experience in this House, I have brought myself to believe that it is at least the desire of an hon. member on his feet to state the facts, and that he would be glad to receive them. I had not read the affidavit of Walkinshaw before. I had not the time to read the whinings of a school girl in such interminable detail; life is too short. I only took occasion to tell the hon. member for Carleton that, living, as I was at the time, in Portage la Prairie, though not connected with the case, I knew right well that Walkinshaw had counsel in Portage la Prairie, and had it before Saturday, the 12th of October. The hon. member for Carleton, with that courtesy which never deserts him, refused to take my word. He preferred, he said, to believe the affidavit of Walkinshaw, whom he had neither seen nor heard of, and on Walkinshaw's affidavit he would stick to his statement that this man never was allowed counsel until the Saturday. Do I mis-state his remarks, I ask again?

Mr. CARVELL: You do. I stated that I was giving a brief review of the affidavits, and I shall leave it to this House to say if I did not state the facts exactly as they are in those affidavits. If my hon. friend wants to give now any personal knowledge he has, which is not included in these

affidavits, it will be a contribution to the debate.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad that my hon. friend rose. We see again where he stands. He told us that he was, on his intelligence, as a member of Parliament, stating what was in that affidavit. I had not read it; I said I knew of my own personal knowledge.

Mr. CARVELL: I did not know you had not read it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Imagine, then, my astonishment when, on reference to the affidavit, I find that it confirms absolutely what I said. I do not need to read the whole of the affidavit but I will read any part that the hon. gentleman wishes to be added. It goes on to state that this man was arrested on the 9th of October; that would be Wednesday. That night he was brought to Winnipeg. He could not get to Portage la Prairie, I presume; at any rate, the affidavit goes on to say that the next morning he was brought on to Portage la Prairie. I will read the affidavit from this point.

At six o'clock in the morning——

That is, the morning of the 9th of October, when he was arrested.—I am reading from the middle of page 64 of 'Hansard,' the affidavit being given by the hon. member for Edmonton.

At six o'clock in the morning a gong rang, and I was roughly ordered to 'hurry and get up now.' My door was unlocked and I got my clothes and dressed.

We can skip the rest for a little piece. He had been taken down somewhere and then:

I was left there till about twenty minutes to ten and was then taken to the office, where my solicitor, Mr. McMurray was waiting to see me. But I had hardly shaken hands with him when I was taken out of the office into another room, where I was weighed.

And so on.

I was then handed over to a provincial detective who took me out of the building, and as I was leaving I asked if I was not to be allowed to see my solicitor.

Still under the conduct of a policeman in transit.

Mr. PROULX: Did he see his solicitor?

Mr. MEIGHEN (reading):

The man only said he had his orders. A taxicab was waiting for us outside. My solicitor attempted to get in and ride down with us to our destination, but was ordered away by the detective. He has since told me that the official in charge of the provincial jail informed him that he might ride in the cab with me.

Mr. CARVELL: Read it all.

Mr. MEIGHEN: He says in his affidavit that he was trying to see his solicitor while in charge of the policeman and that he was refused permission.

Mr. CARVELL: Read it all. If my hon. friend is going to read the affidavit, read it as it is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will read the intervening sentence which my hon. friend considers vital.

Mr. CARVELL: Do not garble it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not near the point yet and I ask my hon. friend to rest his soul in patience because when I get to Portage la Prairie my hon. friend will know what it is to squirm in this House.

My solicitor attempted to get in and ride down with us to our destination, but was ordered away by the the detective. He has since told me that the official in charge of the provincial jail informed him that he might ride in the cab with me, but this was evidently done to put him off, as he was refused permission when he attempted it. I was then rushed to the Canadian Northern railway depot and on to the train for Portage. I was not informed, however, of my destination until I was getting on the train.

On arriving at Portage, the detective took me straight to the provincial jail, where on his telling them who I was, they said they were expecting me. After being entered I was taken into the common ward and locked in a cell until after dinner. Dinner in this jail consisted of a thin, greasy soup, one baked potato, dry bread and a tin cup of rank tea without sugar or milk.

After dinner I was taken to the Police Court——

This is Thursday.

—and was brought up before Magistrate Marshall, in what looked to me like a secret session, as the only persons present were the magistrate, the prosecuting attorney, the detective who brought me and a local police officer. The charge was then read by the magistrate, and it was found to be just the same vague charge as was set forth in the warrant under section 269. The Crown prosecutor, F. G. Taylor, then stated that as the documents relating to the charge were not in his possession, he would ask the court to remand the case until Saturday afternoon, October 12, in order that they might get their case prepared.

It is still Thursday.

The magistrate was about to close the matter in this way, when I took the matter in my own hands, and addressing the court, asked the magistrate if he intended to commit me without any definite charge being laid. As he did not make any comment, I asked that I be admitted to bail. Turning to the Crown prosecutor, Mr. Taylor, he asked him what he thought of that. Mr. Taylor replied that although they were not

there that day to try the case, in view of the fact that the prisoner was not represented by counsel, the information which he had was of too serious a nature to permit of bail. Without further comment, Magistrate Marshall committed me to the jail till Saturday, October 12, two o'clock in the afternoon.

Now this is the paragraph:

I was then taken back to the provincial jail by the detective, and on being turned over to the prison officials was locked up in a cell just like a common criminal and was subjected to exactly the same treatment with regard to meals, sleeping accommodation and confinement as I had been previously. On returning to the jail I demanded to be allowed to get into communication with my solicitor, and I was permitted to call him up on the phone.

Permitted to call him up on the phone.

After being locked up in the cell for some time, I was taken into the office and allowed a few minutes private conversation with my solicitor.

Thursday, October 10.

He stated that he would see what he could do about bail, although he was afraid there was not much chance of doing anything in view of the attitude of the people pressing the prosecution.

Mr. CARVELL: That was over the telephone, man.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MEIGHEN (reading):

On returning to the jail I demanded to be allowed to get into communication with my solicitor, and I was permitted to call him up on the phone. After being locked up in the cell for some time, I was taken into the office and allowed a few minutes private conversation with my solicitor.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN (reading):

I did not see my solicitor again until a few minutes before the time to go to the court house on Saturday afternoon when he informed me that he had so far been unable to do anything with them in the matter of bail, but that he hoped to be allowed to get me out on bail after the hearing that afternoon.

Mr. CARVELL: That is right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is exactly right, and that is exactly what makes my hon. friend wrong, and worse than wrong, if I could name the word. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is some time since the House has been sitting. I know the gentleman who is in charge of the jail at Portage la Prairie. I have been in the practice of the law for some years and I have in the course of my practice, learned which, I have no doubt the hon. member for Carleton, N. B., has also learned, that a prisoner in charge of a constable is not allowed liberty to see counsel until he reaches the point of incarceration.

Mr. CARVELL: I never heard of such a thing in my lifetime, and you could not find a man in the Maritime provinces who had.

Mr. MEIGHEN: After the prisoner reaches the point of incarceration he is allowed to see counsel.

Mr. CARVELL: No lawyer in this House ever heard of such a thing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend is not very loyal to the standard of etiquette that he tried to enforce on myself. However, the point I make against the hon. gentleman is that he refused to take what I know to be a fact of my own knowledge and referred to an affidavit as contradicting me when that affidavit supported me to the letter. Take another point in the affidavit of Walkinshaw. I do not know Walkinshaw, never saw him, but in no line of his affidavit does he even assert or intimate that after he had reached Portage la Prairie, the point at which he was to be incarcerated, he ever asked to see a solicitor and was refused. Yet, the governor of the jail at Portage la Prairie, whom the Liberal party does not ask to be relieved of his position, is compared with Dago Frank, Lefty Louie and other convicted murderers across the line. As far as I understand this affidavit, and I have read it thoroughly, it at no time states that this man was refused access to counsel after he had reached Portage la Prairie and I know of my own knowledge, and know now from this affidavit, that he did have counsel, Daniel Ormand, by name, from the time he asked for counsel in Portage la Prairie, Thursday, October 10, right up to the time of his liberation.

The hon. gentleman, throughout his address at various times, rose to considerable —I cannot say eloquence—but vehemence, but at no time in the course of his remarks did he reach the exalted stage that he did at this point where what he said has turned out to be thoroughly and completely wrong. Walkinshaw himself, though I do not call him a gun man, compares favourably with my hon. friend from Carleton, N. B., in this respect.

I have only one remark to add. In the language that could not have been plainer —and I think I am within the rules when I say in language that could not have been viler—the hon. member referred to Mr. Stedman and to another man whose name I cannot recall, who made the affidavit read by the Minister of Public Works, as gunmen, and compared them with those thugs recently convicted and sentenced to death in the city of New York. I do not know Mr. Stedman, whose name I

never heard until the affidavit was read this afternoon, I do not know the other gentleman, and I venture to say this: that until to-day, the hon. member for Carleton has never heard of either of these men or heard even their names.

Mr. CARVELL: Stedman is one of the men who helped to incarcerate Prince, as I think you will find in the affidavits. Read them over; it will do you good.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I repeat my statement: the hon. gentleman does not know the men; he knows nothing of them, and in that state of blissful ignorance he chose to make the charge against them and the comparison he did. During the four years that I have been in Parliament, and for all the other years that I have followed the course of parliamentary proceedings, I say now that I have never seen so flagrant a case of an hon. member shielding himself behind the privileges of this House as the hon. member has exhibited in this instance.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. L. T. PACAUD (Megantic): Mr. Speaker, in addressing this House for the first time, I feel that the Government has added to the embarrassments which invariably accompany such a task by the very slim and unsatisfactory information which it has pleased them to give in the Speech from the Throne on the merits of which we are called upon to pass judgment. We are told, in the first place, that Canada enjoys at the present time almost universal prosperity, that her trade is increasing steadily and rapidly, and that her revenue continues to expand. The hon. member for Chambly-Verchères (Mr. Rainville), in moving the Address, spoke at some length on this subject. And I may say immediately that I subscribe absolutely and unreservedly to the very vivid description he has given us of the country's expansion and wealth. But let us stop for a moment to consider a question which I regard as of great importance and on which, I am afraid, I must differ with my hon. friend, the question to whom credit should be given for the prosperity which Canada to-day enjoys. The hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres is a very loyal supporter of the present Government. He is anxious to please the members of the present Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: A new convert.

Mr. PACAUD: Yes, a new convert. Still, he was compelled to recognize that it would be an impossible task to show that credit was due to the present Government for this prosperity. But he was not to be daunted. He went back many years in our country's history to discover that the authors of the prosperity we are enjoying to-day were the great leaders of the Conservative party, Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George Etienne Cartier. I was astonished to hear that view expressed by the hon. member. He was a good supporter of the late Liberal government, and only recently did he change his allegiance on account of the naval question. He supported and approved the fiscal policy of the late government, and he approved of the British preference and of every trade agreement entered into by the late Liberal government with different countries of the world.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario): Except reciprocity.

Mr. PACAUD: No, he was in favour of reciprocity. There was only one question which was discussed on their side in Quebec, and that was the naval issue. But, not satisfied with this not only did he support the late government's trade policy, but he approved of what they did in opening up the Northwest provinces and peopling them with three millions of people in the space of fifteen years by means of a wise and vigorous immigration policy. He approved of the Transcontinental railway which will bind more closely together the East and the West. And, to-day, he has not the courage to rise in his place and give credit to his new friends for bringing about the prosperity of Canada, though he is not willing to give credit to whom credit is due, the late Liberal government.

I now come to that part of the Speech from the Throne which relates to the conference which was held in London last summer, in which four members of this Cabinet took part, concerning the question of naval defence. The information about this matter that is given to us in the Speech from the Throne is very slim indeed. We are told that it is the duty of Canada at this time, considering certain conditions which have been disclosed to the ministers, to give reasonable and necessary aid to the British navy. Well, whatever may be our duty as British subjects or as Canadians, at least, common sense compels us to say that, before forming an opinion, we must know what these conditions are. That has been the more or less invariable rule by members on both sides of the House. There has been one exception, and that exception is the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres. We heard the other night from the hon. member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Boyer) what was

the political belief of the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres before the 21st of September, 1911. He recalled to us—what we already knew—the very passionate appeals which were made to the electors concerning the naval policy of the late government and the declaration made by these gentlemen on every hustings in the province of Quebec that whatever was done by Liberals or Conservatives touching the naval problem they condemned unreservedly. But since the 21st of September, 1911, we hear no more of these appeals to the electors. The hon. member for Chambly-Verchères seeks to impress us with the idea that he has seen a dark and threatening cloud which is hanging over the British Empire, and immediately he concludes that Canada should give a contribution to the British navy. He is so anxious to-day to explain his position in this House that he waives the consideration of conditions not yet disclosed to us. He draws his own conclusion and declares a wish to contribute to the British navy. This is serious. But he is not content with this; he goes further still and says: I am sure that the province of Quebec and all the other provinces in the Dominion will unite in favour of that policy. I am sure that the friends of the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres, whom he has greatly surprised in the past, will be still more surprised when they learn that he has risen in his place and, without facts to substantiate his judgment, has thus declared his belief, has bound himself hand and foot to the policy of his new friends.

Now, I would like to say a word about some of the remarks made by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who seconded this address. That hon. gentleman told us that he knew there were men in Canada who thought that Great Britain had not treated Canada rightly in the past and said that Canada owed nothing to Great Britain. He followed this up immediately by saying that he knew that the province of Quebec would unite with the other provinces in favour of the policy of the Government—which policy has not yet been declared to us. There is only one construction to be put upon these remarks, and that is that the hon. gentleman believed that of the men who profess these views, some belong to the province of Quebec. But I will tell the hon. member for Kingston that if these ideas existed in the province of Quebec they did not apply to the French-Canadian Liberals of that province. The French Liberals of the province of Quebec followed their leader and their party in the first attempt to help England and defend Canada by the adoption of an adequate naval policy. They did this not only because of their sympathy with their leader and allegiance to their party, but out of the sincere conviction that the people of Canada have to face like free men the problem of naval defence. In following this policy, we at the same time admired our leader for having by his statesmanship and sagacity solved the problem of fulfilling our desire to help Great Britain and to conserve our Canadian nation. Any proposals that may be made by this Government will be received with that spirit of fair play which characterizes the loyal people whom we represent in this House.

I now wish to deal with the amendment laid upon the table of the House by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I do not wish to discuss the charges ; they have been explained in this House, and the country now knows how the Conservatives win their elections. But may I be permitted to draw a conclusion from what has been divulged in the House in connection with this matter, and that is, that under this present Government we are going from bad to worse? Before the 21st of September, 1911, a free Canadian and British subject who dared to think differently from hon. members opposite was accused of disloyalty —there was no room for him in the councils of the nation. But to-day when a man acting freely and under the law goes forth to convince the electors of this country that the Government of the day does not merit their confidence, he is locked up and imprisoned, refused bail and denied counsel. Every free-minded and honest man in this country will agree that such a state of affairs is outrageous, and I believe that never since responsible government was introduced into this country has there been a government so deserving of the censure of this House and the people of this country as the present administration. Mr. Speaker, I will vote very heartily for the amendment now before the House.

Mr. ARTHUR CYRIL BOYCE (West Algoma): Mr. Speaker, it must be a matter of congratulation to hon. members of this House that the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Pacaud) was able to express himself, on the occasion of his first address in the House, with such fluency and apparent force, even if not characterized with the desire to adhere as closely to facts as has been the custom and general tradition of a deliberative assembly such as the Parliament of Canada. But one can forgive my hon. friend from Megantic when one considers the rapid pace that has been set for him by the hon. gentleman from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) who, I regret to see, is not here to-night. I suppose he is tired after the magnificent physical effort which he made to convince this House that he was in earnest. I do not like to speak of

the hon. gentleman in his absence, but I am going to take the liberty of referring to some of the statements that hon. gentleman has made, so far as they seemed to me to be coherent and relevant to the question raised in the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition.

My hon. friend from Carleton was very emphatic about the facts. It did not take him long to accept a statutory declaration as gospel truth when it was read by such a sanctified authority as the former Minister of the Interior, the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). Without any knowledge of the man who made the declaration, and without knowing whether he was a man worthy of belief, he gives his statement credence merely because of the views of his political ally, with whom he was in very close company as regards declarations when he sat on this side of the House. My hon. friend from Carleton had no hesitation whatever in pledging himself to the truth of the facts alleged in the declarations read so glibly by my hon. friend from Edmonton, identifying himself with the maker of those statements, and making himself responsible for their truth.

Mr. OLIVER: I would ask the hon. gentleman if he is throwing any doubt upon the correctness of those affidavits?

Mr. BOYCE: My hon. friend will be able to judge of that from my remarks if he chooses to listen to them. It was not always that my hon. friend from Carleton or the hon. gentleman from Edmonton were in the habit of paying such respect to declarations as evidence; and since my hon. friend from Edmonton, in all his integrity as regards public misconduct, has interposed a query, I will just remind him of a time when he was sitting upon the Treasury benches and when he was not at all anxious to accept declarations with regard to political corruption, or evidence involving the actions of thugs and thieves in his own department, elevated and promoted by him because they were political thieves and thugs.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend has made an allusion which I do not understand.

Mr. BOYCE: You will understand it in a moment.

Mr. OLIVER: If my hon. friend has any allusion or insinuation to make, let him make it specific, and let us know to whom and what he is alluding.

Mr. BOYCE: I can assure you I have been long enough in this House not to have a herring drawn across the trail of my remarks in that way. I propose to put before my hon. friend, before the House and before the country, one or two glimpses of memory for his edification and in order to show to Canada the spectacle of my hon. friend making an amendment which suggests that this country is suffering; forsooth, from political corruption. My hon. friend was Minister of the Interior in the last administration. Philip Wagner, a trusted officer of his department, preyed upon immigrants coming into this country and stole their money, was prosecuted, once, twice, convicted and jailed, released from jail. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior took poor Philip to his bosom and promoted him. Now, does my hon. friend recollect or deny those facts?

Mr. OLIVER: I can only repeat what I said in the House at the time, that in my judgment Mr. Wagner was the subject of persecution rather than prosecution.

Mr. BOYCE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I remember that my hon. friend did say that, but I was going to say that in connection with these charges there were declarations and statements of fact made to my hon. friend and he scouted them and said it was ridiculous, nay, it was monstrous to found a charge like that upon declarations of that nature, that this was not a court of law, that we were not a jury, that we were not going to try Philip Wagner; and his right hon. leader, puzzled by a resolution couched in the most moderate terms asking only that there should be an investigation into the truth of that charge and if the truth of it should be established that Mr. Philip Wagner would be dismissed, my hon. friend and his right hon. leader, the then leader of the Government, voted down any investigation whatever into the conduct of the thief and the thug whom my hon. friend had taken to his bosom and promoted to a high position.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to protest against the names that my hon. friend from Algoma is calling the late Mr. Wagner. I do not think it is right or fair that this should be allowed.

Mr. BOYCE: I did not know that this poor persecuted gentleman had passed away. I thought he only had passed away politically. My hon. friend received the benefit of his labours as a political hireling a political partisan, rewarded him for these labours and while I have, Sir, I think, enough respect for the departed to speak of him as well as I can, the language of my hon. friend and his colleagues, and the enormity of this amendment, cause me to deal with the facts and conditions and to speak the truth regardless of whom I hit, or whose memory I hit, and my hon. friend ought to be the last one to quarrel with that sort of thing or to endeavour to shield himself behind it.

Mr. OLIVER: In my humble judgment Philip Wagner was very much less of a thug than the member for Algoma who abuses him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that remark is in conformity with the amenities of debate. The hon. member should withdraw it. It is not the sort of language that should be exchanged between members of this House, if I understand the rule.

Mr. OLIVER: I am bound to bow to your ruling. I certainly expressed my opinion. I am willing to withdraw it out of deference to the rules of the House.

Mr. BOYCE: My hon. friend did not recognize the words I used as being the words of his right hon. leader in his speech in this debate, 'political thugs and thieves' and his own words last session. My hon. friend did not quarrel with that then. Perhaps the political exigencies of a difficult position in which he finds himself to-day touched him on the raw and compelled him to take objection to their use.

I was proceeding to ask if it is any wonder, in the face of a record of this nature, not the only ones by any means which are placed upon 'Hansard' during the fifteen years of the reign of my hon. friend and his colleagues that my hon. friend from Carleton, N. B., should this afternoon regale this House with a mournful dismal howl with regard to so-called political corruption, when he is basing all his proofs, all his remarks, all the basis of all his insinuations upon that amendment, and upon remarks and evidence suggested by my hon. friend from Edmonton in a form which he deprecated and deplored under the very circumstances with which I have charged him and which he cannot deny because they are written on the face of 'Hansard.'

Mr. OLIVER: I rise to a point of order. My hon. friend has said he has made a charge against me. I have failed to apprehend what this charge is. I want him to be specific. When he says to this House that he has made a charge against me I ask that he state what this charge is.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid there is really no point of order in that.

Mr. BOYCE: The hon. member for Carleton, N. B., who is a lawyer as many members are, appreciated the fact that when there is very little case there must be very loud and very long and very vehement speech.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYCE: And that when you have a dishonest client——

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYCE—you must abuse the judges.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYCE—and abuse the other counsel.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYCE: My hon. friend overlooked the fact that he was bringing himself entirely within that very salient doctrine. I am sure it was most humiliating to my hon. friends opposite to see my hon. friend from Carleton, N. B., placed in the position that he was by my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen); a position of great humiliation, a position which demonstrated immediately that while he desired to do all the damage he could, he yet failed to appreciate the value of veracity, and of sticking to facts. Why, Sir, the absolute disregard of that hon. member for facts which appear in documents was so funny, that he pretended to quote the price of potatoes in Woodstock last week, and he could not even do that correctly. The poor potatoes had to be libelled at the instance of the member for Carleton, N. B., for he quoted the value of potatoes at $1 per barrel, whereas the price quoted in the paper in his own town was 20 cents more a barrel—just 20 per cent out in his regard for veracity.

An hon. MEMBER: That is small potatoes.

Mr. BOYCE: I have referred my hon. friend from Edmonton to the records of this House with regard to Philip Wagner. I said I was not going to elaborate instances. He knows the circumstances of that case well, and I merely cited it in order to bring before this House for the refreshment and the delectation of the people of this country, the spectacle that my hon. friend presents now in seconding this resolution, and elaborating upon it, as he did in his speech.

My hon. friend from Carleton referred principally to two features. One was the Macdonald election, about which, save for the declaration of my hon. friend from Edmonton, he knew nothing whatever; and the second was a lament, a grievous lament, with regard to the defeat of reciprocity. He had some courage. He bolstered himself up to this point, and it was a point to which his right hon. leader could not bring himself; he boldly asserted, 'I intend to resurrect reciprocity.' There was, I noted, in the conduct and demeanour of hon gentlemen opposite, a strange difference of cordiality with regard to that statement. I did not notice much applause from my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie).

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was not here just at that time.

Mr. BOYCE: Then I beg my hon. friend's pardon. I do not desire to contradict him, but I distinctly saw him in his place——

Mr. GUTHRIE: I rise to a point of order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. BOYCE: When the hon. member for Carleton, referring to my hon. friend the Minister of Finance said, 'We want him to resurrect reciprocity, we all of us want him to do so,' a very grave expression came over the face of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) was complaining of what had been lost to the Liberal party through the defeat of reciprocity, through this country not having seen eye to eye with gentlemen opposite on the 21st of September, 1911. He said, 'We lost power, we lost prestige,' and, in accentuation, he reached the climax when he said, 'And we lost money by the defeat of reciprocity at the last election.' Then he came back, and said, 'But we saved our honour.' Did it not occur to him, or to other members, that if an example of his honour was shown by the palpable misstatements, which he made with regard to the employment of counsel by Walkinshaw, and the slandering of the poor potatoes in his own constituency, the cloak of his honour was in shreds and patches, that it was a poor garment to be left with. 'All lost to the Liberal party save honour,' wails the hon. member for Carleton. All I can say with regard to that which is left is that my hon. friend had better be careful; he would do well to patch up the garment, and not allow further tears such as were made by my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie this afternoon. Well, I have to recollect that the hon. member for Carleton sat on this side of the House not very long ago, and that, with my hon. friend from Edmonton, he had to listen to declarations and amendments, and that, as a champion of contractors like the Marwins, and the rest of those who were plundering the public purse, and who were brought as witnesses—not by declaration, or by affidavit, or by other paper writing, but in person before the Public Accounts Committee—there was no man more adept, no man whose voice was more loudly heard, no man who was more obstructive to the stream of evidence which came through the proper and direct channel, on the oath of the witnesses, than my hon. friend from Carleton during the time his party was in office. He and those who were associated with him earned the title, heralded in the newspapers, of 'official obstructors.' Resolutions were offered to this House with regard to his conduct in obstructing the Public Accounts Committee, and, as my hon. friend well knows, there was no man more desirous of preventing the disclosure of any evidence that might in any way reflect upon the pristine reputation of the late government in matters affecting political purity, than my hon. friend from Carleton. Political thugs and thieves!—my hon. friend from Edmonton takes exception to the expression. Well, we have lots of evidence of their existence in times gone by. Leaving aside the case of Philip Wagner, and without infringing your ruling, Mr. Speaker, if I could go into the history of the frauds disclosed in this House during the recent Administration, what should I say about the ballot switching, the ballot box stuffing, the ballot stealing, the fraudulent ballot boxes, the Byron O. Lott ballot boxes, and the case of Riley—a gentleman perhaps who is known to my hon. friend from South Renfrew—and the fraudulent voters' lists. The time of this House was taken up for no less than two weeks, I think, in showing the fraudulent manner in which the late government made up voters' lists without any regard for law, or even for common decency. Those are matters of history. They were brought to the attention of this House from time to time, and my hon. friend from Edmonton, and other hon. gentlemen opposite voted down the investigation of them by straight party votes, no matter what affidavits, declarations, or facts were brought forward.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition, on one occasion, amazed this House and largely, this country, by refuting charges brought against the Government by the quotation of the words—and my hon. friend is fond of quoting scripture—'to the pure all things are pure.' If the leader of the Opposition were here I would ask him what position he intended to take, or what position he does now take, upon the reciprocity issue. It is true, that the leader of the Opposition did, up to a certain point, say: 'I stand where I stood before the election of September 21, 1911,' but his voice has been getting piano, and piano and pianissimo upon this subject, until you come down to the spectacle of the right hon. gentleman in this Parliament, as leader of the Liberal party, being challenged to state his position upon a great issue which, according to his doctrine and to the line of reasoning of some of his followers, is necessary to the future welfare and development of this country, is afraid to stand up and say that he is now in favour of or desirous of promoting reciprocity with the United States as it was proposed in this House by his late Minister of Finance in January, 1911. Can the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham)

answer for him ? Can he say that he is heart and soul in favour of that policy ? If he can we would like to hear it, and if he can the country is entitled to hear it. I think it is about time that my hon. friends gave some evidence by a public declaration that they were honest in the political principles that they have been propounding to this country. I have given the hon. member for Renfrew an opportunity of denying the suggestion, or base insinuation, I make against him that he is really in favour of reciprocity. I have given him an opportunity of saying that he is not in favour of reciprocity. I think, to use the vernacular, that it is 'up to him' to say something even though his right hon. leader prefers, under that insinuation, to remain absolutely silent. Then, it being impossible to extract any declaration with a corkscrew from the leaders of a great party expounding and propounding an important trade policy for the future benefit of the country, will my hon. friend from South Renfrew, or his right hon. leader, make a tour now to the West and say : ' We have been conscientiously and steadfastly fighting for reciprocity for you,' when they sit on the front benches of this House and are afraid to make any announcement of their political faith in regard to this question.

I will ask the late hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) the same question. I will pick out several of my hon. friends on the other side of the House, in order to demonstrate that it is quite impossible, quite a satire, to say that there will be currents and cross-currents amongst them upon this question. I ask the hon. member for Rouville whether he will make any declaration upon the subject or whether he can tell us where his party is upon this question of reciprocity.

Mr. LEMIEUX : If it would be useful for my hon. friend in helping him to reach the solicitor-generalship, I would answer him.

Mr. BOYCE : Well, that is a very funny remark.

Some hon. MEMBERS : Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS : Answer the question.

Mr. BOYCE : It will only induce me to be a little more adhesive to my hon. friend, to question him a little bit more, and to ask him again whether he is in favour of this great policy ?

Mr. LEMIEUX : I will answer my hon. friend if he will answer my question. Is he an applicant for the solicitor generalship ?

Some hon. MEMBERS : Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYCE: Well, there is one thing with regard to reciprocity upon which my hon. friend are agreed, and that is that they shall keep quiet about it and not say anything about it in Parliament, where their words will go down upon the pages of ' Hansard '. They are absolutely at one upon that. I might ask the hon. member for St. John county (Mr. Pugsley) the same question. Perhaps he will reply by asking a similar senseless question to that of the hon. member for Rouville. That is about all you can get out of these hon. gentlemen. That is one side to it, but there is another side. These hon. gentlemen have gone through the country and have appealed to the people to send them back to power upon the question of reciprocity. The leader of the Opposition said only a month ago: I stand where I have always stood—although nobody knows where that is—and yet neither he nor any of those who have been given the opportunity will stand up here and state upon his responsibility what his position is, either yea or nay, upon this great issue. What sincerity can be ascribed to the professions of these hon. gentlemen under such circumstances as these? I venture to say that the country has ceased to take these hon. gentlemen in earnest, that it has ceased to believe that these hon. gentlemen had faith themselves in what they professed before the last election on the subject of reciprocity and they will have the greater reason for that disbelief when they see that they are afraid to come forward and state the reasons for the faith that is in them.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What about the Address?

Mr. BOYCE: Does my hon. friend desire an opportunity of rising and stating his position on the question? On the question of the amendment, before I leave it, I will just remind my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) of a statement made by a very strong Liberal supporter of the late Ross administration in Ontario during the election which closed the record of that government on the 25th day of January, 1905. His slogan to Sir George W. Ross, then Premier of Ontario was: ' Clean your own doorsteps '. I give that advice to my hon. friend from Edmonton, and I suggest it would be more expedient for a righteously penitent politician, if he would take the penitential bench and pour out contrition for his political sins when he was on this side of the House without attempting to create a mirage by reading affidavits and asking this House solemnly to pronounce against ministers of the Crown upon such affidavits and declarations.

Reference has been made in the Speech of His Royal Highness to the question of assistance to the navy of the Empire. It

is welcome news to most of us, irrespective of politics, that this great country is to demonstrate its greatness, its power, its dignity, its prestige, by taking whatever steps may be desirable and necessary at the moment, irrespective of what permanent policy may be framed later on—for the strengthening of the navy of the Empire. I think the situation as announced by this Government, so early after its acceptance of office is in great contrast with that taken by the late Prime Minister and his government. What position did my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) take upon that question and what position does he take to-day? When his so-called naval Bill was brought down to Parliament, the right hon. friend expressed himself as being in accord with a policy which would give assistance to the Empire. Three years have rolled by since he announced his naval programme and may I ask him what progress has been made upon that programme and how has that programme in any one iota contributed to the strengthening of the defences of Canada or of the Empire. My hon. friend from Edmonton possibly may enlighten me on that. I believe that neither he nor any member on the other side of the House can point to one thing done by which that Liberal naval programme was made effective for the strengthening of the defences of the Empire. We were to have ships; plans were drawn, contracts were promised to be let, the ships were never built and so far from strengthening the defences of the Empire the only thing done was to purchase and take away from the British navy the 'Niobe' and the 'Rainbow', pay for them, and bring them to Canada where they are to-day. I do not desire to deal at length with the naval programme of the present Government because we have not the particulars before us, but I do desire to say to the leader of the Opposition that he would have appeared better before the people of this country had he been a little more true to his protestations of being a great and broad Canadian. The right hon. gentleman's feelings upon the question of the defence of the Empire and Canada's contribution thereto, are somewhat difficult to understand, and so devious were they that when the hon. gentleman went to England last time to attend a council of the Empire, he practically announced that he would do nothing on the naval question after having on previous occasions indicated by his words that he would do something, and so he earned for himself the cognomen of 'Mr. Facing-Both-Ways'. We have in power to-day a government which has announced its intention of doing something on this question and I have the utmost confidence that in due course and as quickly as possible the Prime Minister will bring down a measure which will form an effective programme to meet a situation which must have been galling to every true British Canadian, a situation which has long been neglected, which cannot any further be neglected, and which the institutions and the prestige of this country require should not be neglected longer. I have the utmost confidence that henceforth the naval policy of Canada will be worked out without regard to political expediency, and with a sole desire to promote the prestige and credit of Canada as a strong and mighty factor in the welding together of the British Empire. I hope, when these proposals are brought down, that hon. gentlemen opposite will find themselves able, as true Canadians in spirit, to agree to them, to sink their private prejudices in the enthusiasm of their nationalism, and that they will vote for such measure as will promote the dignity and the honour and the power of Canada as a mighty factor in the Empire to which we are proud to belong. I believe that such a measure will receive the confidence of the Canadian people, as, in full and teeming and enthusiastic measure my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and his Government have the confidence of the Canadian people behind them to-day. Without suggesting any of the facts that go to make up an emergency, and without debating the question as to emergency, I say it is time that Canada should do her part and not be subject to the reproach which was contained in this morning's paper by an announcement made in the British House of Commons in reply to an enquiry as to what the Dominions beyond the Seas have done. The answer was, that there was an Australian contribution, that New Zealand had contributed, that the little Malay Settlements had sent a dreadnought, and that Canada had done nothing.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is in error. Australia has not made a contribution; she is providing her own navy.

Mr. BOYCE: Under the control of the Admiralty; that is what I intend to convey.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, under the control of Australia.

Mr. BOYCE: The Malay Settlements, poor as they are, contributed a ship, which was accepted, and Canada has done nothing. That was the announcement. It is time Canada

should remove that blot upon her dignity, placed there by the late Liberal Government. I have the utmost confidence, as we all have, that, my right hon. friend will, with the utmost despatch remove that blot. We have the utmost confidence that he will bring down a measure which will show to the nations of the earth that supporting Great Britain are the strong arms, ever growing stronger, of her Dominions beyond the Seas; a policy which will show that, with the riches with which Providence has blessed her and which she has acquired under England's protection, Canada will give enthusiastically, will give bountifully and sufficiently to assure, or at any rate to promote, the peace of the world.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, before undertaking to reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Boyce) who has just taken his seat, the would-be Solicitor-General, I desire to say a word in reply to one remark made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) this afternoon. I regret that that hon. gentleman is not in his seat. The hon. minister stated that on a future occasion he would take up in this House the question of the elections, not in the riding of Macdonald, but in some other parts of the Dominion. I imagine he was referring to the local elections in the province of Saskatchewan last July. Let me say to the hon. minister that he cannot bring up that question too soon to suit the members from the West, especially those from Saskatchewan. It is no fault of ours that the matter is not being discussed now. Let me say further that if the Minister of Public Works does not bring up that subject, we will take early occasion to afford him the opportunity to make good on the floor of this House the statement he made at the banquet given to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister on his return from the old country, to the effect that the election in Saskatchewan had been won by the disfranchisement of British subjects and allowing aliens to vote. Never was a statement made more devoid of truth. If old Ananias could hear such a statement he would feel like thirty cents. We are ready to discuss that statement at any time.

An hon. MEMBER: Go ahead.

Mr. TURRIFF: At any time. We will be only too happy to accommodate the hon. minister.

Now, as to my hon. friend from Algoma West (Mr. Boyce). That hon. gentleman was very anxious to use the corkscrew to get a reply from hon. members on this side. I would suggest to him the use of the corkscrew to extract the solicitor-generalship from the Government. It seems to me he would have a much better chance for the solicitor-generalship if he had left his speech of to-night undelivered. It seemed to me that he rather felt so himself, because when my hon. friend the member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) asked about his getting the solicitor-generalship, he said it was a senseless remark. I agree that it was a rather senseless remark, being based upon the idea that the hon. gentleman might get the solicitor-generalship. However, that is a matter for hon. members on the other side to deal with.

The first subject referred to in the Speech from the Throne is the increased trade of the country. I am sure that everybody on this side is glad to congratulate the Minister of Finance upon Canada's trade expansion. But it was pointed out by one of the speakers this evening that this increase of trade is largely due to the policy in force for the last fifteen years. The Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds) pointed out that our trade was greater than in any previous year. He might have gone a little further and pointed out that our trade with the United States was far larger than ever before. The hon. Minister could have shown that during the first year of the present Government's regime Canada's trade with the United States had increased $70,000,000, more than during any year of the former Government. He might have pointed out also that the trade with Great Britain in the same year had increased only $10,000,000. This, be it noted, was under the administration of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, who, only two years ago went through the Western country declaring that if he were returned to power he would put an end to the traffic running north and south, and would direct it east and west so that the people of the West should find their markets at home and in Great Britain. And here, under the administration of this same hon. gentleman, we have our trade with the United States increasing seven-fold faster than our trade with Great Britain. There was their promise, but now they pay practically no attention to it. One would think that their promises were made simply with the purpose of breaking them, for those promises have not been carried out in any respect. Another point touched upon in the Speech from the Throne is the naval policy that is about to be brought down. We have heard a great deal in the past year about an emergency which is said to exist. But so far as anybody can see the emergency that exists is not in Great Britain and not in the British Empire, but in the council chamber in the Eastern block. There has been a put-up job between the members of this Government and the Unionist party in the old country to send out men by the dozen to go up and down this Dominion talking about emergency and about danger to the

Empire, in order to cause the people of Canada to say: Let us forget all about politics and unite to carry out the policy of the Prime Minister. Why does he want that policy carried out? In order to enable him to keep in his Cabinet his Nationalist allies who were elected to this House on the distinct declaration that Canada should do nothing at all for Great Britain and were taken into the Cabinet without any public declaration on their part or modification of their opinion.

And the emergency is that my hon. friend the Prime Minister wants to retain these members in his Cabinet—men who professed that we owed nothing to Great Britain, and did not want to give a dollar or build a ship. There is an emergency, but it is an emergency existing on the Government benches, and if my hon. friend can overcome that difficulty, he may be able to get along without any further break than there has been. During the past summer some of our British friends—dyed-in-the-wool members of the Unionist party—who came out here and addressed Canadian clubs and other gatherings, while making the statement time after time that they did not wish to take part in any discussion of Canadian politics, they invariably ended up with such an expression as 'I hope that Canada will do this or that: ' I hope that Canada will give a contribution; I trust that that the people of Canada will unite, and that there shall be no party divisions upon this question.'

Mr. EDWARDS. Was there anything wrong if they did say that?

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, there is something wrong, and it is this: a put-up job between a party in the old country and a party in this country, and they have brought speakers out here to travel the length and breadth of the land, saying as some of them did, that in September, 1911, the loyal people of Canada preserved the solidarity of the British Empire in opposing reciprocity, and that the people who wanted to trade with the United States without paying duty were disloyal. This was a direct insult to almost half the people of Canada, for it must be remembered that out of every 60 votes cast in the election of September, 1911, there were 31 against reciprocity and 29 in favour of it—a very small margin. These gentlemen travelled throughout the length and breadth of the land, offering an insult to those people who considered that reciprocity with the United States would be an advantage to the people of Canada.

Another matter touched upon in the Speech from the Throne was the question of good roads, and I notice that my hon. friends opposite try to give the impression that the Senate threw out that Bill. That statement is not true, and there is not an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who is not aware of that fact. In spite of that, it has been repeatedly stated that the Senate threw out the Bill. The only action taken by the Senate in regard to the measure was to add an amendment, and it was open to the House to either accept that amendment, or to call a conference between the Senate and the House of Commons to see if some satisfactory arrangement could be made. But my hon. friends opposite did not want to do that. They do not want to pass that Bill unless thep can make a jug-handled measure, by which, in certain provinces where there is a Conservative local government, the money can be given to that government to expend, and in other provinces with a Liberal administration, they will have a string on the money, and can control its expenditure as they see fit. That is why the Senate introduced the amendment, and it is unfair for hon. gentlemen opposite to make the statement that the Bill was thrown out by the Upper House.

I would like to direct the attention of the House to some of the promises that were made by my hon. friend the Prime Minister to the people of the West during the contest prior to the election of September, 1911. The right hon. gentleman promised that if he was returned to power one of the first things he would do would be to hand over the control of the natural resources of the western provinces to the local governments. I believe my hon. friend would have liked to have carried that out, and I believe he would have done so had he been free to act as he would in the matter. But, under the domination of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, the master of the administration, he has not been able to make good that promise, and as far as we can see, has no intention of doing so. He put no strings on that promise, he stated that was his policy, but, when he came to deal with the province of Manitoba, he took away the control of the natural resources that they previously had. Those who heard the utterances of my hon. friend the Prime Minister when he was in Opposition regarding the sacredness of the promises of government, would have thought that when he obtained the reins of power he would have endeavoured to make good some of his promises to the people of Canada. But in almost every case he has deliberately set them aside, and has made no effort whatever to carry them out. That at any rate is the treatment we have received in the West.

Another matter which I consider to be of considerable importance, and a question we have heard but little about, is the degrading of the Grand Trunk Pacific rail-

way. This is a most important matter to the people of Western Canada, and so far as I can see, it has been done at the instigation of the other railway companies, particularly of the Canadian Pacific railway, who are not anxious that a first-class road should be operated between the western prairie provinces and the eastern cities. The result of the changing of these grades will be that the road will be changed from a first-class to a second-class line. Efforts have been made to find out exactly what has been done in this matter, but so far we have been unable to get any definite information. I trust that before very long the Government will bring that information down, and enlighten the members of the House on that important subject.

Mr. BRADBURY: Does my hon. friend know that the grade was changed at the instigation of the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. TURRIFF: I believe it is being done at their instigation. Perhaps my hon. friend the hon. member from Selkirk will tell us at whose instigation it is being done.

Mr. BRADBURY: I do not know that it is being done at all; neither does my hon. friend from Assiniboia.

Mr. TURRIFF: I believe it has been done at the instigation of the Canadian Pacific railway, and it is just in a line with everything else that is being done by my hon. friends on the Government benches, standing in with the big interests, standing right in with the monopolies, more mergers, more monopolies, doing everything for their wealthy friends and paying little or no attention to the farmers, the artisans and the labouring people of Canada. The whole tendency of the Government since they have come into power has been along those lines. Almost the first official act that this Government performed was to put a duty on lumber that had been coming in free for seventeen years, simply by changing the interpretation of one of the items of the tariff. Then, when they saw that they had got themselves into trouble with the farming community they had the matter submitted to the Exchequer Court and they got a judgment from the Exchequer Court saying that lumber coming in under Item 504 of the Customs Tariff was dutiable. Why did they not stand by their judgment? They had got what they wanted, why did they refer it to the court if they did not want the judgment? But knowing that there were some elections coming on in the West after collecting for a while they gave instructions that no further duty should be collected until they got a further judgment from the Supreme Court of Canada. The matter was then submitted to the Supreme Court of Canada and the lawyer representing the Department of Customs appeared before the judge and stated that he withdrew from the case. The Government withdrew from the case and simply left it without making any further plea and the judgment of the Exchequer Court was reversed by the Supreme Court. Now the matter is being submitted to the Privy Council. Why? The lumbermen of British Columbia and other parts of Canada would never submit that to the Privy Council unless they had an absolute assurance from the Government that if they submitted it to the Privy Council and the Privy Council gave a decision that the lumber under that particular item was dutiable, a duty would be put on that lumber. It would be a simple matter, one of the simplest matters possible for the Government to give a decision and carry out the same interpretation of the law that was in force for seventeen years, two years under the late Conservative administration and fourteen or fifteen years under the Laurier administration. All they had to do was to carry out the same regulation or issue a new regulation to make the question clear instead of having it submitted to the Privy Council? If they wanted to make the lumber free, all they had to do was to amend the Customs Act. But they did not want to do that, they wanted to stand in with their friends, the manufacturers of lumber in British Columbia.

What does this mean to the farmers of Western Canada and the people of Canada generally? Last year over $3,000,000 of lumber came in free and if the duty is put on it means about $700,000 or $800,000 of duty that the farmers and artisans of Canada will pay next year on that lumber. Why, Mr. Speaker? Because this is the class of lumber that is used by the poorer people in building their houses and by the farmers in building their granaries and stables. So I am justified in saying that my hon. friends opposite ever since they have come into power, have been standing in with the manufacturers, with the big concerns, the railways and the mergers, and having very little consideration for the general public.

Let me give you another instance. A little while ago, last August, I understand, one of the Canadian associations of workmen applied for a board of conciliation. They were not able to get that board, and the reason given by my friend the Minister of Labour was that their application was not technical. The reasons given by the minister were almost identical with those given by the Canadian Pacific railway when they refused to appoint one of the arbitrators to that board, and my hon. friend

the Minister of Labour also gave as one of his reasons that the Canadian Pacific railway had stated that they would not appoint a member to that board and if the board did give a judgment in the matter that they would not abide by it, and so the Minister of Labour refused to give them the board. What has been the result? A strike has been brought on and that strike to-day is causing a tie-up and a blockade of wheat and other grains in Western Canada for the simple reason that the railway company is not able to handle the cars when they come into Fort William. The other day a statement was made by the Western manager of the Canadian Pacific railway that the reason they were not furnishing more cars to handle wheat, flax and other grains was that there were no ships at Fort William to take the grain away. I see in the Manitoba Free Press a letter from a gentleman in Fort William who states that that reason is absolutely untrue and that the reason there were no ships or not enough ships coming in was that the railway company was not in a position to unload the cars and to load the ships because when a car is unloaded into one of the storage elevators at Fort William or Port Arthur that does not mean that the grain can be immediately loaded into a ship. When that grain is unloaded it has to be weighed and certificates have to be issued. This man, writing with knowledge, writing from the ground, states that the railway company is so far behind with the work that there is $1,000,000 due the Canadian Pacific railway for freight on these cars of wheat coming in and that they have not been able so far to collect the freight because they have not got the clerks to do it and therefore that wheat cannot be handled, cannot be loaded into ships, cannot be sold, because the owners cannot get their certificates and all because the Minister of Labour refused to give a board to these men—and this is the only absolutely Canadian union of labourers in the Dominion of Canada. So I say I am justified in making the statement that this Government stands in with the railroads and the manufacturers and the mergers as against the interests of the farmers and the labouring men of Canada.

We come now to another matter. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance, on Tuesday last, asked what we had lost by not having reciprocity. I just want to make one or two remarks upon that at the present time; I hope to take some future occasion to deal with the question of reciprocity, of our wider markets, or lower duties, whatever you choose to call it. I like to believe that the Minister of Finance is a fair man; but I remember that a few weeks ago he was at the Manufacturers' banquet, held in the city of Ottawa, and he quoted from the press the prices of wheat at Minneapolis and at Fort William. He asked, what has the Canadian farmer lost by not having the American market, and he quoted No. 1 Northern Manitoba wheat as against No. 1 Northern Minneapolis wheat. He led the people, who were present at that banquet, to believe, and he tried to make the people of Canada believe, that No. 1 Northern in Canada was the same class of wheat as No. 1 Northern in Minneapolis, and that the Winnipeg wheat was higher in price than the Minneapolis wheat No. 1. Now, as many of you know, though perhaps not all, there is no comparison between No. 1 Northern wheat of Canada and No. 1 Northern wheat in the Minneapolis market. No. 1 Northern wheat in Canada must weight 60 pounds to the bushel, and must have 60 per cent hard wheat at least. No. 2 Northern wheat in Canada has to weigh 58 pounds to the bushel, and has a somewhat lesser proportion of hard wheat. No. 1 Northern wheat in Minneapolis is a different class of wheat altogether; it is a wheat that has to weigh only 57 pounds to the bushel, and it does not require to have 50 per cent of hard wheat in it. And yet my hon. friend the Minister of Finance tried to make the people of Canada believe that it was the same class of wheat as No. 1 Northern in Canada. I do not know whether he was aware of the difference of the grades or not, but if he was not aware of the fact, he should have been, before he undertook to make a comparison that would naturally deceive the people of Canada.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): What was the spread, using the technical term in the West, between the wheat quotations in Minneapolis and in Winnipeg during September and October, because I have the record, I mean for the same grade? Was it not as much as 15 cents in favour of Winnipeg?

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend the Minister of Finance says he has the figures. If he has, let him produce them to the House.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): You should produce them.

Mr. TURRIFF: I say there is no comparison between No. 1 Northern wheat in Manitoba and No. 1 Northern wheat in Minneapolis, no comparison whatever; and in order that there shall be no question about that I will just read what the grades are:

Manitoba grades spring wheat, No. 1 Manitoba Northern wheat shall be sound and well cleaned, weighing not less than 60 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least 60 per cent of hard Red Fife wheat.

No. 2 Manitoba Northern Wheat shall be sound, reasonably clean, of good milling qualities, and fit for warehousing, weighing not less than 58 pounds to the bushel, and shall be composed of at least 45 per cent of hard Red Fife Wheat.

Now let me give you what No. 1 Northern spring wheat in Minneapolis is.

No. 1 Northern spring wheat shall be sound, sweet and clean, and consist of the hard and soft varieties of Spring wheat, and weigh not less than 57 pounds to the measured bushel.

That is a difference of three pounds in weight, and it may be all soft wheat. It does not need to have a pound of hard wheat in it, and yet that is the wheat that our friends of the opposition compare, in the matter of price, with No. 1 Northern Manitoba wheat. Why, our No. 3 Northern wheat is better wheat than the No. 1 Minneapolis wheat. There are dozens and hundreds of constituents in my riding who have sold wheat at home, and got No. 4 Northern wheat for it; who have drawn from the same bin sent it across the line, paid the 25 cents a bushel as duty, and got No. 1 Northern for it on the American side of the line.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Was there any wheat imported to Winnipeg from the United States during September and October, and how much was it spread?

Mr. TURRIFF: There has not been a year during the last 25 years in which Canada has not imported wheat from the United States, and I do not suppose there will ever be a year in which Canada will not import wheat from the United States. There has never been a year in which Canada has not imported flour from the United States, and I do not suppose there will ever be a year in which it will not import flour, because certain grades of wheat have not the qualities necessary for making certain classes of pastry and biscuits, and they have to import either the flour or the wheat. However, I just wanted to point out the unfairness of comparing No. 1 Northern Manitoba wheat with No. 1 Minneapolis wheat. Our No. 3 Manitoba wheat is a better wheat than No. 1 Minneapolis, and if you compare the prices you will find that they are high in Winnipeg and low in Minneapolis. At the time my hon. friend the Minister of Finance made his speech he must have known perfectly well the conditions that existed. In the United States they are farther south than we are, their wheat is ripe earlier, they had the biggest crop last year that they ever had and that wheat was pouring in by the millions of bushels to Minneapolis, while in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, owing to wet weather, the wheat could not be threshed, it was not coming in, wheat merchants had made contracts to supply wheat in order to ship it out, they had their boats, they had their space chartered and they had to produce the wheat or pay the freight. The result was that cash wheat, for a short time, went away up, and my hon. friend must have known perfectly well what the conditions were and that they were not the ordinary conditions. I can show my hon. friend the prices of wheat in Fort William and Minneapolis month by month and year by year.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the average difference in the price?

Mr. TURRIFF: The average difference for the last three years would be something like ten cents a bushel, and, if you take the actual quality of the wheat and put No. 3 Northern Canadian against No. 1 Northern Minneapolis, the difference will be over 15 cents a bushel. My hon. friend asks what we have lost. Well, I think he got his reply this afternoon pretty well from my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell). The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) undertook to reply to him.

An hon. MEMBER: He did it.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, and he replied just exactly as we knew the hon. member for Portage la Prairie would reply. He is a clever lawyer and when you get a clever lawyer who has absolutely no case he abuses the opposing counsel. That is what my hon. friend did. He picked on one little thing that did not affect the case at all and he made a great, big parade of that for twenty minutes, got a lot of applause and sat down. The hon. gentleman never came within a mile of the subject and did not want to come near it. The hon. member who is a good lawyer knew better than to touch the subject that was under discussion. But, he made a harangue, got the applause, sat down, and he showed mighty good sense as he very often does. I give the hon. gentleman a great deal of credit for the way in which he managed it. He managed it with more than his usual astuteness and that is saying a good deal. It is a mighty poor case when my hon. friend, who had not intended to speak upon the question, had to get up and draw a herring across the trail because hon. gentlemen knew that there was no person else on that side of the House who could do it with the same fineness of touch that my hon. friend exhibited this afternoon.

I want to touch for a moment or two on the question of cement. The Minister of Finance, who spoke upon this subject on Tuesday, was very insistent that an apology was due to him from my right hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition, and, in a

iesser degree from my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). If there was an apology due from the Leader of the Opposition to the Minister of Finance, what about the apology from the Minister of Finance to this House? I gave the hon. gentleman the most absolute attention of which I was capable, because I like to hear him speak and I have a good opinion of the Minister of Finance, and the whole argument that he put forward was that the Leader of the Opposition and the hon. member for Edmonton were opposed to the reduction of the duty on cement. That was the way that he put it before the House and that is the way it will go before the country. You, Mr. Speaker, sitting in your chair and hearing it all, must have been absolutely aware of the fact that the Leader of the Opposition did not oppose the cutting of the duty and that the hon. member for Edmonton was not opposed to the cutting of the duty, but that the argument that they put forward was that the Minister of Finance had made that cut in the duty just at a time to help the pending elections in Saskatchewan. I will leave it to the House if that is not a fair presentation of the case. The Minister of Finance got a little hot under the collar that anyone should suppose that he would make a cut in the duty in order to help an election. I do not believe the Minister of Finance would do that. I was pleased to hear him say that he had ideas. But, he went on also to say that he had ideals. How long he will be able to keep these ideals if he follows in the train of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) the master of the Administration, is a question that cannot be very hard to answer. But, he has ideals and he tried to make out all through that the question of the cutting of the duty on cement had arisen away back last January or last winter in an interview between the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), with himself, and the manufacturers. The ground upon which we based our conclusion that this was a political dodge, not intentional on the part of my hon. friend, but absolutely intentional on the part of the hon. Minister of Public Works and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane)—and the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid) would not be above the same trick—was, not the interview of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance with the manufacturers in January last, but a letter written by his leader the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) to one of his own supporters, a manufacturer of cement, on the 13th day of May last, in which he gave this manufacturer to understand that he was placing too much credence in street rumours, and that there was no intention on the part of the Government to reduce the duties on cement. Less than a month from that date, at the demand of the master of the Administration, and to help him out in Saskatchewan, the Minister of Finance cut that duty in two. The first intimation that we had of that in Saskatchewan was given by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works at the banquet that he gave himself in that province on the 10th of June. Is it any wonder we are suspicious as to why that cut in the cement duty was made? I believe my hon. friend absolutely when he said he had no notion of doing anything of the kind, and he was absolutely justified, as he told us he was, in making that cut in the duty, but if he was absolutely justified in making that cut, was he justified in putting the duty back again? His colleague wrote that the duty on cement was 60 per cent, and I am told it is far more than 60 per cent. I was speaking with the manager of a paving company within the last month, and he told me that last summer he had an offer in writing from one of the largest cement mills in the United States that if he would place his full order for the summer supply of cement with that manufacturer they would sell at 65 cents a barrel. The duty on cement is 15 cents per 100 pounds.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): About twelve and a half cents. The duty on a 350-pound barrel of cement is 41¾ cents, but to that must be added the duty upon the bags which makes it about 52 cents a barrel.

Mr. TURRIFF: Then you have 52 cents duty on the cement and 65 cents for the value of the cement in the barrel so that the duty will be from 85 to 90 per cent. But let us take the duty at 60 per cent. When my hon. friend reduced the duty—I suppose he and his colleagues have got to be unanimous about these matters——

Mr. GRAHAM: Except the navy.

Mr. TURRIFF: Oh certainly, they cannot be unanimous about the navy because I expect the Nationalists may have to separate themselves from the Government on that question. Therefore, as this minister said in this letter to which I refer, the duty on cement was 60 per cent, then when it was cut in two there was still a duty of 30 per cent which was more than the average duty the manufacturer in Canada paid. That idea was put forward by the ministers to ease the manufacturer off when the duty was cut, but if that be true why did the Minister of Finance put the duty back again.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): The statute put it back.

Mr. TURRIFF: No, the hon. gentleman could have extended it still further. If he had power to extend the cut in the duty for four months, at the end of that four months he and the treasury board could have extended it for another four months. The Minister of Finance will not deny that. But the fact is that the Minister of Finance was in trouble with his manufacturing friends, and there were no other elections coming on and therefore the duty was put back and we have to-day a duty on cement of from 60 per cent to 85 per cent. Therefore Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will agree with me that the tendency of this Government has been to stand in with the mergers and the trusts and the manufacturers and the railways to keep up prices, and to still more increase the cost of living and to make life harder for the farmer and for the labourer. That is the state of affairs we have had ever since the Conservative Government came into power.

Mr. PELLETIER: This Government having reduced the duty in that case, perhaps the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) will admit that in four months the Government is at least one better than the Liberal Government was in so many years.

Mr. TURRIFF: If the Postmaster General thinks that his Government did good in reducing the duty on cement then he acknowledges that they are bad now and the signs are that they propose to remain bad. Having put their hands to the plough in reducing the duty why did they turn back?

Mr. GRAHAM: The Hochelaga election.

Mr. TURRIFF: Oh yes, I had forgotten there was an election at Hochelaga and naturally the duty on cement had to be put back to help the new Secretary of State.

Mr. PELLETIER: There was no need of that because the Liberal party had no candidate there.

Mr. TURRIFF: No, the Liberal party had no candidate but the Postmaster General had trouble enough in his own ranks without the Liberal party intervening. His bosom friend Mr. Bourassa and his friend Mr. Lavergne gave him all the trouble he wanted just at that time, and if the Postmaster General takes his character from his old friend Mr. Lavergne he won't be very proud of himself. I think the less the Postmaster General says at the present time the better for his party.

Mr. PELLETIER: There was not much trouble when the other candidate lost his deposit.

Mr. TURRIFF: The Postmaster General and his friends are entitled to take all the comfort they can out of the Hochelaga election and the Macdonald election for that matter. I noticed that to-day the Minister of Public Works took full responsibility for everything that had been done in Macdonald, and therefore, he forces the Minister of Finance and two or three other ministers whom I could mention to share the responsibility with him and I think these gentlemen will be a little restive when they have to uphold before the people of Canada what was done in the Macdonald election. The Minister of Public Works acknowledged this afternoon that he was in charge of that election and that what was done was well done. He went further than that; he went further even than any of his officials, his own tools, went during that election. When the cases arising out of that election came to trial there was not one title of evidence against any one of the four men arrested, and the magistrate said that in some cases they should not have been arrested, and in other cases there was no evidence, and they were honourably discharged, and yet the Minister of Public Works, not satisfied with that, made the statement from his seat in the House this afternoon that every man that was arrested deserved to be arrested; showing that he wanted these tools of his to go even further than they did. And so the Minister of Finance and the other members of the Cabinet have now to assume the responsibility of what was done in Macdonald because their own colleague has shouldered it upon them by defending the nefarious transactions in that election. I wonder how the Minister of Finance would like to get on a platform in his constituency in Ontario and defend the proposition that a man may be arrested on a warrant sworn out two days before the alleged offence could possibly have taken place. Constables were going through the constituency saying : 'We have no warrant, but we have our instructions.' Instructions from whom ? From the Minister of Public Works and from his tools the Prime Minister of Manitoba and the Attorney General of Manitoba—an attorney general who, since he took office, has done nothing but prostitute the Department of Justice of Manitoba for his own purposes in every election that has taken place there. And the boss of the government in Manitoba, while he was there was the present Minister of Public Works, just as he is the boss of the Administration here to which he now belongs. And respectable men like my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds) will have to go through the country defending what was done in Macdonald, because his colleague and master of the Administration acknowledged that it

was well done and that all of these men who were arrested, though there was nothing against any of them, deserved to be arrested. We have the proof of it in one of his own speeches. He stated that one man had been arrested and that more were going to be arrested. How did he know that, except from the fact that he had given instructions, that, whether guilty or not, whether there was evidence or not, these men were to be arrested and stopped from working until the election was over?

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would like to ask a question. Did he take part in that election, and if not, will he tell the House why he did not?

Mr. TURRIFF: One reason I might give is that a number of honest men who had committed no crime, were arrested. Another that I might give is that the Prime Minister of Manitoba made the statement that the fact that a man was a member or ex-member of the legislature would not prevent his being arrested. These I might give as reasons. But it happened that I was in British Columbia at the time the election was held, and so was unable to, and did not, take part in it. I will leave to my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) if he wants to get further reasons——

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): I do not want to mix up in it.

Mr. TURRIFF: Of course the hon. gentleman does not want to mix up in it when he finds how it stinks.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): I said I did not want to mix up in the quarrel between you and Richardson.

Mr. TURRIFF: But he was mixed up in the election, as he will find out before he is through. Four men were arrested—four Liberals—who were working for the independent candidate. But some other men were arrested during that campaign, and I wish to place before this House an affidavit in regard to one of these men. And this, be it noted, is an affidavit by a man who swears to facts, not an affidavit such as we had this afternoon from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) made by men who state only what this, that or the other person told them. This is from a man who knows all about it.

Canada:
Province of Saskatchewan,
To wit:

In the matter of an election holden on the 12th day of October, A.D. 1912, in the electoral district of Macdonald in the province of Manitoba.

I, Richard H. Macdonald of the city of Moosejaw in the province of Saskatchewan, Editor, do solemnly declare:—

1. That on Saturday the 12th day of October, A.D. 1912, I was a resident elector in polling division No. 4, Deer Lodge, in the electoral district of Macdonald, in the province of Manitoba, and was the duly appointed agent at that poll of Robert Lorne Richardson, candidate in the said electoral district at an election held on the said date for the election of the member for the said electoral district to serve in the House of Commons.

2. That while the polling was in progress I was cautioned by Mr. Richardson's outside scrutineers that there had been several cases of attempted personation of persons well known to them but that in each case when challenged the said persons had gone away without attempting to enter the polling booth and in consequence of such information I was watching for attempts to personate absentee voters.

3. During the afternoon while polling was in progress a person representing himself as a voter named 'Quinn' entered the polling booth and applied for a ballot. The said person was unknown to me but was not either of the Quinns on the list of voters at that poll, one of whom had already voted and the other, Valentine G. Quinn being a banker who resided in Douglas Park, within a few hundred yards of my residence, and who had, to my knowledge, left for the Coast for some considerable period and I knew that he had not returned to the electoral district or vicinity. I immediately asked that the said person should be sworn and the deputy returning officer, Mr. Cotter, asked him what number his name was on the list, to which he replied 'they told me 196.' The Deputy Returning officer immediately said 'You are not Valentine G. Quinn; what is your name?' On which the said person replied 'I ought to know my own name,' Again asked what his name was he answered 'Quinn' and stated he had a brother outside and attempted to leave the polling booth under the pretence of fetching the said brother in, but was prevented by the constable at the door, under instructions from the deputy returning officer, to whom I stated that I wished the man arrested.

4. Valentine G. Quinn was a name appearing on the corrected list of qualified voters entitled to vote at the said election in the said polling division and I demanded from the person giving his name, who he was, to which he persisted in replying 'my name is Quinn.' I again asked that he be arrested, to which the deputy returning officer replied 'wait a minute, perhaps there is another Quinn on the list.' whereupon I pointed out that there was, and that the said Quinn had already appeared and voted and had been recognized by those present.

5. In reply to further questioning the person representing himself as Valentine G. Quinn admitted to me that his name was 'Tom Morris' and that he did not reside in the polling subdivision of the electoral district, but that he resided at No. 303 Ellen Street in the city of Winnipeg.

6. Thinking that the deputy returning officer was not going to arrest the man I left

the polling booth for a few minutes and requested a justice of the peace, who was outside, to hold himself in readiness to receive from me an information which I was then preparing and to arrest and to have arrested a person then within the polling booth.

7. On my return both the deputy returning officer and Mr. Johnstone, the agent of Alexander Morrison, the Conservative candidate, pleaded with me not to have the man arrested. The deputy returning officer stated that I could easily trace him afterwards. I pointed out that I had no guarantee that the address given was a correct one and the alleged Tom Morris then threw over to me a brass check marked on one side 'B. & C.' and 'L.T.D.' and on the other side the number '139,' and stated that he was employed by the firm who were laying asphalt on the road running past the polling booth and that this was his time check. He was pleading that I would let him go as he said he had a wife and three children dependent upon him.

8. On Monday the 14th day of October, A.D. 1912, I proceeded to the address 303 Ellen Street in the city of Winnipeg, given by the said Tom Morris, and there learned from the landlady that such a person had been lodging there at one time but had left, owing her rent, a month previously. She identified the said Tom Morris from my description and stated that he had a wife with him but no children and that both were disreputable characters, the man only working a few days at a time in order to purchase drink.

9. One of the objections raised in the polling booth by Mr. Johnstone, the Conservative scrutineer, to my swearing the information against Tom Morris, was that the magistrate before whom he would be brought, would, he he said, have no alternative but to send the man to prison and as he was only a tool in the hands of other people this would punishing him too severely. On my insisting, however, the deputy returning officer accepted the information and ordered the said Tom Morris to be conveyed to the St. James police station in the custody of a constable named Ferguson.

10. I subsequently verified from the poll clerk's registrar his entry which read as follows 'No. Valentine G. Quinn' and in the remarks column 'Tom Morris attempted personation.'

11. On Monday, October 14th I went to the residence of Chief Constable Bain, who informed me that Morris had been released by Mr. S. D. Richardson, a justice of the peace in and for the province of Manitoba on his own recognizance of $250.00, at about eight o'clock on the evening of October 12th——

I might here remark that this man, who was caught red-handed, was admitted to $250 bail, but other men who were not guilty, and against whom there was nothing proven in any shape or form, had to put up $4,000 bail—because they were Liberals.

—and that the said Richardson, who was known to me personally as the man who was in charge of the Conservative campaign in that portion of the electoral district of Macdonald, had remanded the accused for trial on Wednesday, October 16th, but that he was not sure whether the case would be tried at St. Charles or at the provincial police court. Bain also informed me that it would be his duty to instruct me at what time and place the accused would be tried, in order that I might be present to prefer my charge.

12. On Tuesday, October 15th, 1912, I met the said chief constable Bain on a street car in St. James and he informed me that the case had been set for hearing by Magistrate McMiken at 11 o'clock in the forenoon of Wednesday, October 16th, 1912, and I stated that I would be present.

13. On Wednesday, October 16th, 1912, I waited at the said provincial police court from twenty minutes to 11 o'clock in the forenoon until thirty minutes after 11 o'clock in the said forenoon and that on my arrival there I met a reporter from the Free Press named James Fairlie, who had left me to go to the court a few minutes before 10 o'clock in the forenoon and the said Fairlie then informed me that the case had been disposed of before I arrived.

14. That Mr. Alexander Gunn, a witness subpoenaed in a similar case was then in the magistrate's room arguing with some one about the cases and that he came out and very indignantly informed me that the magistrate's clerk had stated that the election cases were disposed of already but that he did not know at what time.

15. That my counsel, W. H. Trueman, arrived a few minutes to 11 o'clock and I at once informed him of what I had learned, and that I also saw Mr. Hugh MacKenzie, a barrister-at-law, and the prosecutor in a similar case against one Stout, and discussed the matter with him.

16. That I have seen the affidavit made by the said Hugh MacKenzie and have read his account of the subsequent proceedings in court as set forth in paragraph 13 thereof, and that I solemnly declare that the same is substantially an exact statement of what took place.

17. That I verily believe and declare that the corrupt motive which induced Alexander McMicken, the provincial magistrate at the said court to dispose of the cases in the way that he did was to prevent the two defendants, Stout and Morris, from appearing in court and there being recognized as having personated other voters in addition to the charges already made against them, and that from information received I believe that I should have recognized the said defendant prosecuted by MacKenzie as having been a voter in another name in poll No. 4.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me this 25th day of November, A.D. 1912, at the city of Moosejaw, in the province of Saskatchewan.

RICHARD H. McDONALD.

E. A. St. James,
A Commissioner for oaths in and for the province of Saskatchewan.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there you can see the contrast. A man was caught red-

handed, trying to impersonate another voter. The evidence was all there; the police magistrate in Winnipeg who was to try the case, Magistrate McMicken, sets an hour and a day to try the case, and before that hour arrives he takes the case up, deals with it, and fines these two men $50 each and lets them go. Who paid the $50? My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works could answer that question if he wanted to. It was paid by tools of his own. That is the sort of justice that is being given us by the master of the Administration, the Minister of Public Works, and that is an action which the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice will have to defend on every platform in Canada. The subject is no longer confined to the Macdonald incident; it is a question of the rights of a free man in the Dominion of Canada, a part of the British Empire. For fifteen long years the right hon. leader of the Government sat on this side of the House, and was a strenuous advocate of clean elections. But now after fourteen months in power, we find an election carried on in this manner, and all my right hon. friend the leader of the Government has to say is 'Oh, it is not the only case where there have been crooked elections.' 'You're another'—that is just the way he puts it. Is that all we can depend on? A year ago, or even six months ago, if anybody had told me that the leader of the Government would take such a position, I would not have believed it, and I would have defended him, but when I see how little he is attempting to carry out his promises I must say I am beginning to lose faith in his integrity. The hon. Minister of Finance, who, as he says, has not only ideas, but ideals, will find it a difficult matter to defend the attitude of the Government on this question. His colleague, the Minister of Public Works, takes the full responsibility for all that was done in Macdonald, and says that it was well done, and not a vestige of evidence of wrong-doing was found against the four Liberals who were arrested. My hon. friend has been talking about Capt. W. Sifton, and showing forth how bad a man he was. Is not my hon. friend the master of the Administration in power? Could he not go after Captain Sifton if he has done anything wrong? Why was he let go, if he deserved to be arrested, and if, as the hon. the Minister of Public Works has said, he was a bad man? He was not an imported article, he was working there in his own province and the hon. the Minister of Public Works says he is a bad man but had no charge against him. The Attorney General's department in Manitoba is simply a tool of his, nothing else. Why does he not arrest Captain Sifton? It is a poor excuse for the Minister of Public Works to give this House to say that Captain Sifton is a bad man and deserved all he got when arrested, when they had not one tittle of evidence against him and treated him and all the others as if they were pick-pockets. That is the position which must be faced by the leader of the Government, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Justice—it will be no trouble for the others, but that will be the position that these gentlemen will have to defend and I think it will bother the Minister of Justice, who is a pretty decent Minister of Justice. That is the position his colleague the Minister of Public Works has put the Government in by his acceptance of full responsibility for all the villany that took place in Macdonald and he says it is all right and they only got what was coming to them and they deserved it.

Let us see what took place in Richelieu. We have in connection with the election at Richelieu two diametrically opposed statements by members of this House. One man is telling the truth, to put it mildly, or there is one of them not telling the truth. Our worthy knight, Sir Rodolphe Forget, the member for Charlevoix and other places, goes to Richelieu and makes a certain promise to the electors. He promises that if they elect Mr. Morgan, the Conservative candidate, the Marine railway will be built and he says: I do not come to you with any empty promise, I do not come to you with an election promise, I come to you with the real thing, a real promise, and I have it from the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works said to-day that he had never heard of that railway until after the election was over. Well, it is between the Minister of Public Works and the member for Charlevoix, the worthy knight. I do not know the worthy knight very well, so I would be inclined to take his word, but it ought to be settled among themselves. We do not have to settle it on this side of the House, that is a matter for them to settle. One of them may be telling the truth. We will probably find out some day which hon. gentleman is telling the truth. Surely the Prime Minister, after the position he has taken in this House for the last fifteen years is not going to tolerate what would not be tolerated in Russia in connection with these elections. I do not think it would be out of place for the Governor General to call upon the Minister of Public Works to resign.

Mr. GRAHAM: Call on Mr. Morrison to resign.

Mr. TURRIFF: The member for Macdonald certainly ought to resign and if he is an hon. member I expect he will resign, he will not want to occupy a seat won by the methods employed in Macdonald; I would be sorry to think that any member would want to sit in a seat won in that way. However, this is a matter for my hon. friends opposite to settle between themselves.

There are a number of things I hope to discuss in this House before the close of the session. One of the matters I am most anxious to have brought up and discussed at as early a date as possible, is the question to which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works referred, the Saskatchewan election. We are ready, let him go on whenever he likes. The Minister does not strike any terror into the hearts of the people of Saskatchewan. He can boss Manitoba and dominate this Government, but when he comes to Saskatchewan we are prepared to try a fall with him any day of the week. I trust that after all the pretensions that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite, when this amendment of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) comes to be voted on in the near future, my hon. friends opposite will see the justice of this amendment and will give it unanimous support.

On motion of Mr. McKay, the Debate was adjourned.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Customs for the year ended March 31, 1912—Mr. Reid.

On motion of Mr. Pelletier, House adjourned at 10.32 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, November 29, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Affairs of the Royal Society of Canada, for the year ended April 30, 1912.—Mr. White (Leeds).

Report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Roche.

Report of the Geological Survey Branch of the Department of Mines for the Calendar year, 1911.—Mr. Roche.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. Louis Coderre, member for the electoral district of Hochelaga, by the Right Hon. R. L. Borden and Hon. L. P. Pelletier.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 7) respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 8) respecting a patent of George Frederick Bishopric.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 9) respecting Canadian Explosives Limited.—Mr. Ames.

Bill (No. 10) respecting Dominion Trust Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill (No. 11) respecting New Orleans and Grand Isle Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'New Orleans and Grand Isle Railway, Light and Power Company, Limited.'—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 12) to incorporate the Great West Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. McKay.

CANADA-WEST INDIA TRADE CONFERENCE.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): When may we expect a distribution of the publication containing the proceedings of the Canada-West India Trade Conference, which, I understand, has been printed?

Hon. Mr. FOSTER: As soon as the debate on the motion now before the House is concluded, I shall lay the papers on the table.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It is expected that the West India-Canada Trade Treaty will be placed before the House for ratification before the Christmas adjournment and in that case it must be very soon presented. I think it only fair that the House should have the printed proceedings as early as possible, because I notice that they were presented to some of the West India legislatures prior to the discussion of the treaty there.

Mr. FOSTER: There will be no undue delay. I suppose we shall conclude this debate early next week. The papers are all ready, and will be laid on the table of the House immediately on the conclusion of the debate, and in quite sufficient time to enable all members to have access to all that is in it before the trade arrangement is brought before the House.

CAR SHORTAGE.

Hon. WILLIAM PUGSLEY: I desire some information on a matter of very great importance and urgency. I have to-day received a letter from the secretary of the Montreal Corn Exchange Association as follows:

Montreal Corn Exchange Association.
Office of the Board of Trade,
Montreal, November 28, 1912.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Sir,—The inclosed copy of letter to the Honourable the Minister of Railways and Canals will explain the nature of a complaint made by the grain exporters in a matter which is of vital interest to the port of St. John and in which we hope to enlist your sympathy, in view of the fact that you represent that constituency in the House.

I have the honour to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,
J. STANLEY COOK,
Secretary.

November 27, 1912.

Hon. Frank Cochrane,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa.

Sir,—I have he honour by direction to communicate herewith copy of telegram addressed you on the 15th inst., together with copies of messages exchanged between officers of your department and the undersigned, with reference to the urgent necessity for the supply of cars by the Intercolonial railway to the Grand Trunk railway for the movement of grain from Georgian bay ports to St. John for export.

It has been the desire of the Government to export as large a proportion as possible of the Canadian grain crop through Canadian ports and in addition to secure for transportation by the Canadian route a fair share of the grain products of the middle and western States, and now when large contracts have been made for shipment of grain by the Canadian exporters, they find themselves unable to secure transportation, either owing to the scarcity of cars on the Government owned road, the Intercolonial railway, or owing to the failure of the officials of that road to appreciate the prime importance of taking care of the immense business offering.

As stated in my telegram of 21st inst. to your deputy, contracts for imediate shipment have been made which call for the use of between seven and eight hundred cars, the securing of which Mr. Campbell's wire of 18th inst. would lead us to believe is not to be hoped for.

You can readily understand what hardship may be involved for Canadian shippers when they are subject to storage charges at bay ports for an extended period, when actions may be taken against them for failure to fill contracts, and when they may be mulcted for dead freight, being unable to supply the vessels with the cargoes contracted for.

The situation is acute, and in the opinion of this association calls for immediate action on the part of the authorities of the Intercolonial railway. The members of this association hesitate to believe that the equipment of the Intercolonial railway is as inadequate as Mr. Campbell's message implies, and they still hope that, in view of the urgency of the case, strenuous efforts will be made to alleviate the situation.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
J. STANLEY COOK,
Secretary

Attached to this letter are copies of correspondence which have taken place between the secretary and the minister, and also between the secretary and certain officials of the Intercolonial railway. I would ask my hon. friend if he has given personal attention to this very important matter, and, if so, if any action has been taken or will be immediately taken in order to enable the Intercolonial railway to take its part in relieving the congestion, so far as the transportation of western grain is concerned.

Mr. COCHRANE: The shortage of cars, not only in Canada but in the United States, is a matter of great anxiety at present. While the matter has not been fully decided, I do not think that the proposition now made is an exceedingly fair one. The Intercolonial railway, like other roads, is short of cars, particularly at this season of the year, and I think it is unreasonable to ask the Intercolonial railway to send 700 cars up to Port Colborne to relieve the Grand Trunk railway. The Grand Trunk railway should furnish these cars and bring them down, and if we did not handle that freight when it was landed in Montreal, we would not be doing our duty, but there is no suggestion in any of our communications that we have not done that. The Canadian Pacific railway does not ask us for cars to take down grain from their road. This freight originates on the Grand Trunk road, not on the Intercolonial railway, and we have enough to do, particularly at this season of the year, in trying to handle what is offered to us originating on our road.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Rainville for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the Opening of the Session, and the proposed Amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. JAMES McKAY (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House during the short time I shall address myself to the subjects placed before us in the Speech from the Throne. I shall not discuss generally these different matters, but shall address myself to some portion of the remarks that have been made, particularly such portions as I consider affect the West. Unlike a great many of the members who have spoken, and particularly the hon. gentlemen in opposition, I see much in the Speech from the Throne which commends itself to not only that fair portion of the Dominion which I represent, but to the Dominion as a whole.

Surely it should be gratifying to every true Canadian to find in the Speech from

the Throne such paragraphs as those referring to the trip that His Royal Highness the Governor General has seen fit to make during the recent summer throughout the whole Dominion, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a tour, I submit, that will result in great benefit to the Dominion and particularly to the West where there are a great many more immigrants than in other portions of Canada. To these people, whom we welcome to our prairies, this tour has been a two-fold object lesson. It has shown to them, not only the personal interest that His Royal Highness takes in the inhabitants of the whole Dominion, but also the great respect and loyalty that Canadians feel and show toward the Crown, and toward its Royal representative in this Dominion. This, I submit, is of supreme importance to those people who have come to join us, and to help us in developing our country. It is a cause of great congratulation, not only to the members who support the Government, but also to the inhabitants of this Dominion, to learn from the Speech from the Throne that His Royal Highness has made a personal inspection from the Alantic to the Pacific, and is able to say to this House that the country is full of prosperity and peace; and that not only is the country full of prosperity, but that it has citizens who have the pluck, energy, and enterprise to develop the rich resources with which this land has been endowed. If these paragraphs simply cause carping criticism to emanate from members of this House; if that is the only effect they have on members of this House who sit to the left of the Speaker, I submit that they can hardly be classed as true Canadians. Such paragraphs should thrill the heart of every true Canadian. and cause him to feel pride in the country he is helping to develop. We have a great country, but we must also have citizens who are capable of developing it; and a Government that will legislate to help those citizens in developing it. I am happy to say that we see in the Government of the day such an administration. It is gratifying to a humble supporter of the present administration to see that it has confidence, not only in the country itself, but in the citizens of the country. In its wise administration, it has seen fit to avoid allying itself with, or tying up its fiscal policy with that of a foreign nation. It has shown that it has confidence in its own people, being able to develop this immense country. Notwithstanding the abounding prosperity that is indicated in the Speech from the Throne, and the satisfactory conditions in the country generally, we find that none of these things appeal to the hon. members of the Opposition. All that they can find in those paragraphs are matters for objection. I wish to deal with one or two of those things specifically. I trust the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), who preceded me, will not consider me discourteous if I do not follow him in the lengthy arguments which he advanced, or what I think could rightly be termed the alleged arguments he submitted with regard to different matters.

First, I wish particularly to dwell upon the question of promises made by the administration, which has been somewhat lengthily referred to by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and in regard to which he found fault with the present administration. Another matter to which I intend to address myself briefly is the question of the reduction of the duty on cement. Until the present administration came into power we had a government of promises. I submit that now, we have, not only a government of promises, but a government which is prepared to fulfil and carry out its promises. I agree with one or two things that the hon. member for Edmonton stated; for instance, that the country is pleased or will be pleased to hear that it has now an administration which is fulfilling its promises. I entirely agree with the hon. member for Edmonton when he makes that statement. Unfortunately, I do not see him in his seat, possibly if he had been present he would have called me to task and declared that he did not make any such statement, or that, if he did, he did not intend to make it.

Mr. OLIVER: I did not just catch what my hon. friend was saying about me.

Mr. McKAY: The statement I made was that I entirely agreed with the hon. member for Edmonton when he stated that the country would be pleased to learn that it now had a Government which fulfilled its promises.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend is absolutely correct, on the supposition that the Government has fulfilled its promises, which I showed it had not done.

Mr. McKAY: I anticipated in a certain measure what my hon. friend would say, and my anticipation has proved correct. He does not give the meaning that an ordinary person, not familiar with politics, as he is, would give to these words. I give the ordinary English meaning that an ordinary person would give to them. But I will take the hon. gentleman's explanation, because I feel satisfied that, to a certain extent, his explanation is correct. I do not think he intended to make that statement, but the truth will out on occasions, remember, and those words slipped out from

him in an unguarded moment. He says now that the Government of the day are not fulfilling their promises. Whose promises are they fulfilling? Certainly they are fulfilling some promises, and I will ask the hon. gentleman to tell me whose promises they are.

Mr. OLIVER: I would certainly say, in regard to the Hudson Bay railway, the improvement of the harbours, and the extension of the boundaries of Manitoba, that they were fulfilling the promise of the late Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKAY: Well, I am prepared to argue this thing fairly and squarely on its merits, and I will take the hon. gentleman's own explanation. I do not consider that he is entirely correct; I say that the Government of the day are fulfilling their own promises, and the facts will bear me out in that statement. But I will take the hon. gentleman's own interpretation of the position, namely, that they are fulfilling promises made by the previous administration, and I will deal with the question on those lines, and see where it will land the hon. gentleman and his friends. As I stated, I intend to deal with what I consider is a matter which more specifically affects the West than other matters that have been brought before the House.

There is no question that affects western interests more than the transportation question. This question of the construction of the Hudson Bay railway has been in politics since 1897, or since the late Liberal administration assumed power. You will remember that in 1896 Sir Charles Tupper promised that, if he were returned to power he would introduce legislation for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. Unfortunately for the country, and more unfortunately for the West, he was defeated. At no time since then was a Liberal-Conservative government in a position to fiulfil that promise, because that party was not in power until the present administration assumed office. In 1897 the construction of the Hudson Bay railway was one of the principal planks in the Liberal platform, at any rate in the West. In the platform of the Liberal candidate in Winnipeg in 1897 it was one of the principal planks. From then on during the whole time that the Liberal administration was in office, that was a principal plank in its platform. In 1908 the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) at Niagara stated most emphatically that it was time to construct the Hudson Bay railway. How many years had elapsed since this was first introduced into the Liberal platform? From 1897 until 1908, and yet nothing was done towards the construction of the road, notwithstanding the fact that from election to election its construction had been promised. Therefore, I am justified in characterizing the Liberal administration as an administration of promises. Then, this statement, made by the right hon. gentleman who was then the premier, was made just on the eve of an election. I do not object to that statement having been made. I am prepared to say that I was pleased when I heard the announcement made. It was an authoritative announcement, but no doubt made for the very reason that hon. genltemen in the Opposition now claim that the reduction in the duty on cement was made during this year, because in 1908 there was a Dominion election pending, and the Liberals knew that the question of the construction of the Hudson Bay railway was a burning question in the West. The road had been promised from year to year ; consequently, it was important that an authoritative announcement should be made from the leader of the government of the day. Hence the announcement at Niagara. So important was this announcement to the West that it created a very peculiar and somewhat ridiculous spectacle in the western Liberal press. When the news first came to the West it was stated that the then premier had announced that the road would be constructed ; but as to the time the announcement was somewhat indefinite, and apparently the Liberal workers in the West were not satisfied with the language in which that announcement had been made, and no doubt some telegraphic communication ensued. However, we know that shortly after the first announcement was made as to the construction of this road, it was reported in the Liberal press that the announcement was not exactly correct, that the word 'now' had been omitted from it, and that the announcement that the right hon. gentleman had really made was that now was the time for the construction of this road,—not tomorrow, but now. Seeing that they could not blame any of the wicked Conservatives, that they could not blame anybody who could dominate the Liberal-Conservative party, they actually had to resort to blaming the poor old Niagara Falls in which every true Canadian takes pride. They said that the reporters were unable to catch all the words spoken by the right non. gentleman, owing to the roar of Niagara Falls, near which he had been speaking. All this indicates the importance that was attached to this announcement. That was in 1908, and we found the then Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) making a somewhat similar announcement in the province of Ontario, no doubt, with the idea of helping his followers in the West. Then, we found that,

when the Hon. Mr. Sifton was accepting the nomination at Brandon in 1908, he stated that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier was returned to power, the trains would be running on the Hudson Bay railway within three or four years. That was in 1908. Hon. gentlemen opposite went out of office in 1911, and yet there were no trains running, nor had the first sod been turned, nor had the first attempt been made towards the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) shakes his head and says, 'Oh, oh.' I repeat that not a single thing was done towards the active construction of the road. I give them full credit for anything and everything they did. They did begin the construction of a bridge, but that bridge was not finished during their administration. They did send out parties to explore the country, they did make surveys, but these hon. gentlemen have posed as the great friends of the farmer, and it is the farmer in the West who has been crying for the immediate construction of this road since 1896. What do we find? When the capitalists demanded the construction of the Transcontinental railway, it was said that time should not be lost. You remember the memorable words used by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition; 'Heaven grant that it may not be too late.' We found another eminent statesman remarking that it was not necessary to go on with such undue haste, that there was no real necessity for the immediate construction of the road, but that the real reason was because Cox cannot wait. The poor farmers in the West may wait until exploratory parties are sent out from year to year, but Cox cannot wait and, therefore, we must go on with the immediate construction of the Transcontinental railway.

I am not objecting to the construction of the National Transcontinental railway, but I do wish to contrast the claims put up by the Liberals and their friends that they are the true friends of the farmer, and that they do everything to advance his interests, when, as a matter of fact, if we look into the history of their dealings with public questions while they were in power, we find that such claims are absolutely without foundation. For years the Liberal administration, and the Liberal members of Parliament, and the Liberal supporters in the country promised the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, but nothing was actually done towards its construction. Contrast that with what has been accomplished since the present Government came to office. They took office about October, 1911, and it is now November, 1912, and in the Speech from the Throne at the opening of the session, we find the following language:

The contract for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway from the Pas to Port Nelson has been awarded and the work is being pushed forward with all possible speed.

The announcement is not that survey parties have been sent out to explore for the location of a possible line of railway, but the announcement is the fact that the contract has actually been let, and that the work is being speedily carried on, and we all know that during the past summer the construction of the Hudson Bay railway has been prosecuted with energy.

Mr. TURRIFF: What survey was used?

Mr. McKAY: Presumably the survey made by the late administration, as well as surveys which have been ordered by the present Minister of Railways.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKAY: I am glad to hear gentlemen of the Opposition applaud; I am glad there is something done by the late administration out of which they can take comfort.

Mr. TURRIFF: We let the first contract.

Mr. McKAY: Yes, the Liberal administration let a contract on the eve of the election. Nothing was done until the election writs were issued, and then the news was spread that men were sent up there to do the work, and, I might remark in passing that in that section of the West which used to be operated by Captain William Sifton, of whom we have heard so much, such indignation did his exploits create among the people that the Liberal-Conservatives practically policed that district in order that the ballot boxes should not be stuffed in the last election, as they had been stuffed in previous elections in the north. An hon. gentleman has asked me who let the contract, and my answer to him is that the announcement was made that the Hudson Bay railway would be built on the eve of the election of 1908, and the announcement that the contract had been let only came on the eve of the election of 1911. It is another evidence that anything done by the late Liberal administration that would enure to the benefit of the country was a thing for them to make party capital out of; everything they did was done for party advantage. But that is not the policy of the present Government. The administration now in power is looking after the true interests of the country, regardless of party advantage.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. McKAY: An hon. gentleman opposite denies my statement, and no doubt he is sincere in his denial, because, belonging to the party he does belong to, he cannot understand how such a thing

should be. Let me tell that hon. gentleman that one of the things that induced me to be a candidate in the last election was the manly and noble attitude taken by our beloved leader during his tour in the West. When Mr. Borden visited the West, the question of reciprocity had not been fully discussed in the country. The whole country was seething with excitement, and a great many of the people of the West were prepared to accept reciprocity without properly considering its effects. With that feeling prevailing in the West, Mr. Borden, our leader, came to the West, and deputation after deputation waited upon him and demanded that he should support reciprocity. And, Mr. Speaker, what was his answer? His answer was: 'I am firmly convinced that reciprocity is not for the general benefit of Canada, and even if you were to reward me by making me Prime Minister in order to give you reciprocity, I would not accept that high office.' That is the attitude the Conservative administration has taken since it assumed power; it has proceeded to carry out measures for the general benefit of Canada, irrespective of ulterior motives, and that being so, every man who supports that administration may be proud of it for that reason, if for no other. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) went on to say:

> What is no doubt an important question is the construction of the Hudson Bay railroad. Mr. Borden told us he is fulfilling the promise of the Government in that regard. May I suggest rather that the Government of the day are fulfilling the promises of their predecessors in relation to that important work.

Let us analyze a little that statement of my hon. friend. The Liberal party had been promising, in election after election from 1897 until 1911, the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, and during all these years they were unable or unwilling to fulfil that promise. Even though it be true, as the hon. gentleman says, that we are but carrying out the promises of our predecessors, are we not justified in claiming credit that we are fulfilling that promise to the hilt which the Liberals, either because of their inability to implement their promise or because of insincerity in making the promise, have never been able to fulfil. It matters not to the West whether the promise was made by the Liberal Government or by any other government. What the West wants is the railway constructed, and in the degree that it is discreditable to the Liberals that they failed to fulfil their promise, it is creditable to the Conservative Government that within one year after taking office they are able to announce that the contract for the Hudson Bay railway has been let and that the work is being proceeded with diligently.

And, in considering that aspect of the case, let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) and his supporters that, so far as I am concerned, and I think I speak the minds of the present administration in this—if they find anything that is beneficial to Canada and that was promised by the late administration, the fact that it was the late administration who made the promise will not deter the Conservative Government from carrying that promise into effect.

As I stated before, they are not seeking party benefits or personal aggrandizement. They are working in the interests of the country, and whatever is good will be fulfilled by them. This alone shows that the great distinction between these two Governments is, that the Liberal administration was a Government of liberal promises, but the present Liberal-Conservative administration is a Government of performance and I am sure it will be a great benefit to the country.

With regard to the question of cement, do the hon. gentlemen on the opposite benches really claim that the reduction of the duty on cement was not an immense benefit to the country, and consequently that the Government of the day should not have made that reduction? They must admit that it was of immense benefit to the country, and must give credit to the Government for what in their eyes may be the little good that the present administration is doing for the country. They fail however, to give the present administration that measure of credit which it deserved with regard to that one item. They object that that reduction has been made. The hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) claims that the whole thing was engineered by the Minister of Public Works, that the wool was drawn over the eyes of the Minister of Finance, and that all the evidence placed before him as a reason for making the reduction was evidence that need not be considered. From the arguments advanced by these gentlemen we must draw the conclusion that the reduction should not have been made. But we find the hon. member for Edmonton declaring that the Government should not have made that reduction because it was done in an improper manner, that should have been done in this House by Act of Parliament. I do not desire to be unfair to the hon. member for Edmonton, but I submit that is a fair statement of the position he takes. The hon. member for Cape Breton, who is an ardent follower of the hon. member for Edmonton, claims that the Minister of Finance was hoodwinked, that there was no cement famine in the West. The hon. member for Edmonton must either agree or disagree with the hon. member for Cape Breton. I say

most emphatically, and the Minister of Finance says also, that there was a cement famine in the West, that he had ample evidence of it, and under the statute he found it necessary to make this reduction in the cement duty. We find that both the Liberal-Conservative press and the Liberal press in the West were full of allegations that a cement famine did exist during the building season, and there is abundant evidence in the press that the whole country demanded a reduction in the duty on cement in order to relieve the cement famine. Although the cement merger took the position that there was a great deal of cement in Canada, and blamed the railway corporations for being unable to send it to the West, the truth was that a cement famine did exist. Now, I would like the hon. member for Edmonton to make himself clear as to whether or not he claims there was really a cement famine in the West.

Mr. OLIVER: I have no hesitation in stating that there is no reason to doubt that there was a most serious cement famine in the West.

Mr. McKAY: I am glad to hear the hon. gentleman make that statement, it knocks the ground from under the feet of the hon. member for Cape Breton in his endeavour to ridicule the hon. Minister of Finance in regard to his position in this matter. I should like, in as mild a way as I can, to remind the hon. member for Cape Breton what he said during the course of his remarks, that it does not always pay a person to be funny. He tried to be funny at the expense of the Minister of Finance, but this admission of the hon. member from Edmonton, puts him in a most ridiculous position. There is ample justification for the action taken in this matter by the hon. Minister of Finance. But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the whole question. No doubt hon members on the Opposition benches will still endeavour to justify their conduct with regard to this question, and the position taken by the hon. member from Edmonton. In order that I may not misrepresent the hon. gentleman from Edmonton, let me again quote his exact words as reported in 'Hansard':

> The objection made to the action of the Government was, as my hon. friend himself stated at the beginning of his remarks, that the reduction was made for the purpose of influencing an election, and not for the benefit of the people.

The logical conclusion to be drawn from that statement, Mr. Speaker, is that the reduction should not have been made on that occasion, because it was an inopportune time for any such action. He admits that there was a cement famine in the West, but his position is one in which he practically states. 'Let this cement famine in the West exist; let there be stagnation in building operations, and let the builders suffer; I admit there is a cement famine in the West, but let the people suffer, because by giving this relief you will indirectly injure the Liberal party in the elections that are about to take place.'

Mr. OLIVER: The idea I wished to convey was that the reduction should have been made long before, while Parliament was sitting.

Mr. McKAY: We have all heard of a certain animal which can change its colour in a moment. The hon. gentleman may change his attitude as often as he likes, and I will deal with him in whatever position he places himself.

Mr. OLIVER: The position I take now is the attitude I took when the Minister of Finance was speaking; my hon. friend is misstating my position.

Mr. McKAY: I do not wish to misstate the position taken by the hon. gentleman. Without any desire to bandy words, or to unduly occupy the attention of this House, I again say in all seriousness, that the logical conclusion to be drawn from the hon. gentleman's statement, considering at the same time his admission that a cement famine existed in the West, is that he says, in effect, 'Let these people starve, so far as cement is concerned; do not make this reduction, because you will indirectly injure the Liberal party in the elections about to take place.' But now the hon. gentleman says that it should have been done during the session of Parliament.

Mr. OLIVER: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKAY: My hon. friend says 'hear, hear.' I am glad to see he grasps my meaning. I again repeat, at the risk of wearying hon. gentlemen of this House, the hon. gentleman says this reduction should have been made during the last session of Parliament, or at the present session. And what about the intervening period? My hon. friend was here during the last session of Parliament; he knew the reduction had not been made. During the last Parliament the Minister of Finance and the Government did not have before them evidence of such an emergency as arose later on, and consequently no reduction was then made. Since then, however, an emergency has arisen, and the hon. gentleman takes the position that, notwithstanding this condition, the people should be allowed to starve until the next session. Is that the attitude which ought

to be taken by hon. members with regard to matters vitally affecting the people of this country? I am proud to repeat again that the present administration does not consider the political advantage or benefit of any party in such matters, but, true to its promises, it will deal only with the interests of the country. In the face of such an emergency as I have referred to, it is as clear as the noon day sun that the action taken by the hon. Minister of Finance was the only reasonable course which could have been adopted. What a howl would have arisen throughout the West in the Liberal ranks had the Minister of Finance not taken that position? What would have been the cry of the Liberal members?

Mr. Speaker, there is a certain paper published in the city of Edmonton, known as the Edmonton Daily Bulletin. I understand that a certain hon. gentleman of this House is intimately connected with that paper, and I think it is the mouthpiece of the hon. member from Edmonton. What position did that paper take with regard to this matter? Reading from the edition of the Bulletin of June 6, 1912, I find the following paragraph:

> A chorus of complaints is going up from western cities against the shortage of the cement supply, which is retarding building operations, and threatens to do so to a far greater extent.

Let me commend the serious consideration of this paragraph to the hon. member for North Cape Breton. Coming from such an authority, I am sure he will give at least some value to this statement, made by the mouthpiece of the hon. member from Edmonton. This paper goes on to say:

> At last accounts the minister was in consultation with the head of the cement merger and we can guess from that whether the duty is to be suspended.

Mark you, the tenor of the whole press, including this paper, was that a reduction should be made and this paper said—at last accounts the minister is consulting with the manager of the cement merger—and it practically says: Well, it is hopeless to expect any reduction if that is what he is doing, manifestly showing that they desired a reduction, not to wait until the meeting of Parliament, as the hon. member for Edmonton says, but desired an immediate reduction.

Mr. OLIVER: I might explain that in all probability the editor of the Bulletin had not thought of the possible synchronism of the Saskatchewan election.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I might suggest also that he had not thought that the head of the cement trust is a great deal more nearly connected with the Liberal party than with the Conservative party.

Mr. OLIVER: Trusts have no politics.

Mr. McKAY: I stated a few moments ago that I would meet the hon. gentleman in every position he took, being a humble supporter of an administration that fulfils its promises. I feel that it is incumbent upon me to make this promise good at the first opportunity. The hon. gentleman says now, bearing in mind again that a cement famine did exist, that the whole country was crying for a reduction and this paper was calling for a reduction.

Mr. OLIVER: Had been doing so for some time.

Mr. McKAY: And he says that possibly the reason that the editor of that paper was crying for that reduction was that he did not have in his mind the provincial elections that were about to take place.

Mr. OLIVER: The reason he did not expect it.

Mr. McKAY: There again taking the position that this paper should have disregarded the true interests of the people lest the advocating of a reduction which would benefit them would be to the political disadvantage of the Liberal party. That is the only logical conclusion you can come to from that statement. He says that was the trouble, he says that if the editor of this paper had in his mind the approaching provincial elections he would not have advocated a reduction at that time.

Mr. OLIVER: Oh no, my hon. friend has taken a wrong conclusion altogether. My hon. friend was commenting on the fact that the editor apparently did not expect any reduction of the duty at that time and I said that probably the reason was he did not think the Saskatchewan elections were coming off at that time, otherwise he would have expected that reduction.

Mr. McKAY: I submit that my previous remarks are a sufficient answer to that and I am prepared to leave to the country the decision who has the best position to uphold. Later on, after a reduction had been made, on the 10th June, 1912, we find in this paper the following paragraph:

> The volley of protests that has been sent in to Ottawa from all parts of the Western country in regard to the cement situation has produced some result, though not as much as was hoped. The Minister of Finance announces that the duty on cement has been cut in two, the new rate to stand until the end of October.

We find that after the reduction was made the paper was apparently satisfied with the manner in which the reduction was

made by the Minister of Finance. There was no objection at the time by the mouthpiece of the hon. member for Edmonton that it was improper to make it in this way. In fact, as I have said, it had been advocating an immediate reduction. The paragraph continues:

Unless the situation which has existed in regard to cement be relieved both private and public enterprise must be checked and many projects on which work has begun will have to go over to another year. Already contractors have been forced to suspend operations and workmen have been thrown out of employment by the lack of this essential and should the scarcity continue much longer we may expect to learn that buildings planned for this season have been struck from the list and left for future consideration. With people pouring into the country at a remarkable rate and swarming into our cities beyond the lack of proper accommodation it is something more than an economic necessity that building operations be facilitated by every possible means. The threatened retention of half the duty on cement would constitute a bar to these operations not very much less serious than the duty has been. The announcement from Ottawa means that unless there is a vigorous and united protest from the Western people this bar will stand.

All this goes to show that the people from the West were demanding this reduction and were satisfied with the action of the administration in having made it when they did.

Mr. OLIVER: That is not exactly what my hon. friend read from that paper.

Mr. McKAY: There is an old adage that says that half a loaf is better than no bread and I submit that this applies in this case very well indeed. The point, however, that the hon. gentlemen have been making in this House is that this reduction should not have been made because it was for the political benefit of the Liberal-Conservative party during the election in Saskatchewan, and I am addressing myself to show that it was not done for the political advantage of the Liberal-Conservative party but for the benefit of the country at large, and I submit that I have made out my case not only from arguments I have found elsewhere, but from the mouthpiece of the hon. gentleman. We find that gentleman now saying that the cement duty should have been taken off altogether. A great deal has been said about reciprocity, but acording to my recollection the reciprocity agreement did not provide for the reduction of the duty on cement.

Mr. TURRIFF: Yes, partly.

Mr. McKAY: What was the result of this reduction? Was it of any material benefit to the country at large, and was the Minister of Finance justified in the position he took, or was he not? I submit that the records go to prove that there was every justification for the action he took in the matter. According to the statement showing the importations into Canada of cement for consumption for the years 1911-12, we find the following position of affairs: In 1911, for the months of June, July, August, September and October, 4,491 barrels of cement were imported into Manitoba; into Saskatchewan, nothing; into Alberta, 309 barrels. For the same period during 1912, in Manitoba, 100,287 barrels were imported; in Saskatchewan, 87,856 barrels; in Alberta, 183,646 barrels showing clearly the immense benefit that was conferred on the people of the West by the reduction which the Government made on that item.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the hon. gentleman state what was the total saving in duties to the people in the West by the reduction?

Mr. McKAY: The hon. gentleman is much more capable of getting at that than I am, and I do not intend to weary the House in regard to that question. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that in order to deal with that question, which opens up a great line of argument, one would have to deal with the whole question of the tariff; consequently I do not intend to deal with it at this hour. These two matters are in themselves sufficient to justify me in taking the position I have always taken with regard to the present administration, namely, that I shall give it my undivided support until I see that it fails to do justice to that section of the West, which I have the honour to represent.

With regard to what has been said concerning the election in Macdonald, I have nothing to say. I do not belong to the province of Manitoba, and, like my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), I did not take part in that election; I was elsewhere. With my knowledge of the gentlemen who have been named as having been placed under arrest, I am satisfied, to use the language of an hon. member who was at one time one of the Liberal leaders in this House, those gentlemen, I can assure you, did not go to Macdonald to make elections with prayers.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The reason I asked my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. McKay) if he could give me the amount that was saved to the people of the West by the reduction of the duty on cement was that, if I heard him correctly, the amount would be comparatively insignificant—less than 400,000 barrels. Now, the duty upon cement, as stated by the Minister of Finance, amounts to about 50 cents per barrel, so that the reduction of one-half would be in the vicinity of 25 cents per barrel, which would make a saving of about $100,000. That is the total saving to the

hundreds of thousands of people in the West in connection with the building operations in those great cities—Winnipeg, Portage la Prairie, Brandon, Regina, Saskatoon, Prince Albert, Edmonton and Calgary, where the people are moving forward in building construction at an unparalleled pace, so far as the history of this country is concerned. And for that comparatively small saving, this Government has violated the principles which have ordinarily actuated governments in the past, and has taken to itself the right to reduce for a temporary period the duty upon an important article of consumption without asking the authority of Parliament. They did it at a time when the people would realize that it was done for the purpose of influencing elections, and when the elections were over they restored the duty to what it was before. It seems to me in view of the fact that strong representations were made early last year by the people of the West, and if I remember rightly, when Parliament was sitting, that that was the time for the Government to take into consideration the question of reduction of duties, to take Parliament into its confidence, and to ask for authority to make a reduction; not merely for three or four months, not merely until the political necessity for it should have passed away, but a reduction that would be enduring, and that would enable the people to enter into contracts of a permanent character with foreign manufacturers of cement. You know, Mr. Speaker, as well as I do, that in connection with these important trade arrangements, people who are purchasers of cement would not willingly cease to trade with Canadian manufacturers of cement, and enter into arrangements with foreign manufacturers, knowing that these arrangements would come to an end in the course of a few months. Such a reduction of duty, to be of importance to the people of Canada, should be of a permanent character, so that they might be able to make arrangements with foreign manufacturers, and so get the benefit of reduced prices.

Let me say a word with regard to the cement duties, and I am going to speak of what I know is the case in that part of Canada from which I come. In the city of St. John, the people are obliged to pay in the vicinity of $1.80 per barrel for cement manufactured in Canada, while I am told that in the United States cement of an equally high character can be placed on the cars at the factories at the price of about 60 cents per barrel, consequently, we in St. John are paying for cement about 300 per cent beyond what it costs to manufacture in the United States.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. MEIGHEN: How long have they been paying that in the city of St. John?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not know; I know that during the past year our people have been paying that. If it is true, as was stated by my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), and as I have been told by others, that cement of equally high character can be turned out in the factories of the United States at sixty cents per barrel, the matter is worthy of the most earnest consideration of this Government and of Parliament. There has been a saving, under the circumstances, of about $100,000 to the people of the West, but that saving has been largely to the people living in cities. The farmers use comparatively little cement; they may use more in future, and they may be getting in the way of using it to a greater extent, but at the present time they use comparatively little. Thousands of people are pouring into the West, going upon the virgin soil, many of them obliged to live in log houses, or even in mud houses, until they get the money to build comfortable homes for themselves, many of them—not hundreds, but thousands of them—obliged to bring in machinery from the United States; and if our hon. friends desired to do something which would be of real benefit to the farmers, might they not, for a short period, at all events—one, two, or three years—have passed a similar order with reference to agricultural machinery, so that the West would have been able to get the benefit of American machinery without paying the duties that the people are obliged to pay at the present time?

Having made these remarks in regard to the reduction of the duty on cement, I desire to say that I do not understand that any of our friends who have spoken upon this side of the House complained of the reduction of duty. What we do complain of is the mode in which the reduction was made, and the time it was made. We complain that this Government resisted every importunity which was addressed to them to make the reduction, and that they only made it when they knew that an election was imminent in the province of Saskatchewan, and were driven to the conclusion at which they arrived by reason of political exigencies. We complain, too, because, when there is just as much necessity, now, as far as the people of the West are concerned, to get cheap cement, they have restored the duty, and the people will be obliged to pay in the vicinity of, we are told, fifty cents per barrel by way of a tax on the cement they import from the United States or other foreign countries.

The hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) has stated that there is a great deal of material in the Speech from the

Throne which is worthy of commendation. My hon. friend referred to the very interesting and beneficial trip His Royal Highness and his party made over this Dominion. With these remarks we all agree. But what we think is well worthy of comment is that the Speech has omitted many important matters which ought to have been brought to the attention of this Parliament and the people of the country. One important omission was referred to by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition which, it seems to me, is entirely unjustifiable It has reference to the readjustment of the representation of the different provinces in the House of Commons. If there is any one subject that ought to be dealt with at the earliest possible moment when the time has arrived at which it can be dealt with by Parliament, it is the question of representation. Under the terms of the British North America Act, as hon. gentlemen all know, there is a unit of representation based on the population of the province of Quebec, and the representation of the different provinces depends upon the increase or decrease in the population of the other provinces relatively to the population of that province. We know, in so far as the Western provinces are concerned, that there has been an enormous increase in population and that it is absolutely essential, under the terms of the British North America Act, that there shall be a readjustment of the representation. It is necessary not only under the terms of the British North America Act, but in order to do justice to the people of the Western provinces. What does the statute say on the subject? Does it give any discretion to hon. gentlemen to bring in a Redistribution Bill whenever they may be pleased to do so? I say it does not. The British North America Act provides that on the completion of a census the representation of the provinces shall be readjusted pursuant to the census returns. The right hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Borden) has not informed the House as to when a Redistribution Bill will be brought in, but he has apparently given the House to understand that there is no obligation on the part of the Government to introduce such a Bill at the present session. That, I deny most emphatically. I say that at the first Parliament which is held after the census is completed, it is the bounden duty, the constitutional duty of the Government, under the British North America Act, to introduce and to ask Parliament to enact a bill for the readjustment of the representation of the different provinces. The leader of the Government says that there is no necessity for it, because it will not come into operation until the dissolution of Parliament. My right hon. friend talks as if he and his Government absolutely control this Parliament. They do not. Circumstances might arise which would make it, in the opinion of the majority of the members of this Parliament, desirable that there should be an appeal to the people. Circumstances might arise, as they have arisen in the past, which might make His Royal Highness, or whoever might be occupying his position, independently of the advice of his Government, feel it in the public interest to make an appeal to the people to get their opinion with regard to any great question which might arise.

Mr. SCHAFFNER : At what date was the Redistribution Bill brought into Parliament after the census of 1901 ?

Mr. PUGSLEY : In the year 1903.

Mr. SCHAFFNER : Yes, two years after.

Mr. PUGSLEY : Two years after. The last census was taken in 1911.

Mr. SCHAFFNER : Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY : Before this Parliament rises we shall be in the year 1913.

Mr. SCHAFFNER : The position will be exactly the same as the position was in 1903.

An hon. MEMBER : No, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY : The Redistribution Bill of 1903 was brought in at the second session after the year in which the census was taken. This is the second session after the census of 1911.

Mr. MEIGHEN : Did the hon. gentleman not state that unless it was brought in at the first session it was illegal and in violation of the British North America Act ?

Mr. PUGSLEY : Not at all. What I stated was that in the year after the census is completed—not after it is taken, but completed—it is the duty of the Government and the duty of Parliament, a duty which they owe to the people of the country under the terms of the British North America Act, to readjust the representation in accordance with the results of the census. That is the argument I make. It would be a most dangerous principle to allow it to rest in the discretion of any government to decide as to when a redistribution should take place. It is a constitutional duty, and that duty ought to be performed. The Speech from the Throne is regrettably and unjustifiably silent upon that point.

Mr. BORDEN : Does the hon. gentleman mean the completion of the census, or the completion of the enumeration ?

Mr. PUGSLEY : What I mean is the completion of the census, so that it will be

known exactly what is the population of the different provinces of Canada, of the different constituencies, and not only the population of the different provinces, but also the population in the territories. What I mean is the completion of the census, so that there can be a thorough, complete, and correct readjustment and rearrangement of the representation.

Mr. FOWLER : Will the hon. gentleman kindly inform me when the census of 1911 was completed ?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) tells me it was March, 1912.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax). It was so stated in the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As to the carrying out of pledges, I would remind my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, that just before the last election, he gave a pledge to the people of St. John with regard to the development of the port of St. John. True, he made the pledge under heavy pressure, true he gave it when the people were making it pretty hot for our Conservative opponents, and when, in order to give the Conservative party any hope whatever in that constituency it seemed to be necessary for the right hon. gentleman to make some promise. Under these circumstances he made a very strong and a very definite promise with regard to harbour improvements, and the right hon. gentleman sent a telegram to the people of St. John telling them that they might depend upon it that if the Conservative party were returned to power there would be no delay, no putting off, and no diminution in the plans for the development of the harbour of St. John. I am happy to know that that pledge has been partially carried out by the Minister of Public Works signing a contract upon tenders which had been called for by the late Government for the construction of harbour works in Courtenay bay, and also by signing a contract upon tenders which I as Minister of Public Works had called for, for the construction of certain wharfs on the western side of the harbour. I am pleased also to know that he has continued the dredging works which the late Government was carrying on in the western side of the harbour. But, beyond the works for which the late Government had called for tenders and asked Parliament for funds to carry out, not a single step has been taken by this Government towards the development of the harbour. Before the late Government went out of power, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, knowing that their policy was to develop Courtenay bay, and to provide a grain elevator there, and to provide suitable accommodation in the way of immigration buildings, bought a large tract of land at the head of the harbour. And, although the present Government let the contract for the harbour development, not one single step has been taken by them to provide railway facilities, and apparently the railway authorities will have to wait until the wharfs are built and dredging completed before they can proceed with their part of the work. So far as the port of St. John is concerned, the Government does not seem to be alive to the importance of taking action along the line I have indicated.

Mr. FOWLER: At what date did the time expire for receiving tenders for the Courtenay bay improvements?

Mr. PUGSLEY: On the 10th of August, 1912. And let me say here, that I doubt much whether the contract for the development of Courtenay bay would ever have been let had it not been for the energetic efforts of my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) who took a very active interest in that work, as he properly should because he represents the county adjoining St. John. I do not wish to detract at all from the efforts of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in that direction, but if all accounts are true it was a very difficult task to get the contract signed by the Government notwithstanding the pledges which the right hon. the Prime Minister had made to the people of St. John. I venture to say, Sir, that if it had not been for the vote that the late Government submitted to Parliament for this great work and had it not been for the fact that I as Minister of Public Works had called for tenders for these harbour improvements, they would not be under way at the present moment. However, as the representative of the city of St. John, I am pleased that even so much has been done. I would call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) to the fact that up to the present time the Department of Railways has taken no action whatever to give the requisite terminal facilities in connection with the wharfs which are being constructed at Courtenay bay. I do not say there will not be time enough to do it in the future, but there is a great deal of work to be done and provision ought to be made for these terminal facilities during this session of Parliament if it is intended that the Grand Trunk Pacific shall be able, as soon as these improvements are completed, to do its share towards bringing the traffic of the West for shipment to Europe through the port of St. John.

Then, the Prime Minister referred to the Hudson Bay railway as if this Government were entitled to credit for proceeding with the construction of the road. Let me call

the attention of the House to the fact that during the session of Parliament before the election of 1911 the Government asked Parliament for a very liberal grant for the purpose of proceeding with the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. The bridge across the Saskatchewan river which was an essential part of the project, had already been placed under construction and the Government asked Parliament for a very liberal vote for the purpose of carrying on the construction of the railway from the Pas to Hudson bay.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: What was the amount the late Government put in the estimates?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think it was a million dollars; that is a good sum of money.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: It would not half build the bridge.

Mr. PUGSLEY: At all events, when the present Minister of Railways submitted his estimates to Parliament it was sufficient to cause him not to change the amount one iota, and so he submitted to Parliament the same amount that was placed in the estimates by the late Government. The contract was actually entered into as quickly as possible and the money had been voted, but when the present Government came into power as hon. gentlemen who represent the West will remember, the work was held up for several months. It was stated at the time that the contractors were notified not to go ahead. We were told that the Minister of Railways wanted to look into the matter, that he wanted to study the details very carefully; he wanted to find out I suppose, if there was anything upon which he could take the contract away from Mr. McDonald and call for tenders over again as was done in a case in the city of Quebec. But, after wasting months of valuable time, the minister finally came to the conclusion that there was nothing to do but to allow the contractor to go ahead with the work. Yet, notwithstanding that, the Government place in the mouth of His Royal Highness a statement which is calculated to convey an entirely erroneous impression, that they have made a contract for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway; instead of informing the House and the country that they have been carrying out in good faith and with reasonable speed the contract for this great work that was entered into by their predecessors.

My right hon. friend made another promise on the eve of the election, in answer to the hon. gentleman representing Kings and Albert, not for the purpose of influencing the electors, but in order to let the people know that the leaders of the Conservative party were wise leaders, that they had the interests of the country at heart, and that, if they got into power, they would show that by their work. My right hon. friend sent a telegram to the hon. member for Kings and Albert stating that the Conservative party had always been of the opinion, or for several years at all events, that it would be in the interest of the country and of the Intercolonial railway, that the various branch lines connected with the Intercolonial railway should be taken over and become part of that railway system. This Government has now been in power for fourteen months; this is the second session of Parliament; they have had ample opportunity to fulfill the pledge made by my right hon. friend, and yet to-day there is not a single word in the Speech with reference to this most important matter, which is of such vital interest to the people of the Maritime provinces as well as the province of Quebec.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, whom I would like to see in his place, prepared, I presume, and through the Prime Minister placed in the mouth of His Royal Highness, a paragraph expressing his pleasure at the rapidity with which the foreign trade of Canada is increasing. He refers to the fact that during the year which closed on March 31, 1912, it was the largest in the history of the country. Now, in view of the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is one of the leaders of the party, who in the election of September, 1911, went throughout this country from Sydney to Vancouver, telling the people that it was greatly against the interests of this country that we should be so closely allied in trade with the United States, and that it would be enormously to the interests of our country that the trade should flow east and west instead of north and south, one is surprised to find a statement in the Speech expressing great pleasure at the increase of trade in view of what is the fact, that our trade with the United States during the year to which His Royal Highness has referred is greater than our trade with all the other countries in the world, the United Kingdom included. Let me give the trade for the year to which reference is made. For the year ending March 31, 1912, the total imports entered for consumption into Canada amounted to $547,482,190, upon which duty was collected of $87,576,036.52. Our total exports were $315,317,250, or about $230,000,000 less than our imports. In quoting these figures to the House, I cannot but recall to mind the eloquent speeches which my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), whom I am glad to see again with us, used to make years ago as to the dangerous condition of a country whose imports largely exceeded its exports. My hon. friend used to dwell strongly and eloquently upon the evils which would result eventually to the

country on account of having the balance of trade against it. One would almost expect that my hon. friend would call attention to the rather dangerous condition in which Canada is to-day, by reason of its imports being upwards of $230,000,000 more than its exports. The increase in imports entered for consumption over the previous year was $85,530,872. What was our increase in exports? Only $18,120,885. The total amount of goods imported from the United States for consumption and for exports as well, was $476,889,112, being an increase over the previous year of $72,557,572. The imports from the United Kingdom for consumption, and export as well, amounted to $268,760,435, or an increase over the previous year of only $21,858,862 as against an increase in our trade with the United States of $72,557,572. One would have expected that this Government—this patriotic Government, this Government whose slogan during the election was 'no truck with the Yankees,'—would have asked His Royal Highness to call the attention of Parliament and the attention of the people to the deplorable fact that during the last fiscal year, our trade with the United States—this country with which we were to have no truck if we could help it—increased 350 per cent. more than our trade with the United Kingdom. We will now take simply the value of imports from the United Kingdom entered for consumption in 1912, $116,907,-022, being an increase over the previous year of $6,970,560. During the same year our imports from the United States were $356,354,478, an increase over the previous year of $71,419,739. Our imports from all other countries of the world were only $74,-220,690, an increase over the previous year of $7,140,573. Our exports for the year 1912 to the United Kingdom were $151,853,413, being an increase of $14,888,302, while our exports to the United States for the same year were $120,534,634, an increase over the previous year of only $1,134,833. You will observe, Mr. Speaker, the startling fact that last year the increase in our imports from the United States over the previous year amounted to seventy-one millions and upwards, and the increase in exports to the same country was only $1,134,-833. That, Sir, is the startling state of affairs which we who favoured a reciprocal arrangement with the United States sought to remedy. We recognized that our trade with that country had already assumed vast proportions, and it was increasing to an enormous extent and with great rapidity. We felt that it was not in the interests of this country that we should continue sending our money to the United States by millions and bringing in goods from that country, instead of paying for them by our exports. We sought to obtain this larger market for the growers of grain in the West, for our lumbermen in the East, for our fishermen and those who are developing our mining industries—all of whom would be glad to find in the United States a market for the products of their labour. Our exports to all the rest of the world in 1912 amounted to only $42,929,203, an increase over the previous year of $2,095,750.

I now wish to deal for a few moments with the department presided over by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid). We had the pleasure of having that gentleman in the city of St. John not long ago, in company with the hon. Minister of Finance, and, when looking over the start which has been made in the great work of developing Courtenay bay—a work which I spoke of as my own particular baby in the presence of my hon. friend, and which met with his approval—he boasted that his department had a rapidly increasing revenue, and told the people of St. John that his only fear was that I and my colleagues had not planned largely enough, and that if the Minister of Public Works wanted more money, all he had to do was to come to him and he would furnish him with as many millions as were necessary for these improvements.

The duties collected last year by the department over which my hon. friend presides—and which represents the taxes paid by the people of Canada, just as much as if a tax gatherer came around every month and asked tribute of the people—on goods imported from the United Kingdom in 1912 amounted to $22,367,039.82, an increase over the previous year of $1,610,229.11. On goods imported from the United States—the country with which my hon. friend desired to have no truck, and no dealings—there was collected in duties the enormous sum of $49,177,584.32, an increase over the previous year of $11,322,856.52.

Does my hon. friend not think that he should have asked His Royal Highness to call the attention of this Parliament and the people of this country to the deplorable state of affairs revealed by these statistics; that from this country to the south of us—with which we did not wish to trade—we have actually made our people pay by way of taxes, upon goods brought in from that country the enormous sum of forty-nine millions of dollars and upwards—eleven millions more than was paid out during the previous year? The duties collected on goods imported in 1912, from all other countries amounted to $16,031,421.38, an increase over the previous year of $940,812.41. The total increase in duties on goods imported from the United Kingdom and from all other countries amounted to $2,500,000, and the increase

over the previous year on goods brought in from the United States, $11,322,856.52—the increase in duties on goods brought in from the United States amounting to 500 per cent more than imports from all the rest of the world, the United Kingdom included.

My hon. friend ought to look sad; indeed, as I look around, the only hon. gentleman who appears to be smiling and happy is my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. The Minister of Customs does seem to be sad and thoughtful upon hearing the figures which I have presented to the House. And what condition is revealed by these statistics? Do they not show that, talk as we will, our trade relations with the United States are as intimate and as binding as our social relations, and as the years go by, these relations will become stronger, our trade will increase, and in the interests of our people something should be done—call it what you will; by making an agreement of reciprocity, if you like; but the people of these two countries ought to come together in an effort to reduce the duties charged upon the goods passing between them, and reduce the taxation which the people are obliged to pay into the treasuries of the respective countries. Only in this way can we alleviate the burdens now imposed upon the great masses of the people, and reduce the cost of living.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am glad my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) is in his place. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works is absent, and while I have some remarks to make to him, I think I will take advanage of the presence of my hon. friend the Postmaster General to call his attention to a very interesting statement which he has recently made. It has nothing to do, so far as I know, with reciprocity; but at the same time it relates to a fear which my hon. friend seems to have had that his former allies were bent upon some course of action which would lead the people of this country into civil war. When an hon. gentleman holding a position of such responsibility as my hon. friend the Postmaster General occupies in the Government of this country, makes the public statement that his allies of yesterday—the men who fought side by side with him in the election of September, 1911, and the men whom he then called his leaders—had asked him to take a course which might lead to civil war, the matter becomes one of more than ordinary interest, and it is a subject upon which the people of this country will be glad to hear from my hon. friend the Postmaster General. In the Montreal Gazette—a good Conservative newspaper—of the 25th of November, I find a report of a speech made by my hon. friend the Postmaster General at a banquet in the city of Quebec. As the subject is one of very great interest, I think I shall be pardoned for reading the whole of my hon. friend's remarks on this occasion as reported in the Gazette:

Hon. Mr. Pelletier began his address by saying that certain relations existed between public men, the privacy of which had to be respected, and if these matters were revealed to the public, and expecially if they were misconstrued even by men acting presumably in good faith, a grievous error would be committed. In the second place, he considered that it was necessary to define in a few words what was meant by a political alliance.

That men of different political beliefs should reach a common understanding in the public interest and that they should carry on together a campaign and separate afterwards if their ideas no longer agreed, was a circumstance that was far from new and was perfectly admissible. Political history of all countries contained examples of this kind and the most distinguished men had taken part in these transactions from time to time. That these alliances and political campaigns waged together should give to some of the allies of yesterday the right to dictate a hard and fast line of conduct of which they alone should be the judges, and that these conclusions should be reached without even discussing the question or endeavouring to find a common meeting ground, appeared to him not only impossible of acceptance, but also altogether too arbitrary for people who reserved to themselves the humble right of thinking for themselves.

'Friendship confers certain rights,' said the minister, and in some cases it is responsible for illusions also. But the most singular illusion is to believe that it may be converted into a dictatorship, especially on the part of those who, possessing eloquence and ability, perhaps forget that they themselves may be deceived and that they do not possess a monopoly of infallibility and a proper appreciation of what is right.

May I ask my hon. friend if that is a pretty good report of his speech?

Mr. PELLETIER: Pretty good, pretty good, but not complete.

Mr. PUGSLEY (reading):

I enter into further details as under the circumstances those who voted for us on the 21st September have the right to know certain facts that may aid them in forming their opinion on recent events. During the first session at Ottawa I had to choose between two alternatives. In my opinion the line of conduct which I should follow was that dictated by honour and duty. At that moment one of our principal allies—

Might I ask my hon. friend to whom that refers?

Mr. PELLETIER: I do not think I will say more here than I said at Quebec.

Mr. PUGSLEY (reading):

At that moment one of our principal allies of the 21st September came to tell me that

this was not the course to pursue, but that the programme which he indicated should be carried out. In answer I replied. 'What you suggest might have consequences impossible to foresee.' He replied there was no doubt that these consequences would be grave, and that civil war might be the result.

Mr. PELLETIER: I said that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And he believed it.

Mr. PELLETIER: I could not believe my ears.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My friend need not fear that I will omit a line or word, it is all too good.

Mr. PELLETIER: I am glad that for the first time in my life I have succeeded in pleasing my hon. friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is to be congratulated on escaping from the shackles which bound him to his former allies.

The report continues.

I could not believe my ears and I should not have given the regrettable example of revealing these words pronounced in private had not the author himself repeated them during the elections of May 15th at Jeune Lorette before three thousand people. I ask you this question: If I find a solution which is acceptable to the parties concerned and of which they have indicated their approval as being likely to settle an injustice, and if I am told not to help in any way to settle this injustice but to let it continue, rather than become the author of a civil war, what do you think I should do? I thought it was my duty to follow my judgment, as I am of the opinion that a civil war would be a national disaster, and because of this a meeting is held in Montreal and I am called a traitor, a renegade. I refused to submit to this odious role, unworthy of a man who respects himself, and I shall always refuse in spite of threats.

Continuing, the minister said that another question needing a solution had come up and here again allies of yesterday were dictating what should be done and threatening that if their demands were denied he would be ruined and dishonoured politically.

What were those demands?

Mr. PELLETIER: I said in Quebec all I had to say.

Mr. PUGSLEY (reading):

The men who had threatened him thus had declared——

Let my hon. friend mark well these words.

The man who had threatened him thus had declared that he owed nothing to the Empire or to the Throne to which he had sworn allegiance and he had assured him that he would lose his esteem if he did his part in working for the general interest.

Let me pause to ask my hon. friend if that gentleman, his particular ally of yesterday, did not, during the election of 1911, use these exact words with reference to the British Empire? Did not the allies of my hon. friend go throughout the province of Quebec from platform to platform urging the same disloyal sentiments to which my hon. friend now objects and asking the people what they owed to England, and if it was not true that they had to bore holes through the British flag in order to breathe the air of freedom? Does not my hon. friend know that the Minister of Customs, in November last, dismissed from the office of Collector at Coaticooke a gentleman whose only fault was that he wrote a letter to the newspapers condemning the allies of my hon. friend for using this disloyal language? Has my hon. friend, since he has cast these allies to the winds, asked the Minister of Customs to restore to his place that gentleman who was dismissed, because, forsooth, he had the courage to denounce these disloyal utterances? I refer to Mr. Baldwin, Collector of Customs at Coaticooke, whose only fault was that he wrote against these disloyal utterances upon the part of the former allies of my hon. friend whose disloyal talk he now condemns, but who were as disloyal in their utterances of 1911 and urged then just as disloyal sentiments as upon the recent occasion to which my hon. friend made reference?

This report continues:

It had also been suggested that he should resign and run again, in order to give the friends of yesterday a chance to bring out a candidate against him. They had received their answer in the verdict of Hochelaga. Had the verdict been otherwise his position would have been the more difficult and he would perhaps have been compelled to ask the electors of the Quebec county to express their opinion.

In other words, had the electors of Hochelaga elected the Nationalist candidate, does my hon. friend mean the public to infer that he would have been obliged to yield to the views of his former allies who wished him to take a course that might possibly lead to civil war? Would not my hon. friend have had the courage, no matter what might have been the verdict in Hochelaga, to have stood to his guns and followed the patriotic course he had decided on?

Mr. PELLETIER: Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then what does he mean by saying that if the verdict in Hochelaga had been different he would have been compelled to resign?

Mr. PELLETIER: What I meant was, that even if the Nationalists had succeded in Hochelaga, that would have been no reason for me departing from the path of duty which I think I am following; but if the Nationalist had been elected in Hochelaga,

the consequences might have been very serious for the province of Quebec, and then I would have considered very seriously what my duty should be, and I would have gone to the county of Quebec, and asked the electors in that county whether they were of the same opinion as the electors of Hochelaga if they had elected Mr. Doyon. That is what I meant.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely, my hon. friend does not mean to lead this House to believe that, if the electors of Hochelaga, thousands of whom, Liberals and Conservatives alike, apparently did not go to the polls at all, had elected the Nationalist candidate on disloyal appeals, he would have had such doubts as to the loyalty of his own constituents, that he would have felt constrained to resign, to see what they would do about it. Is that what he means?

Mr. PELLETIER: I have explained what I meant.

Mr. PUGSLEY (reading):

Happily Providence had ruled otherwise and Hochelaga had given a patriotic decision, the full import of which was realized by all.

Mr. Pelletier concluded by saying that he had been fortified by this expression of confidence on the part of his electors and that the Government now had two mandates from Quebec for the carrying out of the important duties which were awaiting them.

I have called the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) to the fact that one very important office holder had been dismissed because he ventured to criticise the disloyal statements of Mr. Armand Lavergne and other former allies of my hon. friend, one of whom occupies a prominent position in this House. I asked my hon. friend if any steps had been taken to have him restored to office, and to recognize, what ought to be recognized, the true courage of an office holder, who, when he hears those disloyal sentiments uttered by candidates, exposes them to the public, and asks, as Mr. Baldwin did ask, Liberals and Conservatives alike, to condemn those disloyal utterances, and to show their patriotism and loyalty to the old land and to the Empire. Does not my hon. friend think, further that, as he and his colleagues, many of them, gained their seats in this Parliament by reason of those disloyal utterances and those improper appeals to the people of a portion of this Dominion, they owe it to the people of Canada that they should not take advantage of the positions they secured in this improper way, but that they ought to resign their seats, and go back to the people, and give them an opportunity of expressing their views with regard to their conduct? My hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) says of these men, who he now says are disloyal, that they would like him to take a course that would lead to civil war. He denounces them. Let me say that in the election of 1911, in the city of St. John, I stated before the people that there was evidence of a secret compact between the Conservatives and those disloyal Nationalists, and I asked the people to frown down that alliance. Over and over again the Conservative leaders denied that there was any such alliance; but today we have the admission on the part of the Postmaster General that there was this alliance with those disloyal men, and that those disloyal Nationalists helped the Conservatives to win the seats which they hold in this House, thus deceiving the loyal people of this country, from one end of it to the other.

I am afraid I am taking up too much of the time of the House, but I would like to make a reference to the amendment which is before the House. It does seem to me that the course of our friends opposite with regard to the things which took place in Macdonald and Richelieu is very much to be regretted. Perhaps it is not so bad that these things take place, provided they take place without prominent public men being in any way responsible for them. But the sad thing is that these men rise in this House, and deliberately defend the wrongful and deplorable acts which took place in the two constituencies of Macdonald and Richelieu. Take the case of Richelieu. What have we? We have the statement undenied, the statement made in prominent newspapers friendly to the Government, that one of the most important members of this House, whose influence is far-reaching in the province of Quebec, who has even made, or is reported to have made the statement publicly, that he had a great deal to do with the selection of the Postmaster General as a member of the present Cabinet. I refer to the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget)—went down to the county of Richelieu, and at Sorel made the statement to the electors that he had seen the Hon. Mr. Rogers, a member of this Government, and had been authorized by him to say to the electors that if they chose Mr. Morgan for their member they would be given a marine railway, at a cost, I think, of something like $200,000; that that amount would be placed in the estimates during the then coming session. He urged the people in their own interest to vote for Mr. Morgan in order to secure this important work, which, it appears, the people of that locality are very desirous of obtaining. Now, there can be no question, I think, that if the statement was made, it was entirely unjustifiable; that it was an attempt to bribe the electors of the constituency, which no member of this House,

no man in this country, ought to justify. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) attempted to compare it with a telegram which he said I had sent to the Hon. Mr. Templeman with reference to the harbour at Victoria. There is no comparison between the two. What I did upon that occasion was simply to inform Mr Templeman of what my department had decided, months and months before, to do. I had been to Victoria; I had met the Board of Trade; I had been over the harbour in a steamer, which, I think belonged to the Canadian Pacific railway, and I had been impressed with the necessity of harbour improvements. I had brought the matter before my colleagues months before the election took place, and, if I remember rightly, there had been a considerable vote placed in the estimates for the improvements at Victoria. I do not know whether it was on such a large scale as that for the improvements which are now being carried on. Mr. Templeman wired to me asking what the intentions of my department were, and I replied that we intended to carry out these harbour improvements. But I placed no condition on the statement I was making—none at all. I stated that it was our intention to carry out these improvements, and it would make no difference, and could make no difference, whether the city of Victoria sent a Liberal or a Conservative member to Parliament. The department of the Government had decided on the policy of carrying out these improvements.

Mr. FOWLER. What condition was in the telegram addressed by the Premier to St. John, other than the condition, which it was necessary should be fulfilled, that if they were to carry out the improvements, they would have to be in power to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY: None whatever.

Mr. FOWLER: Then the cases must be parallel?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Absolutely parallel. I have not found the slightest fault with the telegram of the Premier with regard to the taking over of these branch railways. It was unconditional. The Premier bound himself that the Government would take over these branch railways no matter what the constituencies in the province of New Brunswick might do. I found no fault last year, nor do I this year with the Prime Minister for sending that telegram. The same thing with regard to the harbour improvements in St. John. All I complain of is that the Government is not carrying out the pledges that it made to the people. The same in regard to the car ferry between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. A promise was made by telegram by the Prime Minister at a time which, to use the very appropriate language of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) synchronized with the local elections in Prince Edward Island. The Prime Minister wired to a prominent member of the provincial government that this Government had decided to establish a car ferry between the mainland and Prince Edward Island. So far I have not found any fault with that because it was not conditional. But, suppose the Prime Minister had wired to my hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) that the Conservative party, if returned to power, would take over the branch railways and make them a part of the Intercolonial railway provided Kings and Albert sent to Parliament a supporter of the Conservative party; or, suppose he had wired to St. John, as he did wire, that his party, if returned to power, would proceed with the harbour improvements and had attached the condition provided the city of St. John elected Conservative members to Parliament; or, if he had sent a telegram to his friends in Prince Edward Island stating that a car ferry would be established between the mainland and Prince Edward Island provided the people of Prince Edward Island supported the Conservative party, what would have been the result? Every man in this House would have said that it was a most corrupt course of conduct on the part of the Prime Minister and I am sure that no one would have justified it. The Prime Minister would be the last man to descend so low as to attempt in that way to corrupt the people in any portion if this Dominion. But what do we find the gallant knight who represents Charlevoix doing? He goes down to Richelieu, he finds the people intensely anxious to have this marine railway and he pledges his knightly word that he comes there with the authority of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Rogers). He has seen him, he has talked the matter over with him and he is authorized by the Hon. Mr. Rogers to say to the people of Richelieu that if they send a Conservative to Parliament this marine railway will be built and that the amount of money necessary for the purpose will be placed in the estimates during this coming session of Parliament. Surely that is not to be compared at all with the telegrams which the Prime Minister sent either since he has been Prime Minister or when he was leader of the Opposition. That is not to be compared at all with the telegram which I sent to the Hon. Mr. Templeman who represented the city of Victoria. In the three cases in which telegrams were sent by the Prime Minister and by myself we were simply stating the fact, the policy, the decision which had been arrived at and which the people could depend upon and, in my own case, the money had been voted months and months before. In the case of Richelieu

the grant of public money is made conditional upon the people of Richelieu accepting the bribe and sending a Conservative member to Parliament. As my hon. friend who sits beside me (Mr. Lemieux) says, the hon. member for Charlevoix also undertook that in case the money was not voted at the present session of Parliament, Mr. Morgan would, if elected, resign his seat. Now, what have we? We have the hon. the Minister of Public Works rising in his place and stating that so far from the hon. member for Charlevoix having any authority to make this statement, he had never spoken to him upon the subject. Sir, I believe the Minister of Public Works, and, for this reason, that I care not what others may say in regard to the Minister of Public Works, I do not believe for a single moment that he would rise in this assembly of gentlemen and make the statement that he had had no conversation with the hon. member for Charlevoix upon this subject if there had been a conversation and if he had authorized the hon. member for Charlevoix to go to Richelieu and attempt to bribe the constituency in the way he did. But, what a spectacle we have to-day! It is worse than we supposed it was. A member of this House, enjoying the confidence of the Government, has gone into a constituency and declared that he was authorized by the Minister of Public Works to make this statement when he absolutely had had no conversation with the Minister of Public Works on the subject. It is bad enough, Sir, for one to obtain any article of value by false pretenses, but I ask you if there is anything in this country that is more valuable, more sacred, than the right of the franchise and what do you think of a man who goes into a constituency and who deliberately tells the people that he is authorized by the Government to make promises to them if they sent a supporter of the Government when he had no authority to do so and when he had not even spoken to the minister to whom he referred upon the subject. It is up to our hon. friends opposite to deal with this matter. Are they going to allow it to drop or are they going to investigate it? We have had no statement at any rate upon the part of the hon. member for Charlevoix.

My hon. friend from Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler), is, I am told, going to follow me, and I would be glad to hear from him. I know that he would cut off his right arm before he would go into any constituency in New Brunswick and make false statements in regard to what was proposed to be done there. I am sincere in that. No matter how much we may differ on political questions, no matter how earnestly we may fight, I think we would all recognize that it is absolutely indefensible for a public man to make representations of the character of those that the hon. member for Charlevoix made unless he had authority from the Minister of Public Works to make them. He is reported to have made these representations. There are one or more members in this House who heard him make them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was present.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Here are two hon. gentlemen who sit on my right who heard the hon. member for Charlevoix make these statements which are reported in La Patrie and reported also in the Montreal Star. Did the hon. Postmaster General read in the Montreal Star and in La Patrie the statements which the hon. member for Charlevoix is reported to have made to the electors of Richelieu? Did other members of the Government? Did the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) know of these statements being made? I do not know whether they did or not, but we have to-day the extraordinary spectacle of the Minister of Public Works referring to the member for Charlevoix and saying:

It may be true—it is true—that the hon. member for Charlevoix, went to the constituency of Richelieu. That hon. gentleman is quite able to take care of himself either in the constituency of Richelieu or in this House.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: An hon. gentleman says, 'hear, hear'. Does he say 'hear, hear' with a full knowledge and understanding of the fact that it is true that he made this promise to the electors of Richelieu and that he had no authority from the Hon. Mr. Rogers to make it, that he was guilty of false pretenses to the electors of that constituency? If this be true does he say that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Forget) is worthy to be among the gentlemen who occupy seats in this House? I do not say that the hon. member for Charlevoix made the statement; all I say is that he is reported in La Patrie and in the Montreal Star as having made the statement; all I say is that my hon. friend (Mr. Lemieux) who sits to my right was present and heard him make the statement, and that my hon. friend (Mr. Lafortune) was present and heard the statement made. What I say to you, Mr. Speaker, and I am sure you will agree with me, and what I say to the members of this House, and I am sure they will agree with me, is, that if that statement was made by the hon. member for Charlevoix, not only without the authority of the Minister of Public Works but without ever having spoken to him upon the subject, I think there is no man here who will rise in his place and say that the hon. member for

Charlevoix, is longer worthy to occupy a seat in this House. I do not pass judgment upon him, I merely call attention to the evidence there is of his having made the statement. It is due to the Government, it is due to that gentleman himself, that the Government should have this matter investigated to find out the real facts. So far as the hon. member for Charlevoix is concerned, after the statement which has been made by the Minister of Public Works, his conduct is infinitely worse than it appeared to be when it was supposed that the Minister of Public Works had had a conversation with the member for Charlevoix and had authorized him to make some statement to the people upon the subject. The Minister of Public Works goes on to say:

> But the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) charged me with making a promise by proxy or in some other form that a marine railway should be built in the town of Sorel in the county of Richelieu. Let me tell my right hon. friend, and tell this House and this country, what truth there is in that statement. It was not until weeks after the election in Richelieu that I had ever heard that a marine railway was proposed or expected to be built in Richelieu. I had never been spoken to about it,—never heard of it, neither the hon. member for Charlevoix nor anybody else had mentioned the matter to me.

Notwithstanding that statement of the Minister of Public Works which I cheerfully accept, we have it here in evidence uncontradicted, that the member for Charlevoix went to the people, pretended that he had seen the hon. Mr. Rogers—who I believe was Minister of the Interior at the time but about to become Minister of Public Works—and that he held his promise to build this marine railway provided the electors of Richelieu returned a Conservative to Parliament; that a grant would be put in the estimates this session and that if it were not then Mr. Morgan, if returned, would resign his seat as a member of Parliament. I leave the matter with hon. gentlemen opposite; it is of more concern to them than it is to us. The Government has a majority in this House; it is their duty to move in the matter, and if they do not have an investigation and expose the truth, and take such action as may be demanded by the truth, then the people of Canada who have some regard for the honour of Parliament will hold this Government responsible for their want of action upon this important matter.

A few words with reference to what took place in Macdonald. I am not going into the details of these various affidavits, but would like to call your attention to the affidavits which were read yesterday by the Minister of Public Works. Hon gentlemen will find them at pages 226, 227 and 228 of 'Hansard.' Might I ask my hon. friend from Kings-Albert (Mr. Fowler) to read them. He will find that from the second paragraph in the affidavit made by Stedman and from the second paragraph in the affidavit made by Jarvis, to the end, the two affidavits are word for word in every particular. Although sworn to by different men they are identical in every particular as I say, showing that the language is the language of the lawyer who drew the affidavits and not the language of the men who swore to them. They were evidently struck off together upon a typewriter. My hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) laughs. That is the sad part of it; just a laugh. When these deplorable and disgraceful facts are brought before Parliament, there would be more hope for the country if gentlemen opposite looked upon the matter in the serious aspect in which it deserves to be looked upon. And, Mr. Speaker, what strikes me as important for this House to consider is that while the Minister of Public Works produces two affidavits with regard to Mr. Sifton, there is no affidavit with regard to the other three men, Mr. Walkinshaw, Mr. Prince, or Mr. Sullivan; no denial at all of the extraordinary conduct of the provincial authorities with reference to them; no explanation of their being deprived without justification, of their liberty, of their being taken about from place to place, denied an opportunity of seeing counsel, and at last, after the purpose for which they had been arrested had been accomplished, when the election was over they were discharged without a trial and without anybody being able to produce one tittle of evidence against them. I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to think for a moment of what it means to the people of Canada if this Parliament should justify conduct like that. If this Parliament will justify the prostitution of the courts of justice for political ends so that the liberty of the subject can be taken away until certain designs are accomplished, will not the effect be disastrous upon the people of Canada? This is not a matter that affects Manitoba alone; it affects the liberty of the subject: it affects the right of the whole people of this country to have the forms of law obeyed, and there is no more elementary principle governing the administration of justice than that a man's liberty shall not be taken away except in pursuance of the provisions of the law. But what does the Minister of Public Works say? He says in effect: Oh well, although there may not have been a proper information, although the proper charge may not have been made in accordance with the law, yet these people had operated in elections in the province of Saskatchewan and it served them right to

be arrested and to be confined until the election was over.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario): What were they doing there?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not care what they were doing there; I have no knowledge of what they were doing there; and I say to my hon. friend, and he should know it as a lawyer, that no matter what may have been a man's previous life, no matter what may have been his object in going into a constituency, until he is guilty of some wrong-doing which comes within the provisions of the law, and a proper information is laid against him so that he can be legally arrested, it is a prostitution of the machinery of justice to take away his liberty.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE (Lisgar): That is what has been done in this case.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Can the hon. gentleman say that he has ever seen any person arrested on suspicion—I never have—except on proper information? Let me ask this: is it not one of the most elementary principles of justice that when a man is arrested he shall be taken as speedily as possible before a Justice of the Peace, and if the crime is not clearly made out with the information against him, or is not of a very serious character, such as murder, or some other very serious crime, he shall be admitted to bail? He is to be allowed to see his lawyer and make preparations for his defence, and he is to see the charge that is laid against him. But in these cases the men were taken to jail by constables. One was taken to Winnipeg, another to Portage la Prairie. They were treated as criminals of the vilest character; treated as men who had committed some grave offence; and at last, when the election is over, the magistrate is told, 'We have no evidence whatever to offer against these gentlemen,' and they depart from the court of justice as innocent men. Can the hon. gentlemen opposite justify conduct like that? It would be bad enough if that had been done by officers of the law on their own initiative. Officers sometimes make mistakes. They sometimes arrest people whom they have no right to arrest; but in this particular case, the Premier of Manitoba and the hon. the Minister of Public Works took the matter out of the Department of Justice, and took charge of it themselves; and Sir Rodmond Roblin in a speech, which has been quoted by my hon. friend the member for Edmonton, does not say: 'I have placed this matter in the hands of the Department of Justice with instructions to see that if these people commit any wrong they shall be arrested, and the necessary steps taken to punish them,' but what he says is, 'I know these men; I have given instructions that they shall be arrested.' We find from the statements contained in these affidavits, in the statement which my hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) has made from the communication which he received from his son, that these police officers proceeded on the idea that their masters, the Manitoba Government, represented by Sir Rodmond Roblin, would justify whatever they might do in arresting these men, and in preventing them from taking any part in the election. You can see, Mr. Speaker, what an opportunity it would give them to win the election by these means. The Conservative party had their personators abroad during that election.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): Where is the proof of that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Two of them were arrested, pleaded guilty, previous to the date set for trial, before Mr. McMicken, and were released on payment of a fine of fifty dollars. If our friends, with all the disabilities under which they were suffering, were able to arrest these two men, how many scores, how many hundreds more personators were there to vote in the names of absent voters or dead men in this constituency? If you drive our Liberal workers from the polls by threatening to arrest them, if you destroy their organization, how easy is it for the Conservative personators to get in their work and add many hundreds to the majority which the Conservative candidate might obtain.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before proceeding to deal with the reference made in the Speech from the Throne to the naval question, I would like, in order to avoid doing any injustice to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works, to make a further brief reference to the Macdonald by-election scandal. I find that the minister gave a reason why these four men who were arrested under the circumstances set forth in the affidavits produced, had not been prosecuted. It is only just to my hon. friend that I should again give that statement, and it will be for this House and the country to judge whether or not his reason is a good and sufficient one. I quote from page 229 of 'Hansard':

Mr. ROGERS: I have told the hon. gentleman already why they were not prosecuted, and I will again.

I have examined the previous part of this speech, but I cannot observe where he made reference to that reason.

Sifton has been regarded as a public nuisance in that province for years, and if he was not prosecuted it was not because there was not abundance of evidence against him on which to base a prosecution——

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Will the hon. gentleman permit me——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Sit down.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not want to ask a question if the minister does not want to give way. I was going to ask the minister why he does not initiate prosecutions now against this gentleman.

Mr. ROGERS: If the hon. gentleman will wait a minute I will tell him. The hon. gentleman opposite told us here the other day that a protest had been entered against the election of the member for Macdonald, and I now tell these gentlemen opposite that a counter protest has been entered against their candidate, and we expect that the conduct of hon. gentlemen opposite will be revealed to the public, and will not further be tolerated in this country. We are going to see that there shall be placed before the courts of the country a full and through examination of the records of the Liberals in that constituency.

That, apparently, is the reason why these four gentlemen were not prosecuted. that there has been an election protest entered, and they intend to enter a counter protest. Under the election law a protest cannot be entered until after declaration day, and, therefore, the Conservatives would not know whether there was to be a protest or not, and could not enter a counter protest until the main protest had been filed. But these four gentlemen were all dismissed before the day of the election, and before my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works could know whether or not there was to be a protest entered against the candidate who was elected. The House may therefore judge as to the weight which should be given to that most extraordinary explanation submitted by the Minister of Public Works as to why these prosecutions were not carried to a conclusion, and why these four gentlemen—or three of them, at all events —were sent out from the court with a declaration from the prosecuting attorney that there was no evidence against them. It has been stated to the House that Mr. Prince, Mr. Walkinshaw and Mr. Sullivan have entered suits for damages for false arrest against Mr. Stedman and Mr. Jarvis, the two gentlemen who made the extraordinary affidavits read yesterday by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works.

I observe, Mr. Speaker, that in the Speech from the Throne His Royal Highness has been asked by his advisers to say that:

> During the past summer four members of my Government conferred in London with His Majesty's government on the question of Naval Defence. Important discussions took place and conditions have been disclosed which in the opinion of my advisers render it imperative that the effective naval forces of the Empire should be strengthened without delay. My advisers are convinced that it is the duty of Canada at this juncture to afford reasonable and necessary aid for that purpose. A Bill will be introduced accordingly.

It appears to me that in a matter of such great importance, and in which the people of Canada are so deeply interested, it would have been but reasonable that some information should already have been submitted to this House from which hon. gentlemen would have been able to judge as to the proper course to pursue when called upon to discuss the question, and to vote upon the Government's proposition. But so far the House and the people of the country have been kept absolutely in the dark as to the result of the communications between the ministers and the British Government. Only a few days before the election in Hochelaga my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, who has been a member of this Government for some fourteen months, in addressing a meeting of the electors, told them that he was ignorant as to what the documents would disclose, but that when he had an opportuuity of reading them he would then make up his mind as to what would be his duty so far as the naval question was concerned. My hon. friend the Secretary of State (Mr. Coderre) who with the aid of the Liberals of that constituency, succeeded—and I am glad he did succeed—in defeating the Nationalist candidate by such an overwhelming majority; even he, in addressing that constituency, told the people that he was not aware of what the documents, as he called them, would disclose, but that after he had had an opportunity of reading them, he would make up his mind as to what course he would pursue. A sorry spectacle, is it not, Mr. Speaker? Two members of the Government go before a constituency in one of the provinces of this Dominion and tell the people that even they are unaware what the documents relating to the naval question would disclose, or what course they would pursue when the naval proposals would come before the House.

The Address moved in reply to the Speech from the Throne is very meagre as to detail. It has not followed, as has been the practice in recent years, the course in former times adopted in this House, as well as in all deliberative assemblies modelled upon the Parliament of the Mother Country, to go into detail in regard to the different paragraphs of the Speech. It does seem to me that it would have been well if, upon this important question, the attention of His Royal Highness had been called to the fact that this question of naval defence is not a new one so far as this Parliament in concerned. It would, I think,

have been well to have invited the consideration of His Royal Highness and his advisers to the fact that as long ago as the session of 1909 this House emphatically placed itself on record as being prepared to take whatever course was necessary for the defence of our country and the Empire. I intend to read the resolution which was unanimously passed on the 26th of March, 1909, so that it will again appear in 'Hansard,' and be placed before the people of this country. The resolution was as follows:

This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

The House reaffirms the opinion, repeatedly expressed by representatives of Canada, that under the present constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the self-governing dominions the payment of any stated contribution to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be a satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The House has observed with satisfaction the relief afforded in recent years to the taxpayers of the United Kingdom through the assumption by the Canadian people of considerable military expenditure formerly charged upon the Imperial treasury.

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire and the peace of the world.

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the Imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and the honour of the Empire.

In view of that resolution, unanimously passed, in the session of 1909, when my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was leading the Government of this country, expressing so strongly the loyal sentiments of the people of this country, irrespective of party, would it not have been well if in the Speech from the Throne reference had been made to that resolution, instead of conveying the impression that now, for the first time, was the Government of this country asking Parliament to do its duty towards the defence of the Empire? I have not a shadow of doubt that that resolution expresses the almost universal sentiments of the people of this country.

I am glad that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) has been able to return before we entered upon a discussion of the naval question. Let me express the hope that in council he will urge upon his colleagues that we should now engage upon a policy, a truly Canadian naval policy, a policy which will be permanent in its character, the strength of which will increase as the years go by, and by which we will be able, in time of stress, to render all necessary aid to the Empire, and to have a navy which will co-operate with the Imperial navy and be of material assistance not only to Canada, but to the Empire as well. Let me express the hope that the Minister of Trade and Commerce will urge upon his colleagues what he so eloquently urged in 1909, that we should do our duty by Canada and the Empire with our own ships and with our own men, and that we should not hire other people to do our work.

In view of the resolution passed on the 26th of March, 1909, the late Government entered into communication with the British Admiralty, took all the pains possible to get information as to what should be done for the purpose of carrying out the resolution, and as a result of the communications and conferences which took place, tenders were invited for the construction of a number of cruisers and torpedo boat destroyers. Those tenders were received some months before the election of September, 1911. After the tenders came in it was necessary, of course, to consult the British Admiralty in order to find out what confidence the Admiralty reposed in the different builders and also to examine into their financial standing and ability to carry out their contracts. For that purpose one or two of the ministers went to England, conferred with the Admiralty and just before the elections our Government would have been prepared to intelligently award the contract upon the tenders which had been received. There were, I am glad to say, a number of tenders from firms who stand pre-eminent among the shipbuilders of the motherland, firms who had been entrusted by the Admiralty with the building of the greatest battleships of the British navy, a number of these firms were quite willing to come to Canada, to establish shipyards in our country, to employ Canadian labour, to utilize Canadian material and to build ships just as good and as well suited to the purposes of the navy as any which could be built in British shipyards.

It was thought that, as the question with regard to the navy had been raised and made a party question by our opponents, it would be as well not to award an important contract of this character until after the election. As a result of the elections of 1911 the Liberal Government no longer enjoyed the confidence of the people of the country. The people had given a mandate to the Conservative party to carry on the

affairs of Canada. That party came into office. They found upon record these tenders to which I have referred. One tenderer was the firm of Campbell, Laird & Company, which has a great shipyard upon the Mersey extending, I think, for about one and a half miles along the shore of that river, one of the greatest shipyards in the United Kingdom. That firm was prepared to enter into a contract for the building of the vessels for which tenders were called, and proposed to establish a shipyard at the port of St. John. I had no personal feeling in the matter. I was not animated by any sectional or provincial feeling. Apart from the fact that I represented the constituency of St. John I would have been quite willing to have them establish their shipyards in any part of Canada, whether on the St. Lawrence or in Nova Scotia or on the coast of British Columbia. As a Canadian I would have been rejoiced to have seen a shipyard established in any part of Canada, so that we would have had these ships to have formed a part of a Canadian navy built in our own country, giving employment to our own people, and utilizing material as far as possible which could be produced in Canada. What happened? When this Government came into power there was a deposit which had been made by the Campbell, Laird Company to the amount of $100,000 as security for the faithful performance of their contract. After some months' delay this Government, acting through the Minister of Marine & Fisheries, returned the deposit to Messrs. Campbell, Laird & Company, and declared the matter at an end. In my humble judgment, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries struck a blow at the constituency which I and he represent, which may never be repaired. At the port of St. John there is a great work of harbour improvement; there is to be built one of the largest dry-docks in the world, a dry-dock which will be capable of accommodating the largest battle-ship. That work is going on pursuant to a vote of money which Parliament granted at the request of the Government of which I have the honour to be a member. That dry-dock is all to be constructed under proposals which were called for when I was also a member of the Government. But, Sir, right alongside of the dry-dock, Messrs. Campbell, Laird & Company, in conjunction with Norton—Griffiths, the contractors for the present dry-dock and harbour works, proposed to erect a great shipbuilding plant, where the ships of the Canadian navy could have been built if the contract had been awarded to them. But the Minister of Marine, for reasons which I submit to this House are without the slightest weight, declined to enter into the contract, and returned the deposit to the proposed contractors. What is the excuse that has been been given by the Minister of Marine for that? The excuse is contained in a note which Admiral Kingsmill presented stating that before the entire programme could be carried out the ships which it was proposed to build would be obsolete because of changes constantly taking place in war-vessels. The reasons given will not appeal to the common sense of any man, for if weight were attached to them no country would ever begin the construction of a navy.

If that reason were true, how foolish it would have been for Japan to have undertaken the construction of a navy, and how foolish for the United States; both of which countries have navies which are almost equal to any of the navies of the world. In the memorandum which Admiral Kingsmill presented, he suggested that it would be well to have two or three ships built in England, and in the meantime the yards could be prepared in this country, and the building of other vessels could be carried on here. We know very well that changes are taking place, but two of these ships were to be built every eighteen months in order to complete the entire contract within the six years. The privilege would be reserved in the contract to make any modifications which the Admiralty or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries might require, and, under the ordinary terms of the contract if there was any reduction in cost, the contractor should get the benefit of it, and, if there was any increase in cost, it would be paid by the country. Therefore, I think the reason which was given by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries for striking this blow not only at St. John, but at the whole of Canada, is not a reason that will appeal to the judgment of any sensible man who gives any thought or study to this important subject.

But, let me say further, Mr. Speaker, that by reason of the resolution that was unanimously passed by this Parliament in 1909, it was believed that it would be the policy of this country to proceed with the building and maintenance of a Canadian navy, and great firms were induced to look to this country. Under my department, while I was Minister of Public Works, a contract was entered into with Messrs. Vickers Sons & Maxim, one of the greatest shipbuilding firms in the world, for the building of a dry dock at Montreal. That dry dock has arrived, it has been placed in position under the contract which we entered into, and I do not believe, from what I know of the communications which took place with that firm, that they would have entered into that

contract, or that they would have built and brought to the port of Montreal that great dry dock, unless they had had reason to believe that it would be the settled policy of this country to construct the Canadian navy, to have ships built in Canada. I am told that right alongside of the dry dock there is ample room to place a shipbuilding plant, and that they would be prepared almost immediately to enter upon the construction of battleships as large as any which are now in the British navy. They have built many battleships, cruisers and smaller vessels for the Imperial government and they would be quite prepared, so I am told, to engage in this work in Canada. So also, upon the Pacific coast, there is a shipbuilding firm engaged in the construction of smaller vessels, it is true, but steel vessels, vessels of the character that will be required only they will require to be upon a larger scale, and it will not take very long to establish a shipbuilding plant upon the Pacific coast at which the largest vessels can be built. The same thing applies at the Port of Sydney. When the late Government were in power, plans were submitted and proposals were made for the construction of a great dry dock there, and it is recognized universally that the port of Sydney would be an admirable place for the building of ships.

In view of these facts, while we have no information as to what will be the course which the Government will ask Parliament to pursue, let me express to the House, and I do it with all sincerity, the hope that the policy which was laid down and unanimously agreed to in the session of 1909, will not be departed from, and that we shall now begin in Canada, upon as large a scale as the necessities of the Empire may require, the building of a Canadian navy, which shall be strengthened and added to from year to year, so that the navy will be a source of real strength to the Empire in time of danger. No matter what others may think, I am of the opinion that, if the Government does what the newspapers have been repeatedly suggesting it intends to do, that is, give a contribution in money to the Imperial Admiralty, and so hire the people of England to do, as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce told us, what we ought to have the courage to do ourselves, I am satisfied that such a course will not meet with the approval of the people of Canada. I am thoroughly satisfied that what the people of Canada want is that we shall show our strength and our courage, and that we shall move forward along Canadian lines and build up a Canadian navy of the necessary strength for the service of the Empire.

I forgot to mention, Mr. Speaker, that upon the Great Lakes they have also gone into steel shipbuilding. I have had the pleasure of being at Collingwood, and I have seen magnificent steel vessels turned out of the yard there, 500 to 600 feet in length, equipped with the most powerful engines, and equal to any of the vessels of the kind built in any shipyard in Great Britain. The same skill, knowledge and enterprise will enable these builders to construct vessels of smaller size which may be brought down the lakes, such as torpedo boat destroyers, and torpedo boats. So that on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts and on the Great Lakes, we have the knowledge, we have the skill, and I am sure we have the courage, to enter upon this work and to do our duty, a duty which devolves upon us as a part of the great Empire to which we belong.

Let me beg my hon. friends opposite to reconsider their relations with the Nationalist party of Quebec. The hon. Postmaster General admits that those gentlemen who were their allies but a short time ago, during the elections of 1911, have demanded of him that he should pursue a course which, in his judgment, might lead to civil war. Let me call his attention to the fact that the only reason—and he knows it, and all hon. gentlemen upon the other side of the House know it—why this Government is not prepared to-day to bring down a permanent policy for adding to the naval strength of the Empire is because they have made a pledge to the Nationalists that they will not do so until they submit the question to the people. My hon. friend has parted company with some of those who are most disloyal in their utterances. Let me implore him, let me implore his colleagues, and let me implore the right hon. Prime Minister, in the interest of the people of this country, and in the interest of the Empire, to go still further and break entirely away from the Nationalists and refuse to be bound by the secret pledge which they gave when they came in, that the question should first be submitted to the people. My hon. friend knows that while the ministers were in England making those silly and mischievous speeches, speeches almost as mischievous as that which the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Mr. Hughes) made in British Columbia in his reference to Germany, they were not making those speeches in order to influence the loyal people of this country. The people of Canada, from the shores of the Atlantic to the Pacific, need no urging to give aid to the Empire, but all those speeches were made for the benefit of the Nationalist wing of the Conservative party in Quebec. They were made for my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk); they were made for others. They did not have the

desired effect upon him, and so far as we have observed from the statements in the newspapers, they have not yet had an effect upon the Nationalist wing of the party generally. They still demand that the secret pledge shall be carried out, and that this Government shall not engage upon a permanent policy for the defence of the Empire until the question has first been submitted to the people. But in the meantime, they are going, so the newspapers say, to make a contribution of money, because they have discovered an emergency. Well, we do not know what the papers will disclose, but I venture to say that my hon. friends the ministers who went to England, went there hunting for an emergency, and if our information is correct, they have not found it yet. My hon. friend the member for Brandon (Mr. Aikens) also went over, and, always anxious to assist the Government, of which he is so prominent a supporter, he went to Germany to see if he could find something there. When he came back he told the people that Germany and England were actually at war.

Mr. AIKENS : Where did my hon. friend find such a statement ?

Mr. PUGSLEY : I saw it in several Conservative papers.

Mr. AIKENS : Will my hon. friend read the exact words contained in those papers, or the statement in effect ?

Mr. PUGSLEY : Yes. The statement which my hon. friend was reported to have made was that he had been over in Germany and in England, and that the two peoples were to-day actually at war.

Mr. LEMIEUX : What do you say about that ?

Mr. PUGSLEY : I was not surprised at my hon. friend's statement ; knowing the flights that his imagination takes at times, I would not be surprised at anything he might say.

I will not detain the House longer. Let me just say in conclusion that the Government knows what the policy of the Liberal party was. The Government has before it the resolution unanimously passed by this Parliament. In any policy which looks toward the building of a great and strong Canadian navy, which looks towards having that navy controlled by the people of Canada, a navy which shall be strong and great, and always available for the defence of Canada, and in times of stress for the defence of the Empire—if that should be their policy when they bring it down—they will receive the hearty and loyal support of the Liberal members of Parliament and of the Liberal electors in Canada, from one end of the country to the other, irrespective of province, irrespective of race, irrespective of creed.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (Kings and Albert): At the outset, I must congratulate my hon. friend the member for the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) on the form of his speech. I have heard the hon. gentleman on many occasions, but never have I heard him so eloquent as he was this afternoon and this evening. I congratulate him, and I do so most heartily and most honestly upon the form of his speech; but I use the word 'form' advisedly, because I must take serious objection to the matter of his speech, which was misleading, and in which he misinterpreted and distorted facts. When he had no facts to distort, he relied upon that fertile imagination of his to supply them. I am going to follow my hon. friend seriatim, taking up the different items which he discussed, and I shall try to show in what respects my hon. friend has wandered far from the facts.

In the first place, and I do not know why, the hon. member took up the question of cement, and he told us that the price of cement in St. John was $1.80 a barrel, whereas the price at the American mills was, I think, 60c. I do not know what experience he has had in the purchase of cement, but if that has been his experience, I must tell the hon. gentleman that he has been badly imposed upon by the persons from whom he purchased his cement, because within the past four weeks I, myself, have bought in St. John a car of cement, and the actual cost to me was $1.38. If, therefore, the hon. gentleman paid $1.80 for his cement, he had better change the merchant from whom he purchased it. It must be remembered in discussing the retail price, or even the price by the carload, that cement is a very bulky material, that we have no cement mills in St. John or near it—they are hundreds of miles away—and that the freight is a very important consideration. When you come to take into consideration the freight, and the different hands through which cement has to pass in the way of wholesale and retail merchants, you will find that $1.38 is not a very high price to pay in view of the original cost. The duty on cement is 12½ cents per 100 pounds, which would come to a little more than 31c. per barrel.

Mr. PUGSLEY: There are 350 pounds to the barrel.

Mr. FOWLER: Yes, that would be about 52c. This great panacea of reciprocity, I understand, would have reduced the cost a cent and a half per 100 pounds, which would make a difference of less than five cents, about 3½ or 4 cents, per barrel on the cost of cement, but my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, whose course in this matter

was severely criticised by the late Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), cut the duty in two by the reduction he made, and reduced it by over 6 cents per 100 pounds. So much for cement.

My hon. friend next took up the question of redistribution, and he was very severe upon this Government for their course in not taking up that question at this session of Parliament. The right hon. the Prime Minister in his reply to the leader of the Opposition showed that the late Government waited nearly two years after the census of 1901 before they introduced their Redistribution Bill. The recent census was completed in March, 1912, and if the present Government take up the question of redistribution at the next session of Parliament, they will have dealt with it sooner after the close of the census than the late Government did in 1903 when they discussed redistribution. If the present Government have violated the statutes, as my hon. friend says, it is a very unfortunate thing that he was not in the House and was not a member of the late Government at that time in order that he might have prevented his friends from violating the statute in a still more flagrant manner. If the present Government have violated the statute, as he says—he did not produce the statute—they are only following in the footsteps of the late Government, and for them my hon. friend has not a word of criticism or blame with regard to that.

My hon. friend next spoke of the improvements at St. John, and he took a very great deal of credit to himself for what was done there. I do not propose to take away from the hon. gentleman's credit in that regard. I believe that the hon. the ex-Minister of Public Works did honestly and seriously try to induce his colleagues in the Government to do justice to the city of St. John, one of the great ports of this Dominion. But he had a hard task before him. He had a difficult task to convince those gentlemen who did not have very much faith or confidence in the Maritime provinces and whose sole desire was to trade, not through our own Canadian ports, but through the ports of a foreign nation. When the Transcontinental scheme was before Parliament, and when they had an opportunity to safeguard the interests of Eastern Canada by providing that all the freight originating along the line of that railway should be carried through Canadian ports, they turned down the proposition of the Conservatives in this House, which would have brought about that result. And why? It is because they were more interested in building up the ports of a foreign country than they were in the prosperity of the ports of their native land. The hon. gentleman is entitled to very great credit for the improvements in St. John harbour, but it ill becomes him to attempt to derogate from the credit that is due the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) for all he has done for the port of St. John since this Government came to power. In season and out of season the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) has been insistent that this great scheme which is going to do so much for the port of St. John should be carried on with all the expedition possible. My constituency is within three miles of the post office of St. John city and the interests of that constituency are absolutely bound up, not indirectly but directly, with the prosperity of the city and port of St. John, and consequently, I thought it was my duty to, in my humble way, do all I could towards seconding the efforts of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. But, what did the Liberals when they were in power do about the improvements in the port of St. John? The tenders were called for and were in on the 10th of August, 1911, and the Liberal administration held office until the middle of October and yet nothing was done. Why was not the contract let before they went to the country? My own opinion is that notwithstanding the efforts that had been made by my hon. friend, his colleagues were not in earnest in forwarding that great work which is now progressing so rapidly under the fostering care of the present administration. My hon. friend told us that Courtenay bay was his baby. It must be a source of keen regret to the hon. gentleman that the founts of life, so far as he was concerned, were dried up on the 21st of September, 1911, and that he had to put this baby out to foster parents.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It has a sort of a step mother now.

Mr. FOWLER: Yes, but a very kindly stepmother; not the kind in the story books, but a real and kind stepmother such a one as in some instances is far better than the real mother.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I may have it back bye and bye.

Mr. FOWLER: Let me assure my hon. friend that his so-called baby will not be neglected by the present ministry, that it will be cherished and nourished and brought up to a much more healthy maturity than were it left to the neglect of the hon. gentleman and his colleagues.

The question of the Hudson Bay railway has been so ably dealt with by my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) that there remains little to say. It is equally true in the case of the Hudson bay railway as in the case of the Georgian bay

canal and other great national enterprises, that they were dangled before the people of this country merely for whatever party advantage could be got out of them by the Liberal administration. It was not until the present Government came to power that anything tangible was done in regard to the Hudson Bay railway.

The hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) has spoken with regard to the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway, and he must know that it is not to be expected that all the promises which a party makes can be fulfilled in the first year of office. Let not the hon. gentleman be disturbed with regard to what is to come on this branch line question. Let me say to the hon. gentleman that the pledge given by the Prime Minister with regard to this matter will be carried out to the very letter and that the branch lines will become part of the great Intercolonial railway system as they should be. The Liberal party was in power for a long time and the hon. member (Mr. Pugsley) was himself a not uninfluential member of the administration, and, if he is now so anxious with regard to the branch lines will he tell me why during all the time he was Minister of Public Works nothing was done?

Mr. PUGSLEY: We got the Bill.

Mr. FOWLER: Yes, you got the Bill; you were great people for getting things on paper; you were great for giving paper promises and verbal promises as well, but when it came to performance you were most lamentably weak. There is no gentleman in this country who is stronger on political promises than is my hon. friend, and, as I am reminded, particularly on the eve of an election.

As to the trade question, to show the unfairness of the argument of the hon. member, I may mention that he spoke as though the present administration and its supporters were against having trade with the United States. A more ridiculous assertion could not be made, and I was surprised that the hon. member, who is a man of very great intelligence, would venture before such an audience, to make such a statement. The supporters of the present administration are not opposed to trade with the United States, but we do insist that that trade shall be on terms as fair to us as it is to the people of the United States, and the reciprocity treaty upon which the Liberals ran the last election and on which they were so gloriously defeated, was not fair to us.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought you gentlemen wanted no truck at all with the United States.

Mr. FOWLER: The hon. gentlemen is only joking when he makes a statement of that kind. These gentlemen opposite told us that if we rejected reciprocity it was going to end all trade with the United States, and yet the hon. gentleman quoted figures to-night to show that during the term of office of the present administration our trade with the United States has tremendously increased. This shows that the people of the United States are sensible people. It shows that because Canadians had the good sense to turn down a bargain that was two-thirds in favour of the Americans and one-third in our favour, they do not resent it by foolishly proposing to lessen their trade with Canada, which is to-day the most valuable trade of all foreign trades to the people of the United States. I am glad to hear from my hon. friend that our trade with the United States has increased, and I will tell him why it has increased. The reason is that this country is increasing so vastly in population and development that our manufacturers are unable to keep pace with the increasing growth of the country and so more manufactured goods have to be imported from the United States. Coal, that coal which is used in manufacturing, is one of the largest items of the increased trade between us, and more coal is needed to turn out the increased products of the Canadian manufacturer. And so, notwithstanding our greatly increased manufacturing in Canada and the tremendous prosperity of our manufacturers at the present time, they are unable to keep pace with the requirements of the country, and our people are obliged to import from the United States more manufactured articles in the year 1912, the most prosperous year in our history, than during any previous year. I would be glad to see that manufacturing done in Canada. My hon. friend and those who think with him would prefer to have that manufacturing done in some country outside of Canada. The hon. member for Carleton spoke the other day as though the manufacturer was a criminal in this country. 'There were none,' he said 'except those who cut down lumber in the woods, caught fish in the sea, dug coal in the mines, or ploughed the fields, who were producing wealth in this or any other country.' The manufacturer not a producer of wealth? The manufacturer who takes the raw material and by reason of his skill turns it into the finished product, making it ten times, sometimes fifty or a hundred times more valuable than the raw material? That man is not a producer, is a mere parasite, as it were? Such ridiculous nonsense! That is the sort of political economy they talk of on the other side of the House.

Let me point out another instance. Here we have the two leading Liberals from the province of New Brunswick, the hon. member for Carleton and the ex-minister from

St. John. One spoke of seventy-two millions of extra duty that he said we had to pay, on imports from the United States. The other says: 'Every time you send your hay to the States'—a man ought to be prosecuted for sending hay from his own country—' and every time you send lumber to the States, you pay the duty;' and he roared it so that he could have been heard down to Queen street. The hon. ex-minister, in those sweet melodious tones of his, says, 'The consumer pays the duty,' while the hon. member for Carleton, in those harsh and strident tones of his, says, 'The producer pays the duty.' Which is right? It is a greater problem than solving the age of Anne. We will let those two great political economists fight it out between themselves, as they cannot very well both be right. That is the sort of political economy we get from gentlemen on the other side of the House—anything to catch a vote.

Mr. NESBITT: Would you mind telling us who you think pays the duty?

Mr. FOWLER: When two such learned statesmen as the member for Carleton county and the member for St. John are as wide apart as the poles, I with my humble ability and my lack of knowledge of political economy, would not dare to venture an opinion. There is an old saying that 'fools rush in where angels fear to tread.' I fear to tread. I want to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) a question. He was asked it the other day. Perhaps by this time he has screwed up his courage so that he will be able to answer. Is the hon. member for St. John in favour of reciprocity?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I may say emphatically yes.

Mr. FOWLER: I am glad we have been able to extract an answer from the hon. gentleman.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is the first time my friend has asked me the question.

Mr. FOWLER: My hon. friend from Sault Ste. Marie (Mr. Boyce) asked that question and he would not answer.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member from Sault Ste. Marie was simply making a remark that he noticed on the face of the member for the county of St. John a shade of anxiety and sorrow when that was mentioned. I made the remark that the hon. member for St. John is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and not myself.

Mr. FOWLER: The usual lawyer's evasion on the part of my hon. friend. Perhaps the right hon. the leader of the Opposition will be willing to answer now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: With great pleasure. We are a united party on this side. We never vary.

Mr. FOWLER: That is a still more clever lawyer's evasion. I ask the right hon. the leader of the Opposition: 'Were you in favour of reciprocity as it was presented to the people of Canada during the elections of 1911?'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I know of some Liberals who have varied their views upon that. I am not one of them. I stick to my ideas.

Mr. FOWLER: I am glad to know that. I congratulate myself upon having produced from the two leaders of the party for the first time during this session a statement on this very important point. I see the smiling face of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). Perhaps he would be willing to answer the question. Is he in favour of reciprocity between Canada and the United States, as it was set forth in the platform of the Liberal party during the elections of 1911?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I was, and I am still.

Mr. FOWLER: Then the hon. gentleman has changed his views since last session.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, not a particle.

Mr. FOWLER: The hon. gentleman said the question so far as he was concerned was dead and buried.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I never said that at all. I said the reciprocity issue is dead, and at the time I spoke I think it was dead.

Mr. FOWLER: And you said it was buried too.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I don't think so. My memory may be wrong upon that point, but my language at the time was accurate in describing the situation.

Mr. FOWLER: The hon. member claimed that the issue is dead.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Was.

Mr. FOWLER: Well, it is over fourteen months ago; it ought to be buried by this time.

The hon. member for St. John paid some attention to the Postmaster General, making some quotations from certain newspapers with regard to a speech that the Postmaster General had made in some portion of the province of Quebec, and the hon. ex-minister found it almost impossible to realize that there could possibly be a difference of opinion at the present time between two parties who at one time may have been in some sort of alliance. I cannot think that the hon. gentleman was serious

when he made that statement. I think the hon. gentleman must have been laughing in his sleeve when he talked along those lines, for the hon. gentleman has found himself, during his political career, in so many different situations—allied to-day with the very persons he was in opposition to yesterday, the foe of yesterday becoming the loving friend of to-day—that it should not be a matter of surprise to him to hear the hon. Minister say that his old-time associates are those with whom he is at present in enmity. I do not think the hon. gentleman was serious when he spoke that way. However, the hon. Postmaster General has the reputation of being able to take care of himself; of being able to answer any charges that may be brought against him, and replying effectively to any criticism that may be made of his public or private conduct. I therefore leave the Postmaster General to look after my hon. friend with regard to these matters.

I now come to the question of the by-elections in Macdonald and Richelieu. The ex-minister (Mr. Pugsley) waxed righteously indignant when he spoke of the things that were alleged to have taken place in Macdonald and Richelieu. One would have thought that he had never heard of such a thing as corruption, or had never known of improper conduct in elections. One would have thought that he was as innocent as a child of any knowledge of or participation in such matters. What a short memory must the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) have, when he does not remember the famous Rothesay lists; when he does not recollect when that tremendous fraud was perpetrated—a fraud combining forgery and perjury——

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER: He, as Attorney General employed counsel from the city of St. John, when the motion was made by the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries before the Supreme Court of New Brunswick to quash that list. The hon. ex-Minister, who has been so shocked at matters in Macdonald and Richelieu, employed counsel and paid him from the public funds of New Brunswick for the purpose of defending that gigantic fraud.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I presume my hon. friend has no desire to mislead the House; am I correct in that?

Mr. FOWLER: Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is entirely mistaken. I did not employ counsel for the purpose of defending that fraud; I simply employed counsel to watch the matter, and, that counsel was a consenting party to the quashing of the lists. It was quite proper that this should be done, and every reasonable aid was given to have the lists quashed in court.

Mr. FOWLER: The hon. gentleman was Attorney General at the time, and as such he was charged with the duty of seeing that the laws of New Brunswick were observed. He said 'hear, hear,' when I stated that these lists involved forgery and perjury——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER—and I wish to ask my hon. friend if, having counsel there as he said to watch the case, he prosecuted any of these men?

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the hon. gentleman's memory will serve him rightly, he will recollect that I stated that I had no knowledge or information as to who had committed the fraud. At that time I called the attention of my hon. friend and his associates, who had stated publicly that they knew who had committed the fraud and forgery, to the fact that it was their duty to give that information to me as Attorney General, and I told them that the moment the necessary information was received, prosecution would be commenced.

Mr. FOWLER: Let me tell my hon. friend that the information was given. It was known that these lists were in the hands of friends of his party. One of those gentlemen was a Liberal councillor from the parish of Rothesay. This was well known to my hon. friend, and when he speaks of employing counsel to watch the case, we have cause to remember what that counsel did. It was in my hon. friend's own parish that this fraud was consummated, by which the total number of names constituting the voting strength of that parish was increased from 350 to 750—an addition of not less than 400 fraudulent names. My hon. friend should not be so shocked; I do not charge him with anything more than an error of omission rather than commission. I think my hon. friend is too honourable to do anything of that kind himself; but I say he was derelict in his duty as Attorney General when he did not see that those men, whether Liberal or Conservative, were properly prosecuted. Therefore my hon. friend cannot be serious when he speaks of the matters in connection with the elections in Macdonald and Richelieu.

My hon. friend has criticised very severely the conduct of the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget). He made an insinuation — not in words, but by an intimation — when he spoke of that gentleman having pledged his knightly word. Sir, I am a democrat. I do not think a knightly word is any better than the word of a common man. I do not know whether my hon. friend is democratic or not; but that state-

ment was an insinuation against knights, and he had a knight right alongside of him when he made the statement. I am surprised at the lack of courtesy shown by the hon. gentleman—for courtesy is one of the virtues for which he is noted—in not notifying the hon. member for Charlevoix that he proposed to make these intimations concerning that gentleman's conduct, so that the hon. member for Charlevoix might have been present in this House, and in a position to make a satisfactory explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY : In view of the fact that this amendment was moved on the first day of this debate, and that it was distinctly brought to the notice of the members of the House, does not my hon. friend think that the duty devolved upon the hon. member for Charlevoix to be present in this House ? That hon. gentleman has not been here, so far as I have observed, for some few days. I think he ought to be here, and I may add that I consider it the duty of the Minister of Public Works to have given that member due notice to be here.

Mr. FOWLER : The hon. member for Charlevoix has been here, but during all the time he was present none of the gentlemen who sat on the other side said one word in regard to the Richelieu election.

Mr. PUGSLEY : Does not the hon. gentleman realize that it was the duty of the hon. Minister of Public Works to have notified the hon. gentleman from Charlevoix to be present ?

Mr. FOWLER : I have no doubt the hon. member for Charlevoix will be here in due time, and give such an answer to his traducers as will cause them to hang their heads in shame. They based their whole charge against him on the statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works that he gave no authority for anything of this kind to be done. But it is only recently that a change in the personnel of the Department of Public Works has taken place. Might it not be possible, and is it not highly probable, if any conversation took place between the hon. member for Charlevoix and the Minister of Public Works, that it took place between him and the late incumbent of that office, and not the present Minister of Public Works ? The election for Richelieu, as I remember it, was held just before or after the retirement of the late minister, and it is quite possible, and I have no doubt it is the case, that when the conversation took place it was between the late minister and the member for Charlevoix. I have no hesitation in saying that if an hon. member for this House on either side should go into a constituency and represent himself as being charged with a certain message to the people of that constituency from a minister of the Crown, and the statement so made was absolutely false, I say that member would be doing a very dishonourable thing indeed.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOWLER: And I think that would be the common verdict of every hon. member. Therefore I say that the hon. member who makes that charge against the member for Charlevoix should be very careful of his ground because he is making a serious charge and he should have learned from both the Minister of Public Works and the ex-Minister, whether, in either case, the member had received the instructions he claims to have received.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My remarks are based entirely on the fact that the report states that he pledged to the electors that he had the assistance of Mr. Rogers. Mr. Rogers is the gentleman specifically named.

Mr. FOWLER: My hon. friend was not really so much shocked perhaps at this very thing as he professed to be. My hon. friend must remember the world-famed Leary telegram which was conceived in fraud and born in iniquity and my hon. friend was present at the conception and also at the birth.

Mr. PUGSLEY: When was that?

Mr. FOWLER: Oh what a memory has my hon. friend! He has actually forgotten the Leary telegram.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Was it fifty years ago?

Mr. FOWLER: It was several years ago, but the unfortunate part about a public man's career is that the public remembers away back in the beginning. My hon. friend may have blotted this out from his memory, he may have forgotten what he wishes to forget, but unfortunately the public has a better memory and so they all know about the Leary telegram.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If that event occurred thirty or forty years ago——

Mr. FOWLER: It is scarcely that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I happen to know that long after that my hon. friend was a very loyal and warm supporter of mine, long after thirty years ago.

Mr. FOWLER: Not since the Leary telegram, no.

Mr. PUGSLEY When was that?

Mr. FOWLER: Let me say that I never cast a vote for the hon. gentleman, I never professed to cast a vote for him. The only time I supported the hon. gentleman was in the year 1895 when the hon. gentleman was the Tory candidate for the county of

Kings. I am surprised that my hon. friend would refer to that, but I have no desire to wound him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I was referring to was when I was in the Provincial Legislature and the hon. gentleman was my warm supporter.

Mr. FOWLER: Never, never, never, not so. The only time I sat in the local House was the three years when the hon. gentleman was not there at all. He was the very efficient law clerk of the local legislature of the province of New Brunswick when I happened to be a member of that body. Let us hope that the passing of the years has brought with it, as it often does, penitence on the part of the hon. gentleman, that he really now feels shocked at the things that never shocked him before. If that be the case, if he is sorry for the Leary telegram and for the Rothesay list in his county in connection with it, I will be the last person to upbraid him with these things, if it is real penitence he feels. But I think it is only mock-penitence; I fear it was only mock indignation which he expressed at what took place in Macdonald. Telegrams? He sent a telegram to the Hon. Mr. Templeman, of Victoria, on nomination day saying they proposed to spend $3,000,000 in the harbour of Victoria. What did he send that for?

Mr. PELLETIER: To synchronize.

Mr. FOWLER: Why did he send it then? Was it necessary to assure Mr. Templeman that he was going to spend this money? Mr. Templeman was a member of the Government who surely knew that this money was to be spent, that telegram was not necessary to re-assure Mr. Templeman, but he felt it was necessary or Mr. Templeman felt it was necessary to assure the electors of Victoria, and that is why it was sent, to influence the electors, to induce them to vote for Mr. Templeman, and fearing lest the electors would not take the word of my hon. friend he got the endorsement of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. But the result showed that the electorate of Victoria were a very wise people, an intelligent electorate as I know them to be, and no better proof of that can be found than the fact that they sent to this House as their representative the present member for Victoria.

My hon. friend called particular attention to a couple of affidavits in the report regarding Macdonald, and he asked me to read them carefully. The inference he drew from their being alike was not that the two men had seen the same thing the same way. That was the reasonable conclusion that most men would draw, that when two men described an occurrence in the same way they were both present and both telling the truth, but my hon. friend, with the legal ability for which he is so famous, for let me say that in all Canada I doubt if there is my hon. friend's superior as a lawyer, what conclusion does he draw? Why that the whole thing is a fraud and he says it was evidently written by a lawyer. What has been the experience of my hon. friend with regard to the drawing of affidavits? Is it his experience that, when a man comes into his office to swear to an affidavit, the man drafts it himself in his own language, and signs it and presents it to be sworn? Is it not the experience of my hon. friend that the lawyer gets his facts from the party who is to swear to the affidavit, in his own language, and then he, the lawyer, draws the affidavit? I appeal to my legal brethren in this House if that is not the invariable rule and custom. It is only natural that these affidavits should appear to be couched in the same language because they are swearing to the facts, they both saw them, they both knew them, and my hon. friend has certainly gone far afield when he tries to show that these affidavits are false simply because they are couched in the same language.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I think my hon. friend will agree with me that he has heard over and over again the supreme court of our province say that it is always suspicious when you find that an affidavit is apparently in the language of the lawyer who drew it up because the affidavit ought to be in the language, as far as possible, of the deponent. In this particular case these two affidavits are identical, word for word. Even to the smallest preposition, everything in the two affidavits is identical.

Mr. FOWLER: I do not recall that the court in New Brunswick or any judge of that court ever made such a statement, and I would say to any court or any judge that made a statement of that kind that they were casting upon the lawyers of this country an odious and false insinuation.

Another criticism which my hon. friend makes with regard to the Macdonald election is that they released these men. Well, it serves the Manitoba Government, or whoever was responsible for the release of these men, right to be criticised for it in this House. They had in this constituency of Macdonald a lot of election crooks, they were sent into the constituency for the purpose not only of debauching the electorate but of trying to switch the election, conduct at which these gentlemen were experts, and with a magnanimity which the hon. gentleman is unable to understand or comprehend, after the election was over and they had won they said:

Let the poor devils go; they were only tools anyhow. Yet, for this magnanimous conduct Sir Rodmond Roblin and others are subject to the criticism which we have heard in this House. My hon. friend says that never in the whole history of this country were men arrested without a charge being made. Why, it is a common thing. If there is a horse race going on at the Woodbine, or near Montreal, or a great circus being held, that is the time the crooks gather around to pick pockets and any man who has attended these gatherings—my hon. friend may not go, but I am sure that my hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) will bear me out when I say——

Mr. GUTHRIE: I did not hear the remark, so I would like it repeated in order to see whether I can bear the hon. gentleman out.

Mr. FOWLER: I will take it for granted that the hon. gentleman will bear me out, and I will not repeat the remark.

Mr. GUTHRIE: No, we must have this settled. I do not want my name brought into the debate in which I have taken no part. If the remark is repeated, I can say whether I can bear the hon. gentleman out or not.

Mr. FOWLER: I made a little, innocent allusion to the hon. gentleman, but I did not mean to offend him. I would not offend him for the world.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am not offended.

Mr. FOWLER: I said that it was a very customary thing that at races, where many people were gathered together, crooks will attend as well as honest men, and that the police gather in these crooks. I said that if the hon. ex-Minister does not attend these places, perhaps the hon. member for South Wellington would be able to confirm what I had said. Maybe he does not attend them, and if he does not so much the better.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I cannot confirm what my hon. friend says, so that we will have to take his word for it.

Mr. FOWLER: Very well, then, I take it for granted that my hon. friend does not go, or else I take it for granted that at the places where he has gone the crooks have not been arrested. I have not any personal allusions to my hon. friend and I hope my hon. friend will give me credit for sincerity in making that statement. So, I say, it is not an uncommon thing in point of fact for crooks, or suspicious persons, to be arrested under these circumstances, for men who are looked upon as being crooks and pickpockets to be taken into custody. When men came into the constituency of Macdonald, having no known business, and who were known to have been connected with election frauds before, these people did the wise thing when they arrested them without warrant or without charge. It was necessary for them to be so arrested. My hon. friend would have had them wait until they had stolen the election. The best thing is to lock the stable door before the horse is stolen and drive the thieves off with a shotgun.

Mr. PUGSLEY: And then discharge them on the ground that they are innocent.

Mr. FOWLER: No, I have already told the reason why they discharged them.

My hon. friend lastly referred to the naval question. He spoke very eloquently and very well on this naval question and the duty which we owed to the Empire. I am glad to know that my hon. friend recognizes the duty which we owe to the Empire, not to England, but to the Empire of which we form a part, a duty to maintain in—as great efficiency?—no, Mr. Speaker, considering what foreign nations are doing in the way of building navies, in far greater efficiency than ever before the navy of the Empire upon which the welfare and safety, and the very life itself of this country depends. Who is there, however disloyal he may be to England, that would desire that Canada should come under the yoke of the foreigner? We could not under the present circumstances, even if we so desired, be independent in this country. If we were to break those bonds, light as air though stronger than iron, which bind us to Great Britain, some foreign enemy would gobble us up and we would find that we had exchanged the light government of England for the yoke of slavery. In my opinion nothing is of such great importance to the welfare of the Empire as a strong, united, not a disunited, navy. Why, the afternoon papers have shown us something that should stir the patriotism of every man in this country from Halifax to Vancouver. We are told in the afternoon despatches that the native princes of India have dedictated to the Empire's navy three superdreadnoughts and nine cruisers. The other day we were told that the Malay States, which are under the protection only of Great Britain, had provided for a dreadnought for the Imperial navy.

That is what the dusky-skinned sons of the East are doing for Great Britain. Shall we, the fair-haired sons of Canada, who have boasted that we are the proudest jewel in the Empire's Crown, be behind the Hindu in what we shall do for this Empire of ours? I am sure that the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) will see to it that we take a step or two in advance of the Hindu at least.

Before I sit down, I wish to refer to a remark or two made by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). That hon. gentleman tried to show the great advantages we had lost by voting against reciprocity. He said the Liberal party had lost all but its honour; some of us had thought they had not very much of that left. He stated that the price of potatoes in Maine was $1.45 a barrel, while the price in his town of Woodstock, was only $1. Knowing the hon. member for Carleton pretty well, I was afraid that he had misstated the facts, and so a telegram was sent to Woodstock, the town from which the hon. gentleman comes, and I will read the answer to that telegram. My hon. friend the member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) pointed out some of the inconsistencies in the speech of the hon. gentleman, and I will just read this telegram to see if it will disclose another.

Understand that Mr. Carvell made statement yesterday in the House that potatoes were forty-five cents per barrel higher in Maine than in New Brunswick. If correctly reported same is gross misrepresentation. Have just communicated with largest shippers at Bridgewater, Maine. Their price to-day on potatoes just ten cents per barrel higher than at Florenceville, New Brunswick, which points form a fair comparison. Prices generally for the past month have ruled about even between Maine and New Brunswick. To-day market reported easier on American side. Our market firm.

That disposes of the argument that the hon. gentleman was trying to make with regard to the benefits of reciprocity in the county which he has the honour to represent, a county very strong in the matter of potatoes.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will the hon. gentleman give us the name of the party signing that telegram?

Mr. FOWLER: Yes, it is a name well known in New Brunswick, and respected wherever known. The name is B. F. Smith, not John, but B. F.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm): (Translation). Mr. Speaker, I listened with pleasure and interest to the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Fowler). That hon. gentleman has argued his case very forcibly and eloquently, and is entitled to our congratulations on that account.

I have the honour to represent the county of Montcalm, a purely agricultural constituency, which formerly was pledged to the Conservative party; and I can assure you, Sir, that I found it a hard task to secure my return, having to fight both Conservatives and Nationalists who had joined hands to wage war on the late Government. We found it a rather difficult matter to have them accept the navy bill which had been passed by the late Parliament.

Conservatives and Nationalists were both very loud in their condemnation of that disastrous, outrageous piece of legislation, as well as of the whole policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Government.

More particularly the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier, representing the constituency in which I have the honour to reside, would cry out: 'Down with the navy; we owe nothing to Great Britain, absolutely nothing. It is Great Britain's duty to protect us, not ours to protect Great Britain'. Then he would add in mournful tones: How grieved I am at the thought of having to separate from my leader, for Sir Wilfrid Laurier's policy is objectionable, but Mr. Borden is even worse.

Subsequently I learned of the entry into the Cabinet of the same man who had denounced that measure. How changed from his former stand! Our opponents were prone to say: 'Should the Laurier government be defeated at the polls, should we be carried to power, that outrageous legislation will be repealed forthwith; it will disappear from our statute books.'

I wonder if that is now an accomplished fact. These gentlemen were to ask for a plebiscite on the navy question; the people were to be consulted in that connection. That plebiscite is still to come; expectations have not been fulfilled. Of course, those hon. gentlemen scoured the province of Quebec under the leadership of Henri Bourassa, of Armand Lavergne (the hon. Postmaster General's manager), of Mr. Monk, head minister for the province of Quebec, and all along their journey flags and bunting bordered the roads, bearing the words: 'Down with the navy.' In my constituency there were such flags floating from every tree, along every highway, over cheese factories, butter factories, blacksmith shops, &c. 'Down with the navy,' they said, and some would even add: The navy be d——

Well, Sir, I had a hard time of it in my constituency. Recklessly I agreed to encounter the leader of the gang, Mr. Bourassa, who had challenged me to meet him. I discussed the political issues with him and his friends who surrounded him, especially the "half-leader" Prévost. I rejoiced at seeing them all there. I recalled to Mr. Prévost times of bygone days when I was fighting by his father's side, a great orator, surnamed the lion of the North, and deservedly so. How edifying it was to hear Mr. Bourassa brand Mr. Prévost a perjurer, a boodler, he even added a rake because the latter had come back from Belgium accompanied by young lady secretaries, and everybody saw the point. I said: 'You are mis-

taken, I have had Mr. Prévost as an opponent, and I knew him to be true and honest; I believe him to be so yet. When you accuse him of being a perjurer, a boodler and a rake, you are a contemptible liar.'

But Conservatives vociferously applauded. I heard the gentleman who entered the Cabinet recently, the Secretary of State, while attending meetings at St. Eustache and St. Henri, joins with the other in crying: 'Down with the navy. A navy is of no use to us, and we do not owe anything to Great Britain.' And to-day these same people exclaim: 'Hurrah, three cheers for the navy.' From that we may judge how sincere they are.

The former Prime Minister must have perceived on May 15 last that the electors of the province of Quebec had discovered the error of their ways. They made amends for past mistakes, and they will make further amends at the next general elections. These gentlemen who to-day are clamouring loudly for a navy will have their turn bye and bye. Beware, the people have a good memory, the people do not readily forget. Did not the hon. member for Chambly-Vercheres (Mr. Rainville), who was a Nationalist at the time, go through his county with the cry: 'Cut out the navy, we have no use for the navy; we must not send out our children to be butchered, they should not be made to serve as targets for guns, as Mr. Laurier would have it?' To his mind Sir Wilfrid was a wicked man, a wretched fellow, willing to sacrifice anything for Great Britain's sake. That was the gossip at every street corner.

And to make success still more certain, Mr. Bourassa, the so-called champion of provincial autonomy, the vindicator of our rights in the Dominion, was taken from place to place. The Liberal party made the mistake of letting them have a free hand in the matter, they allowed that campaign of insult, slander and falsehood to be carried on unimpeded. Thus did our opponents succeed in moulding public opinion, and when the general elections were on, we lost some of our best men who suffered defeat. It was contended in every quarter that the Navy Bill was obnoxious, was outrageous, that our children would be constrained to take part in all Great Britain's wars, that they would have to fight even the Japanese or the Chinese. Thus they spoke at the time, but they tell quite another story now.

The hon. member for Chambly-Verchères has given up all his former associates, Liberals as well as Nationalists, and now he is an out and out Conservative. He waves a three-striped ensign, a tricolor; but before the next election comes on, he may change once more. Notwithstanding which, I very much fear he will be defeated.

I see in the Speech from the Throne that the Governor General is made to say how pleased he is at witnessing the prosperity enjoyed by the country at large. As a matter of fact the country is prosperous, but if His Royal Highness had travelled through the country in 1893, in 1894 and in 1896, I wonder if he would have made a similar statement. Going through the cities, he says, I found everywhere evidences of the greatest prosperity. That is a state of things quite different from what existed under the Conservative rule. Then trade was stagnant, business failures were on the increase, agriculture neglected, manufactures just holding their own, or even winding up in many cases. Is it not striking that with the same tariff, the same available labour, and under the same management, prosperity should have set in after 1896. How can such a change be accounted for? To my mind, if with the same tariff, the same territory, the same men, the same help, the same soil and the same brains, an extraordinary wave of prosperity has set in, that is due to the fact that there was a change of leadership in the meantime, and that for a period of fifteen years Sir Wilfrid Laurier has governed the country.

To my mind that conclusion stands out clearly: the management of affairs has passed into different hands. For instance when we reached power the rate of postage on letters was three cents.

Mr. PELLETIER: There were many dead letters.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Yes, on account of so many people going over to the United States. Fully one-third of the people had crossed the border; no wonder if nobody was found at home; they had all departed for the States. But since Sir Wilfrid Laurier's coming into power, letters easily get to their destination, because our people have flocked back to Canada in large numbers. Nevertheless, at the time, the Post Office Department showed deficits from year to year. On taking charge of that department the Liberal Postmaster General cut down the rate on letters to two cents, and instead of former deficits, surpluses were obtained from year to year. That is a rather extraordinary result. Of course that was the result of good management, and the present Postmaster General took up that department in a very flourishing state, yielding heavy surpluses. Now, Mr. Speaker, it may be such a condition of things which induces him to do away with all the officers appointed by the late government; to deprive whole families of their only means of support. In my constituency he dismissed postmen, poor people eking out a living by means of hard work. 'He is a Liberal,' he would say, 'let us put

him out.' He dismissed postmasters because they had voted for me, poor people who had been doing the work for twenty or thirty years.

A commissioner was sent over to my constituency to inquire—Mr. Bergeron, a good fellow, a good citizen, but who had suffered defeat at the last election. He was on the wrong side, and people would not have anything more to do with him. He was appointed commissioner at a salary of $15 a day, plus his travelling expenses. He succeeded in carrying on mock inquiries. 'Did you take part in the election?' would he inquire. 'Did you vote?' 'Well, yes,' the poor man would answer. 'I did vote.' 'I am a Liberal.' 'That is all I want to know, the inquiry is over, and be off.'

You may rest assured, Sir, that if the hon. Postmaster General turns up in Montcalm at the next election, he will have a hard time of it. He can make a good speech and find his way out of difficulties all right enough, but he will soon discover that these dismissals have not helped him very much.

His Royal Highness was quite right in stating in his Speech from the Throne that he found the country in a state of great prosperity; and I understand it might have offended his advisers should he have added: 'That is entirely the outcome of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's good management.' The Governor General took the Speech from the Throne as it was handed to him; but the people, knowing who brought about that great prosperity, draw their own conclusions, as they have shown at the last provincial election, and as they will further show at the next general election.

A great deal of canvassing has been done in the county of Richelieu at the last election; and you may be sure, Mr. Speaker, that had it been possible to buy the county, that would have been done; but it was not for sale and they had to go without it.

The Speech from the Throne states that the increase in trade is satisfactory. That is so, but here again it is easy to find out who should get the credit for that increase. Under the former Conservative government we had no treaty with Belgium, or Germany, or Japan, or France. All such treaties were concluded by the Liberal administration, and we are now in a position to judge how far astray were hon. gentlemen on the other side when they predicted that our leader would fail in concluding such treaties and securing for us the benefits deriving therefrom. Without their help, nay in spite of them, Sir Wilfrid Laurier has succeeded in satisfying the Canadian people as to his ability to cope with such a situation and developing our trade with the rest of the world. Such is the real explanation of the increase of our trade. Here, again, no mention is made of the fact that credit for all this is due to the hon. leader of the Opposition, as being the result of his special efforts in that connection.

Why did we endeavour to develop trade with the United States, why did we enter into a reciprocity agreement with them? Had you, Sir, been present at the meetings held in my county, you would have realized to what extent the electors approved of that policy; but at the same time you would have heard our opponents condemning the Liberal administration for not having carried out that plank of their platform as defined at the great convention held in Ottawa. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, our opponents contended, had promised that a treaty of reciprocity would be concluded, and apparently he had not the slightest thought of carrying out his promises in that connection. However, when the former government introduced in this House a reciprocity bill, hon. gentlemen on the other side, Mr. Speaker, would not accept it. It was even expected that the measure would carry unanimously. It was such a beneficial agreement. Hon. gentlemen could hardly believe it; they never expected that Sir Wilfrid Laurier could obtain such terms from the United States. Indeed they realized full well that should such a policy go through, it would enable us to hold power for many years to come. So they hastened to swallow their whole past history in this connection, they set aside the standing offer that they had written in the Tariff and would have nothing more to do with reciprocity proposals, although they had pledged themselves in favour of such a measure when it was introduced by a former Conservative administration and Sir John Macdonald. They turned right around and said 'Let well enough alone.' After criticising the Liberal administration for such a long time, these hon. gentlemen discovered on a sudden that things were in pretty good shape, that the country was prosperous, that there was nothing to complain about and nothing to change.

Then they thought to themselves that they should come out with something more. Of course, these hon. gentlemen are not easily put out. It is not an easy matter to corner them. So they cried out: 'Reciprocity is a step towards annexation.' That settled the matter, and with that catch word they succeeded in bringing over to their views a great many voters. As for me I have stopped sending my shirts to the Chinese laundry, as that might affect my loyal feelings. I realize we should not deal with foreigners, for fear of impairing our national characteristics. A party intent on reaching power will go to any lengths to reach its ends. In upper Canada we were defeated on the Ne Temere decree. Laurier was held responsible for that decree, it being asserted

that he could have it repealed if he wished, a thing he refused to do, because he was too much of a Catholic, of a Papist. Let us have Borden, who no doubt will secure the repeal of that decree.

However, the ablest man we have had as Minister of Justice, the most eminent jurist of all those who filled that position, I mean the hon. Mr. Aylesworth, after duly considering the matter, came to the conclusion that the Ne Temere decree was a matter under the exclusive control of the provinces, and that the Dominion Parliament had no jurisdiction in that connection.

Later on, his successor, a former judge of the Superior Court, a prominent man as well, the present Minister of Justice, in turn looked into the question, and both he and his leader have confirmed the opinion given out by Mr. Aylesworth, and which was the only true and reliable one. Albeit, the promise it seems had been made to Ontario that, should the Conservatives be returned to power, the matter would be settled, and the question was how could such pledges be redeemed. As there might still exist some doubt in regard to this question, it was suggested that a way out would be to refer the matter to the Supreme Court. That was done. Then it was resolved that once the matter had been passed upon by the Supreme Court, it might be referred to the Privy Council, and that also was done.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his Minister of Justice who solved the question without any cost to the country, might now enquire from this Government how much did it cost to get the same judgment over again. I shall be glad to see the bills of cost of the numerous counsel who have been retained in this historic case by the various provincial governments and the Dominion Government as well. And all that to find out whether there remains any doubt. To my mind the opinion of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and that of the right hon. Prime Minister should have carried weight. But hon. gentlemen were anxious to put something in the way of their friends and do something to please those who had requested such a move. They will be around again; the Government will hear from them before long. An effort will be made, it appears, during this session to insert in the criminal code a section making a misdemeanor of any attempt to prevent marriage between Catholics and Protestants. Is that question also to be referred to the Supreme Court and to the Privy Council? That is very likely, as the Government is bound to redeem in some way or other the pledges made to the electors. It seems to me, however, that if hon. gentlemen continue referring all such political issues to the Supreme Court or the Privy Council, their surpluses will soon dwindle into nothingness. Once they have settled with all the commissioners retained since their advent to power, and paid all such reckless expenditure, very likely our surpluses will not reach yearly into the 25 or 30 millions as was the fashion under the former government.

In connection with the increase in Canada's receipts, which is still going on, hon. gentlemen have forgotten to state how this result was brought about. They did not make the least reference to the efforts of the former government to develop a branch of our trade which has considerably increased. I mean the trade in agricultural products.

At the head of the Department of Agriculture in the late government we had a practical man, a real leader, a farmer who knew his business, I mean the Hon. Mr. Fisher. Thanks to him, the exports of our farm products increased considerably. As a practical farmer, he introduced some marked improvements. He had cold storage compartments provided on board steamships for the safe transportation of cheese, butter, and all perishable products. His first-hand experience in matters agricultural enabled him to give such an impetus to the various branches of farming in Canada, that farmers in all the provinces of the Dominion now are in a position to secure fair remuneration for their labours.

The Speech from the Throne makes reference to the increased flow of immigration. Formerly Conservatives were prone to say: You are bringing to this country undesirable immigrants, you are wasting money; it is an outrage to waste so much money with a view to bringing over here such a class of settlers. However, since they have taken the reins of power, they utter not a sound, they are all perfectly satisfied, immigration is on the increase.

How sincere they are! Of course, I am aware, I know from experience, having for a number of years back held the position of Crown prosecutor at Montreal, probably the busiest criminal court in the Dominion, I am fully aware some people come in who should never have been admitted. But immigrants cannot be picked like raspberries on the bush, by gathering the ripe fruit and leaving out the rest. An inquiry cannot be carried on concerning their previous record, and of course nobody is in a hurry to say: I am a thief, or a murderer, or a forger, or a firebrand. Such people hide, go under assumed names to escape detection. However, as soon as we found out that abuses were being committed and that undesirables were getting in, further legislation was introduced by the Laurier government providing for the deportation to the country of origin, and at the expense of the senders, of any immigrant who turned out to be objectionable within two years after his arrival. Cases occur almost every day. Newcomers are sentenced

by the courts, and after serving their time, are peremptorily deported to their country of origin.

Surely hon. gentlemen opposite must have noticed that matters in that respect had been set right by the Liberal government. I remember hearing the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier exclaim at a public meeting: 'Just think of it, gentlemen, Laurier and his colleagues grant admittance on Canadian soil to Doukhobors, people who are still expecting the Messiah, who run about through the Northwest Territories almost naked; and even more, Laurier spends money to get them here. What a pity to see those people governing the country in such miserable fashion.'

Well, he did not govern it very long. I was surprised to see him accept a portfolio, but I was still more surprised to see him renounce it, as he had stated that he was bolted, rivetted, padlocked, chained to his seat. Well, I can see neither chains nor padlock any longer. He has taken everything away with him. I hope to see him back here before long. At that same meeting he added: Just think, Lafortune, an elector of mine, support these people. How painful it is for me to see him in such bad company. Well, I may tell him that it was very painful to see him take a portfolio in the newly-formed government, he who had almost weeped when saying: 'How deeply I regret to have to separate from my leader; but his policy is even worse than Laurier's!'

Nevertheless he accepted a portfolio, and stuck to it with bolt, rivet and padlock. I expected he would remain there for a while; but on a sudden he woke up, got angry, broke the padlock, and skipped off with the chain. Of course, he knew somebody would be found to take his place. There was a shuffling of portfolios. Public Works was taken up by a man who hails from a distance; the finest department of all was given to another, and Mr. Monk's successor was content with taking the meanest portfolio. I wonder if the electors will appreciate the change. Richelieu voters apparently were not very much pleased.

I would have been very happy to meet the hon. Postmaster General in Richelieu. He did not dare to come, although his self-confidence at times is apt to make him overlook danger. I realize that he is not without experience and ability; of course, some brains are required to be taken into any government. But what I object to is the manner in which some people get there. True, he had to follow the lead of a very young man, by many years his junior, Mr. Armand Lavergne. I must admit that I would not accept the leadership of a youth. That accounts for the early breaking out of family quarrels.

The hon. Postmaster General is no longer a favourite with his erstwhile chief, Mr. Lavergne. The latter challenged him to a public discussion of the political issues, but the hon. minister backed out. Of course, I do not mean to say that he was afraid to go. At any rate, a separation is pending, but the Senate will not be called upon to act. The Ne Temere decree will settle the matter.

I say such marriages are ill-assorted. You called yourselves Nationalists for the sole purpose of defeating Laurier. Realizing that in the province of Ontario such a platform would not take, you started to make trouble with the Ne Temere, while the navy question was made the main issue in Quebec.

Thus was the late government defeated. 'Laurier is responsible for the Ne Temere, they cried out in Ontario, 'Down with the Navy,' they cried in Quebec. Our good parish priests feel particularly aggrieved, as they relied to such an extent on the pledges given by Mr. Henri Bourassa.

The late government they contended, had sacrificed the rights of the minority in connection with the Manitoba school question. Laurier they said had sacrificed the rights of the Catholic minority of the province of Manitoba, as a word from him would have sufficed to settle the matter. I still have ringing in my ears the statement made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel): 'If our friends are returned to power, the school question will be settled in quick order. I am ready to spill my blood for the triumph of the cause.' Well, he did not spill much of his blood, not so much as half a pint. Don't fret, once they were in power, the question was shelved.

Did not Mr. Monk state on the floor of the House that this school question was settled, that it had been settled by the Liberal party, through the Greenway-Laurier settlement? That settlement, he would say, I approved of it at the time. But did not the same Mr. Monk wage war on Sir Wilfrid Laurier on that account? Did he not taunt him for having sacrificed the rights of the Manitoba Catholics? The new government has not even been able to grant to the Manitoba Catholics what Sir Wilfrid granted to the Catholic minorities in Saskatchewan and Alberta.

It was necessary that the new Opposition leader should fall from power. Why? So that full justice might be rendered him during his lifetime. His very opponents were constrained to do full justice to him. It is seldom such a thing happens during a political man's lifetime. Had it not been for that change of government, future historians might have written a rather dismal account of his participation in that affair, as the whole clergy were unanimous in saying that he had acted treacherously towards them. By assuming for a while the reins of government his opponents have against

their will certified to his superior skill, and such a thing does not happen very often.

As regards the Nationalists, I wonder if there are many left; one would need a lantern to discover them. Once the election is over, you have the whole population on your side. Your most bitter opponents are among the first to cry: 'Hurrah, we have won the battle, let us have a drink together.'

Those old-time Nationalists, it is a difficult matter to keep track of them now, they will no longer acknowledge the name. Formerly, when Mr. Henri Bourassa would request all Nationalists in the audience to lift up their hands, there was quite a number to respond. There were Nationalists galore in those days. Their cry was: 'Long live Nationalism.' But to-day should Bourassa enter this House and call on Nationalists to stand up, very few would respond. Nationalists are few in this House. That was well and good previous to Sept. 21st, but to-day their cry is: 'Long live the Conservatives.'

And when we hear even former Liberals, who supported and fought for Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government, the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères, for instance, a Liberal himself and descended from Liberal stock, but who now that a Conservative government is in power, refuses to go by the name of Liberal, and even, declares, as I heard him do the other day, that he is sorry for ever having been a Liberal, I say can any faith be put in the sincerity of such men? I very well remember that even a short time ago he could be heard crying out in our committee meetings, as a half-leader might do: 'Long live Laurier.' To-day he asserts that Laurier has been bungling all along.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: (Translation.) He is in the manger.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) I will not say that, as he might get mad, and we are still good friends; but I must say that it grieves me to see a young man who got such a good start take such a bad turn. Should the Government be defeated to-day I am confident he would return to the fold, and pretty quick too; a friendly wink would bring him round in short order.

The Speech from the Throne refers also to the rich harvest. We used to hear our opponents say: 'Well yes the country is prosperous, business is in a good way, but Liberals are mistaken when they say that Laurier is the cause of it all, that he is the weather-maker, that he is in touch with Divine Providence.' Well, if Providence had anything to do with it, she certainly was bountiful to him. But Providence is of changing disposition. You will see, gentlemen, that Providence will not extend protection for a long while, for your building lacks the right foundation; you have been building on sand and you are bound to fall before long.

Mr. NANTEL: (Translation.) Such is the blessing I wish you.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) I may say in reply to the hon. gentleman that his constituents will have no blessing in store for him when he tries to explain before them his change of front on the navy question. They will rather order him back to private life.

I still hear the Conservative leaders' cry of the time: 'That great prosperity is not due to Laurier, but rather to the late Conservative administration' (under whose rule bankruptcy was rampant in every direction).

On reaching power, Sir Wilfrid Laurier had to proceed to a general overhauling. He turned down the faucet and stopped the leaks in the casket. Henceforth deficits became a thing of the past. Not he, but Providence should be thanked, the former Conservative leader, Mr. Taillon, would sarcastically say. Well, I am the owner of farms, and if I said to my men: No use ploughing this spring, we will get a crop all the same, do you think Providence would help me very much? When I hear the new Ministers assert that the country is prosperous, the harvest abundant, the treasury overflowing, I am tempted to answer right away: You are merely profiting by that bountiful policy introduced by the Laurier government.

The Speech from the Throne then mentions a treaty of commerce concluded with the West Indies. Now, what do you think of that? The former Minister of Finance (Mr. Foster) is the author of this great work. He is a man of worth, though his friends have rather lost faith in him to a certain extent. I was sorry to see him passed over as Minister of Finance and that portfolio handed to a new member, and a former Liberal over the bargain. How pleased he must have felt to see the hon. Mr. White take that portfolio away from him!

Of course the former Minister of Finance might well have expected some such dealing. He has not always travelled on the straight road, and his friends put him aside and called upon a Liberal to be their Minister of Finance. True, the latter was from Toronto, and possibly the large manufacturing concerns were in need of him to help on their business. However, had I been in Mr. Foster's place, I would have been aggrieved. No doubt he must have grumbled some.

The country is in such a prosperous condition, it seems, that the House will be called upon to vote millions. The exact number is not given; the child has not been christened as yet. Out in the country

places, two or three days are sometimes permitted to elapse before the child is baptized, when the roads are bad. In this case there is much delay in bringing this Bill before the House. I am anxious to know the figure, whether it be thirty, or forty, or even fifty millions. Once the principle is recognized, there is no reason for being bashful about it. I wonder if the old Nationalist by-word will be heard: 'Down with the navy, no contribution.' The hon. Mr. Monk is at loggerheads with his former colleagues on that question. No wonder, since the Conservative party has three platforms, one for Ontario, one for Quebec, and another for the Nationalists.

The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) has been consistent at all times. He has never changed his mind. That is why the Prime Minister took him along on his journey through the provinces. He left Mr. Monk behind, as he could not properly show him around in the other provinces. He took along the Minister of Justice, who besides being a worthy minister of the Crown, had always on all matters agreed with his leader. As for the others who have been taken in, I feel rather chary of referring to them. To see people thus accept portfolios in cabinets which they have previously condemned makes me uneasy, and I wonder what kind of a bargain has been entered into. It may possibly never be brought to light. How comes it that Nationalists are now so gentle, so easy to please? What has brought about the change? One of their number has already taken leave, and others may follow suit in the near future.

Mr. Armand Lavergne has not yet succeeded in meeting the hon. Postmaster General. Mr. Lavergne is a young and fiery opponent, a man of resources, with a great future before him. I am pretty sure he has something in store for the hon. Postmaster General. He will want to know why he deserted them. I would be grieved to see the Postmaster General in a bad plight. Many people, on the other hand, consider him a renegade. Really, that is too bad. You are a renegade. Mr. Armand Lavergne says so, and many others go on repeating it.

Mr. PELLETIER: (Translation.) He has slandered others previously.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) But two blacks do not make one white, two backsliders do not make an honest man. That does not seem to trouble the hon. Postmaster General, but nevertheless there is not much fun in being called a renegade. Had it not been for me, says Mr. Lavergne, you would not have been offered a portfolio. He must keenly regret having exerted himself on behalf of a renegade, of a cad, of a political time-server, as he calls the hon. minister.

The latter has not accepted Mr. Lavergne's invitation to meet him in public. But they will come to hands, some day or other, and I will be there to witness the fray; it will be some fun to see them battering each other. I for one would not retain a portfolio if my leader addressed me as a renegade and a cad.

If an hon. gentleman challenged me to meet him, with the words: 'I wish to meet you in the county of Montcalm to discuss your conduct as a minister,' it would not take me long to resign. Let any hon. gentleman state that I secured my election in Montcalm, under false colours, and I shall resign at once; there will be no dilly-dallying about it either. Come before the people and we will soon find out who is the renegade and the cad.

The hon. member for Chambly and Verchères addressed a meeting in a parish where my wife's ancestors were settled; he will see what kind of a welcome he gets the next time he goes there; defeat awaits him at the next election.

Mr. RAINVILLE: (Translation.) Those good people have voted for me and will continue doing so.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) You are in error, as you will find out. Honest people may be deceived once, but not twice in succession. The hon. member deceived his electors, but he will not succeed a second time, you may be sure. A poor man is sent to jail for stealing five farthings from his neighbour, and in a country such as ours, would it be allowable to secure a constituency under false pretenses and then go scot free? No, that cannot be, and the hon. member may rest assured he will not succeed a second time.

He defeated a talented man, and a respectable citizen, the former member, Mr. Victor Geoffrion, a man of honour, and a man of learning. He succeeded in defeating him by joining hands with the Nationalists. He managed to have the electors believe that Mr. Laurier's policy was wrong; that it would mean for the country the expenditure of extravagant amounts, that their children would be enlisted against their will, and that in future they would be mere targets for guns.

By means of such falsehoods, these hon. gentlemen have led the public opinion astray, have misled many people, and on polling day the result showed that the electors had accepted as true those false statements. But the day of retribution is at hand. When the time comes you will have to render a strict account of your doings, with vouchers attached; if not I pity you.

Mr. RAINVILLE: (Translation.) Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) I have no time to answer. Let me get through,

and keep quiet in the meantime. The hon. member visited my native parish along with several other Nationalists, but the people would not listen to him.

Mr. RAINVILLE: (Translation.) You were responsible for not letting me speak.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) The people refused to listen to you, and you had to go back as you came. The Government allowed Monk to depart, and they are on the point of requesting us to vote millions, to borrow millions from England for the purpose of giving them back to her, millions on which we will have to pay interest. Is that good business? Is there any sense in borrowing money from the mother country and then returning it to her in the shape of a contribution? How profitable that will be to Canadians! But it may not be an easy matter to have the people agree to such a policy.

The navy as proposed by the former government was to be Canadian, but our opponents contended that there was no necessity for it. In spite of their denunciations, the electorate have kept faith with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and we succeeded in getting returned. True several of us have fallen on the battlefield, but I was fortunate enough to satisfy the electors of Montcalm that our opponents were only slandering us to secure the reins of power.

People would say: How comes it that men of such worth as Bourassa, Monk, the member for Chambly-Verchères and other Nationalists overrun the province asserting everywhere that there is no use for such a measure and that you do not answer? You are invited to attend Nationalist meetings and you abstain from being present.

That accounts for the people taking stock in the statements of our opponents. I used to reply: If the Nationalists ever set foot in my constituency, Lafortune will be there to meet them. And I did not back out either.

Mr. RAINVILLE: (Translation.) Did you go alone?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) Certainly alone; that was enough. When Mr. Bourassa came to Ste Julienne with his Nationalist allies, I was not alone. The mistake was made to let these gentlemen hold meetings by themselves. They came to Chertsey and addressed a meeting of ten thousand people. People expected that Bourassa would finish me in the first round. Well, it was on that day that I won my election. Another of these gentlemen once came to give me a hand in an electoral contest and caused my defeat. He was my leading speaker at a large meeting held at Ste Julienne. I mean the present Postmaster General. At the time he was neither a Nationalist nor Conservative; he was a Liberal, under the Mercier government. He was very eloquent on that day; I was glad to have him with me; but I was nevertheless defeated.

Times have greatly changed. The hon. Postmaster General periodically shifts his allegiance. I hope he will be back with us some day. Just then he was a Liberal; later on he became a Nationalist, and later still went back to the Conservatives. What will he become next? God knows, but I do hope he will not set foot in my county, for that would ensure my defeat.

We succeeded in satisfying the people that what was needed was a Canadian navy, under the control of the Canadian Government; a navy that would be built by Canadians, with Canadian iron, steel and wood, and by our own people. We got them to understand that the millions voted for the building of ships would come back to our pockets in another shape. The farmer who buys a farm for ten thousand dollars is not any poorer after doing so, provided the farm is really worth that money.

The Nationalists had misled public opinion to such an extent that a great deal of work was required to set it right. I for one fell sick in consequence; I almost died. They spent twenty thousand dollars in the hope of defeating me. Bourassa had made up his mind to get me out of the way. For a period of two years they kept on directing shafts at me in a special column of their paper. I had no paper to defend me; Bourassa had his and he never stopped heaping aspersions on me from morning till night. The happiest day in my life was when I had occasion to meet him on neutral ground. I can assure he had a hard time of it and thanked God when the ordeal was over.

These gentlemen state to-day that there is urgency. They sent some of their number to Germany to obtain first hand information, and they returned with reports of warfare. Of course, they came back in the best of health; but before returning to Canada it occurred to them that they should warn Canadians as to the possibility of war breaking out; hence the necessity for contributing millions towards assisting Great Britain.

Is not that humiliating for Great Britain? Fancy the strongest of the great world powers stating through the mouth of the Prime Minister of the Dominion that she needs a contribution from us, failing which her supremacy will be in jeopardy. The mere thought of it must be painful to such a proud people as the British. If Canada will not make a grant, our national supremacy is imperilled.

Who will believe such a story? Is there a single Canadian who will take stock in such a statement? No, Great Britain does not need our money. Papers state that

the whole thing was done at the suggestion of the Prime Minister, who said: Send me a note of what you require, and you will get it; The late Minister of Public Works told us we had canals to build, great natural resources to develop, trade connections to extend, and above all the Georgian Bay canal undertaking to carry through. Two hundred millions, to say the least, Mr. Monk told us, will be required to build that canal. He has departed taking that idea along with him; at any rate no reference is any longer made to it. What was the position of these hon. gentlemen in regard to the Hudson Bay railway? Their contention was that it would be a waste of millions of dollars; and now they rejoice at the thought of it, and forget to say that the proposal originated with the Liberal Government. Objection was taken to the Hudson Bay railway just as much as to the navy. What the late government have done they have deliberately done, after giving due consideration to all the circumstances of the case. The late Prime Minister was not wont to act recklessly, without the requisite information. He has shown that he is the greatest statesman that Canada, and possibly any country can boast of. Wherever he has played a part, we have had every reason to be proud of him and to glory in him; and when he ceased to be Prime Minister, he remained what he had always been, and he still remains to this day, the greatest political figure in this House.

It is urgent, we are told, to uphold the mother country; but about the plebiscite? I do not see those Nationalists who were clamouring so loudly for a plebiscite. When the subject is broached to them, they look annoyed. But formerly the plebiscite was a favourite topic with them. Why do they not refer to it any more? Why do they not insist to get it now, after clamouring so loudly for it? Are they sulking? I do not know what is going on.

I do not intend voting a single cent as a contribution, because I am satisfied that Great Britain is in no need of our money. I shall not vote a single cent, except to carry out the resolution voted on March 29, 1909, giving effect to our policy. Accordingly we purchased two ships and pledged ourselves before the country to build others as circumstances required, but with the understanding that none of these vessels would be commissioned for active service without the Dominion Parliament having been summoned specially for that object and having given its consent, and besides that such ships would be built in Canada by means of Canadian labour. All that was carried out, or was on the point of being carried out.

When I hear people talk of loyalty, it

makes me smile. Is there any need for stating that Canadians are loyal? No, there is no necessity for stating such a thing. When I hear somebody say: I am an honest man, I get suspicious. Why should we boast of our loyalty? Is not the fact emblazoned on every page of our country's history? Can any body point out a single fact that impugns the loyalty of the French Canadians?

I fail to see how the contribution which it is proposed to give can be defended. There is no necessity for it. Great Britain would be incensed at the thought of a colony suggesting and proclaiming by a vote that she is in need of our help, of our assistance to maintain her supremacy among the nations of the world. Is it fair to send away Canadian funds when so many things remain to be done in this country, when we have railways and canals to build natural resources to develop, public works to carry out? To borrow money for the purpose of making a present of it would be a rather costly luxury, since our only advantage would be to pay off the interest.

I notice that hon. gentlemen opposite look tired. I would advise them to retire for the night, as I do not intend closing my address for some time yet. If the hon. minister thinks we have been sitting long enough he might allow me to move the adjournment of debate.

Mr. PELLETIER: (Translation.) If the hon. member intends speaking for a while yet, I think he should move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) Yes, I will not be through for a while. It is not very often that I address the House, so allow me to move the adjournment of the debate.

On motion of Mr. Lafortune the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Pelletier the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 2, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) presented the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House during the present session. The report is as follows:

No. 1.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs:

Aikins,
Barker,
Barnard,
Bennett (*Calgary*),
Bennett (*Simcoe*),
Blondin,
Borden,
Boys,
Bristol,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Chisholm (*Antigonish*),
Coderre,
Crothers,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Fowler,
Fripp,
German,
Kay,
Lafortune,
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Lapointe (*Kamouraska*),
Lemieux,
Maclean (*Halifax*),
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Munson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Porter,
Rainville,
Robidoux,
Ross,
Sévigny,
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Tremain, and
Wilson (*Laval*).—41.

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs:

Achim,
Aikins,
Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Arthurs,
Baker,
Barker,
Barnard,
Barrette,
Béland,
Bellemare,
Bennett (*Calgary*),
Bennett (*Simcoe*),
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Carroll,
Cash,
Chabot,
Charlton,
Clare,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Crocket,
Cruise,
Currie,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Donnelly,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliott,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fripp,
Gauthier (*Gaspé*),
Gauvreau,
German,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Green,
Guilbault,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Jameson,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lalor,
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (*Kamouraska*),
Lapointe (*Montreal, St. J.*),
Law,
Lemieux,
L'Espérance,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (*York, O.*),
MacNutt,
McCraney,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McLean (*Queen's, P.E.I.*),
McLean (*Sunbury*),
Marshall,
Martin (*Regina*),
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Monk,
Morphy,
Neely,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Paquet,
Pelletier,
Pugsley,
Rhodes,
Schaffner,
Sévigny,
Sharpe (*Lisgar*),
Sharpe (*Ontario*),
Smith,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Stevens,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Tremain,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Wallace,
Weichel,
White (*Renfrew*),
White (*Victoria, Alta.*),
Wilson (*Laval*),
Wilson (*Wentworth*) and
Wright.—119.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-five members.

No. 3.

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs:

Ames,
Armstrong (*York, O.*),
Ball,
Boulay,
Bourassa,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Boys,
Bristol,
Broder,
Bureau,
Burnham,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Clare,
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Crocket,
Davidson,
Devlin,
Elson,
Ethier,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fripp,
Gauthier (*St. Hyacinthe*),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gordon,
Guthrie,
Hepburn,
Hughes (*Victoria*),
Jameson,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lamarche,
Lavallée
Macdonell,
McLean (*Sunbury*),
McMillan,
Marcil (*Bonaventure*),
Martin (*Montreal, St. M.*),
Mondou,
Morrison,
Murphy,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Paul,
Porter,
Proulx,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Robb,
Ross,
Sharpe (*Ontario*),
Shepherd,
Steele,
Stewart (*Hamilton*),
Thoburn,
Tobin,
Turriff,
Walker, and
White (*Renfrew*).—60.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs:

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Barrette,
Best,
Boulay,
Brown,
Burrell,
Chabot,
Clare,
Cromwell,
Doherty,
Elson,
Fortier,

Hazen,
Knowles,
Kyte,
MacLean (*York, O.*),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Michaud,
Paquet,
Paul,
Reid (*Restigouche*),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Séguin,
Sharpe (*Lisgar*),
Stanfield,
Turgeon,
Verville, and
White (*Leeds*).—34.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of seven members.

No. 5.

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs:

Beattie,
Bickerdike,
Bowman,
Brabazon,
Brouillard,
Cardin,
Chabot,
Clark (*Bruce*),
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Currie,
Douglas,
Elliot,
Graham,
Lavallée,
L'Espérance,
Martin (*Montreal, St. M.*),
Middlebro,
Murphy,
Nantel,
Nicholson,
Roche,
Stevens,
Verville,
White (*Victoria, Alta*), and
Wilson (*Wentworth*).—25.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of five members.

No. 6.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs:

Aikins,
Baker,
Bennett (*Simcoe*),
Blain,
Boys,
Carvell,
Chisholm (*Antigonish*),
Chisholm (*Inverness*),
Clarke (*Essex*),
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Clements,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Davidson,
Edwards,
Fisher,
Foster (*King's, N.S.*),
Fowler,
Fripp,
Garland,
German,
Hughes (*King's, P.E.I.*),
Kyte,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Maclean (*Halifax*),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCraney,
McKenzie,
McCrea,
Marshall,
Martin (*Montreal, Ste. M.*),
Martin (*Regina*),
Meighen,
Merner,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Mondou,
Morphy,
Morrison,
Murphy,
Neely,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Pardee,
Proulx,
Pugsley,
Reid (*Restigouche*),
Rhodes,
Robidoux,
Rogers,
Sévigny,
Sinclair,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Tobin,
Tremain,
White (*Leeds*), and
Wilcox.—61.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

Mr. BORDEN.

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs:

Aikins,
Ames,
Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Armstrong (*York, O.*),
Baker,
Ball,
Barker,
Barnard,
Beattie,
Bellemare,
Bennett (*Calgary*),
Best,
Bickerdike,
Blondin,
Boivin,
Boyce,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Carrick,
Carvell,
Charlton,
Clark (*Bruce*),
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Currie,
Demers,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Emmerson,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fortier,
Foster (*King's, N. S.*),
Foster (*Toronto, N.*),
Fowler,
Gauthier (*St. Hyacinthe*),
Graham,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Hughes (*King's, P.E.I.*),
Hughes (*Victoria*),
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Knowles,
Law,
Lemieux,
L'Espérance,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (*Halifax*),
Maclean (*York, O.*),
McCraney,
McCurdy,
McLean (*Sunbury*),
McMillan,
Martin (*Regina*),
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Perley,
Porter,
Power,
Pugsley,
Rainville,
Rhodes,
Robb,
Roche,
Ross,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (*Lisgar*),
Sharpe (*Ontario*),
Sinclair,
Steele,
Stewart (*Hamilton*),
Stewart (*Lunenburg*),
Sutherland,
Thompson (*Yukon*),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Verville,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel, and
White (*Leeds*).—95.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 8.

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs:

Achim,
Alguire,
Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Armstrong (*York, O.*),
Arthurs,
Ball,
Best,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Broder,
Brouillard,
Brown,
Buchanan,
Burrell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chisholm (*Antigonish*),
Chisholm (*Inverness*),
Clare,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Cromwell,
Cruise,
Currie,
Delisle,
Donnelly,
Douglas,
Edwards,

Elliot,
Elson,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Foster (*King's, N.S.*),
Garland,
Gauthier (*Gaspé*),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gordon,
Graham,
Guilbault,
Haggart,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hughes (*Victoria*),
Kay,
Lanctôt,
Lewis,
Lovell,
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McKay,
McLean (*Queen's, P.E.I.*),
McMillan,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Marshall,
Meighen,
Merner,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Morrison,
Munson,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Paquet,
Paul,
Proulx,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Richards,
Robb,
Rogers,
Ross,
Schaffner,
Séguin,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (*Lisgar*),
Sharpe (*Ontario*),
Sinclair,
Smith,
Steele,
Stewart (*Lunenburg*),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thompson (*Yukon*),
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Thornton,
Turriff,
Walker,
Wallace,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (*Renfrew*),
Wilcox,
Wilson (*Laval*),
Wilson (*Wentworth*) and
Wright.—100.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of twelve members.

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs:

Alguire,
Barnard,
Bradbury,
Cardin,
Chisholm (*Inverness*),
Clarke (*Essex*),
Clements,
Emmerson,
Fowler,
Gauthier (*Gaspé*),
Hazen,
Hughes (*King's, P.E.I.*),
Jameson,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lapointe (*Montreal, St. J.*),
Lavallée,
Loggie,
McCurdie,
McKenzie,
McLean (*Queen's, P.E.I.*),
Morrison,
Nicholson,
Pardee,
Pelletier,
Power,
Robidoux,
Shepherd,
Sinclair,
Stevens,
Stewart (*Lunenburg*),
Taylor,
Turgeon,
Wallace, and
Wilcox.—35.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs:

Arthurs,
Carrick,
Carroll,
Chisholm (*Antigonish*),
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Foster (*King's, N.S.*),
Garland,
Green,
Guilbault,
Hartt,
Hepburn,
Lalor,
Law,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
McMillan,
Marcil (*Bonaventure*),
Merner,
Mondou,
Nesbitt,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Richards,
Sexsmith,
Shepherd,
Smith,
Smyth,
Thompson (*Yukon*),
Turiff, and
Walker.—35.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERES.

Messieurs:

Ames,
Barrette,
Béland,
Blain,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Brabazon,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Cochrane,
Coderre,
Cromwell,
Cruise,
Davidson,
Ethier,
Henderson,
Green,
McKay,
Michaud,
Munson,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Perley,
Rainville,
Richards,
Rogers,
Stewart (*Hamilton*),
Thoburn,
Warnock,
Webster,
White (*Victoria, Alta.*),
Wilson (*Laval*) and
Wright.—32.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of ten members.

No. 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs:

Beattie,
Bellemare,
Boulay,
Burnham,
Cockshutt,
Devlin,
Foster (*Toronto, N.*),
Lapointe (*Montreal, St. J.*),
Lemieux,
Marcil (*Bonaventure*),
Monk,
Perley,
Reid (*Restigouche*),
Schaffner, and
Taylor.—15.

And that the quorum of the said committee do consist of five members.

No. 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs:

Béland,
Blondin,
Borden,
Boyer,
Broder,
Clark (*Bruce*),
Crothers,
Doherty,
Emmerson,
Foster (*Toronto, N.*),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Meighen,
Pardee,
Pelletier, and
Pugsley.—17.

On motion of Mr. Borden, the report was concurred in.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the Select Standing Committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers, and records, with the exception of the Committee on Debates and that on the Library of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

POSTAL IRREGULARITIES IN MONTREAL.

The orders of the day being called:

Mr. LEMIEUX: I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to certain irregularities which are taking place in connection with the Montreal post office. I am informed by the newspapers that a certain American gentleman is sending a large number of letters to different parties in Montreal, to induce them to take stock in a cerain railway apparatus, which in the United States has been found to be a fraud. I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman to this fact, because I see that proceedings are being taken in Montreal against the gentleman referred to.

Mr. PELLETIER: We are taking proceedings just in order to try to prevent that.

THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GRAHAM: I notice in one of the newspapers to-day an interview which states that the portion of the line between Cochrane and Superior Junction and Graham, will not be completed until next fall, that there are 46 miles of steel yet to lay, and that it will be impossible to lay that steel during the present fall. Will the Minister of Railways tell me if that is correct, or approximately so?

Mr. COCHRANE: I hope the steel connecting Cochrane with Graham will be laid before Christmas?

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Rainville: For an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm). (Translation): Mr. Speaker, when the House adjourned on Friday night, I stated that I had a few more suggestions to offer, and with your permission, I shall go on.

One item in the Speech from the Throne draws attention to the desirability of improving our highways. Surely there can be only one opinion on the matter. No better use of public funds could be made by this Government than for improving our highways, so as to facilitate traffic, and more particularly those that are the most travelled over, and which are often the most neglected, great national highways, colonization roads, country roads. Surely not a single member will take exception to the new Government pursuing the work begun by the late Government. But on one condition, however: this Government should not be left with a free hand in the use of those public funds, in the way it proposed to do last session, by means of a Bill which let the Government free to do whatever it thought fit in the matter, without any restrictions whatever as to dates and places.

I stated at the time that it would constitute an infringement on the rights of provinces and municipalities. I said that it would be ignoring the constitutional principle in virtue of which the care of highways is placed under the absolute control of the provincial governments.

No one will object to the Government spending large amounts for that object. But all such moneys should be handed over to the proper authorities, that is the various provincial governments and municipalities. Otherwise, I fear the Government might overlook such constituencies as are on the other side of politics. I know from experience how the thing works. In making up last year's estimates no provision was made for a post office in my constituency, and towards the building of which an amount of $20,000 had previously been voted.

Since this Government has come into power, the amount I had secured for that purpose has been struck out, simply because I am not a Gvetrnment supporter. The land had been purchased, the plans had been drafted, everything was in readiness for starting work on that post office. But the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) made up his mind to cancel all that had been done in this connection. That is not fair play. Once this House has decided that a public building is to be erected somewhere, and once the plans have been drafted, it seems to me the successors in office should be bound to carry out what the former House had decided upon to do. It seems to me that such treatment should not have been meted out to the province of Quebec, especially by a Minister of Public Works hailing from that province.

Then again, I see in the Speech from the Throne that the government propose asking the House to vote rather large amounts towards encouraging agriculture. I entirely approve of the idea; there cannot be any difference of opinion on that point. It is of absolute necessity that the farming class, which is the most numerous, be protected. Agriculture is the fountain-head of all prosperity, and it should be protected in the

same way that we protect all other classes of society, the industrial class, the manufacturers, the mercantile class, by means of a protective tariff, which now does not apply to farm products. If we wish that the younger generation of farmers should remain on the land, if we wish to see the country progress and our people stay with us, a great deal more should be done towards assisting the agricultural class.

While the late Government was in power, the hon. Sidney Fisher, then Minister of Agriculture, had agreed to divide the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa; and if this Government is so anxious, as it would have us believe, to assist the farming community, they should carry out or return to the policy announced by the late Minister of Agriculture, who had decided to establish a large number of illustration stations in the various provinces of Canada, which farmers might be in a position to reach easily, without any undue expenditure of money and without practically any loss of time. Under present conditions, farmers have barely any time to look over the experimental farm and gather therefrom information which may be serviceable to them. They generally reach Ottawa at eleven o'clock in the morning and are due to return by the three o'clock train in the afternoon. Hence a waste of money, since there remains no time for looking over things, gathering information, getting below the surface in matters agricultural, with a view to bringing about improvements. Matters would take an entirely different turn, if illustration stations were established in several constituencies. Through such stations farmers would largely benefit by the information given out. Besides, such stations might be the means for distributing seed grain, and that would be of real service to the farming community.

I was sorry to find that in the province of Quebec, which is wholly agricultural, better advantage was not taken of the distribution of seed grain from the experimental farm. People do not even go to the pains of applying for a share in those free government distributions. If we had such illustration stations, they might be entrusted with the distribution of seed grain and the result would no doubt be satisfactory, for the government, surely, is anxious to help on the farmers.

Of course, it cannot be denied that people in a great many cases are indifferent, merely plodding along, not going to the pains of applying for samples, or waiting too late to forward their application. But a great change for the better would be noticeable if there were agricultural stations established in the various districts, with men appointed to advertise and effect such seed distribution. So I say, if the government is desirous of assisting farmers, illustration stations should be established in several constituencies.

During the late general election, our opponents, with an eye on the farmers, stated that should they be put in power, they would build the Georgian bay canal. Nevertheless, I see nothing in the Speech from the Throne in this connection.

Have they altered their platform in this respect as well? We are told that the Welland canal is to be rebuilt in order to retain and develop long distance transportation. In my humble opinion that is a mistake, a huge mistake. Why should we spend more millions for the purpose of deepening a canal on which so much money has been expended, and even up to a very recent date? There are two kinds of canals: those of smaller size which are utilized solely for inland trade, and those of greater depth destined to navigation by crafts of larger size, for instance the Georgian bay canal for the transportation of grain from the West. On this latter point we are not yet posted. We have no information as to what the government intend doing, since the Speech from the Throne makes no reference to the matter.

As regards protection for the agricultural class, there is one point which appears to me of the utmost importance, and which we should lose no time in having set right. I mean the embargo affecting Canadian live stock exported to Great Britain. Every farmer, and especially every breeder, is interested in having that quarantine done away with. For the time being no animal may be exported from this country without undergoing that quarantine. I deeply regret that no mention should be made in the Speech from the Throne of any intention to relieve the farming community of this burden.

Farmers of the province of Quebec were anxious to secure the benefit of a reciprocity treaty with the United States as regards farm products; they rejoiced at the thought that their butter, cheese, ham, fruit, &c., would soon have free access to the American markets. But hon. gentlemen on the other side replied at the time and will no doubt continue to reply: You have Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, France, Portugal, Japan; we have trade arrangements with all those countries, why should we require a treaty with the United States? Of course, that is so, but business men, merchants, exporters are aware that it is much more expensive to trade with such foreign countries than with the United States. The risks are greater, insurance and freight rates are enormous, while products sent just across the border have the benefit of direct and safe transportation, intercourse facilities are greater, there is less danger of fraud on the part of go-betweens, accounts are more

readily settled. The insurance and freight charges are lighter. Correspondence and other unavoidable expenditure should also be taken into account.

But, it was stated to farmers: If you enter into a trade arrangement with the United States, the exports from that country will flood our markets, our industries will decline and fall. No one thinks of hurting our industries, and no one intended reciprocity to injure those industries. As a matter of fact, the reciprocity proposals with the United States did not at all affect our industries, the late government having included in the treaty farm products only, and such treaty could be abrogated at once if the House so desired. But not content with that, our opponents contended that such a treaty would bring about annexation. That word was turned into a bugbear wherewith to scare the farmers.

I am a French Canadian and I say that my compatriots have fared well under the British crown, and they would be the first to oppose any endeavour to change their allegiance. But is it not preferable to have a market of one hundred million people, at our very door, with whom we are already actively trading in spite of a high tariff, rather than send our agricultural products to Great Britain or to foreign lands.

"'How is it, Mr. Lafortune,' my opponents would urge, 'that representing as you do a county where tobacco is grown on a large scale, you favour reciprocity which will enable the American leaf to compete with the Canadian on our own markets?' —I had no difficulty in showing that tobacco growers were not at all concerned in the passing of that treaty, since it did not interfere at all with the growing of tobacco.

I regret that there is nothing further done towards protecting the farmers. Is there is a single word in the Speech from the Throne giving one to understand that the Government propose increasing the duty on foreign tobacco, so as to protect the national product? Not a word. In the course of the session I shall take occasion to press for an increase of the rate on the foreign leaf which competes on our territory with the home-grown leaf. We shall then be in a position to gauge the sincerity of our opponents who denounced reciprocity on the ground that it would, they contended, ruin the tobacco-growing industry in Canada.

Sir, since the opening of this debate, reference has been made to what occurred during the electoral contests in Macdonald and Richelieu. I did not go to Macdonald, and I am glad of it, for I might have been arrested like the others. I would have stated to those gentlemen that I was a British subject, a lawyer of thirty-three years practice at the Montreal Bar, a King's counsel and Crown prosecutor for the district of Montreal. All that might not have prevented these gentlemen from laying hands on me, as they tried to do in the case of a King's counsel, Mr. Gauthier, a well-known lawyer of Montreal, a former M.L.A and the sitting member for St. Hyacinthe in this House. An honest man, with a good reputation, and a commissioner for the Revision of the municipal code of the provinces of Quebec. All that was not sufficient. An effort was made to force his grip, to pry into his political secrets, and he was subjected to all kinds of humiliations.

In what kind of a country are we living? Is it in a British country that such things are being done? And what has become of the Magna Charta of which all British subjects are so proud, and justly so? Under its provisions, you have not the right to lay hands upon or arrest any one without filing a duly sworn complaint. A preliminary inquiry must be held. Now, will it be said that in a British province the primary principle of Criminal law is deliberately ignored and set aside? That is incredible.

Mr. Boyer, who represents the county of Vaudreuil, is also a man well worthy of consideration. As a citizen and a public man his record is unimpeachable. But he also has been subjected to vexations and humilations in the course of that election.

After such attempts, I feel inclined to say: Let us tear to pieces the Magna Charta; let us no longer glory in British citizenship; let us no longer say that the British crown is the safeguard of all individual liberty.

The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), who is a well known citizen and respected jurist, who has been for many years a judge of the Superior Court of Montreal; the hon. Minister, I say should be the first to get up and take those fellows to task. Honourable gentlemen should be unanimous in asking for an enquiry, so as to find whether it is true or not that during the election in Macdonald an attempt was made to molest and arrest representatives of the people, men of such high standing as Messrs. Gauthier and Boyer. An investigation should also be carried on in connection with the arrest of five or six other persons who were sent to jail without being afforded any opportunity of vindicating themselves.

I am in full sympathy with the vote of censure moved by the leader of the Opposition, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as an amendment to the address in answer to the Speech from the Throne. We should all demand, whatever our party allegiance, that an inquiry be made as to the truth of the facts alleged before the House.

An assassin, a thief, a cut-throat, a firebrand cannot be convicted until all legal

formalities have been gone through, and it would be permissible to lay hands on a British subject without any regard for the law? Now, if such things occurred in the province of Quebec, there would be loud protests on the part of all those who are anxious that the rights of the British subject be upheld; they would insist on an investigation being carried on to probe the matter to the bottom. Sauce for the goose should be sauce for the gander. Is the criminal law two-fold, or is it one and the same for the whole Dominion? It is, and so I shall give my support to the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition, asking for the appointment of a committee to enquire into the facts; and should the Government refuse to do so, he deserves censure for not moving in a matter of such import.

I had the pleasure of taking a hand in the election which took place recently in Richelieu, in behalf of Mr. Cardin, who is now representative for that constituency, having defeated his opponent Mr. Morgan, a Montreal lawyer. It was highly laughable to hear the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) say to his electors: I have taken a hand in eight elections, and I have been successful in all of them. I have entered the ring in Richelieu, and at any cost I shall come out victorious; I shall not leave the constituency until the Government candidate is elected. And he added: Do you wish all government employees to lose their jobs, the yards to be moved somewhere else, the thought of building the railway which you have been asking for so long a time, dismissed forever? Well then you may vote against Mr. Morgan, and should you do so, dismissals will be proceeded with.

How grand and how inspiring it was to hear such a discourse from the mouth of a member of this House, a millionaire, recently knighted. No, it was not inspiring, it was degrading to hear such words fall from the lips of Sir Rodolphe Forget, and yet all that is the truth. I almost fancied I was dreaming. But I heard it all myself, and the hon. member did say every word of it. Nobody can deny it.

Some may think that in speaking thus I am taking advantage of Mr. Forget's absence from the House. Of course, I should not be blamed if he is so seldom in his seat. That is his business, but I should not suffer on that account. He can take care of himself, but he must be aware of what people say concerning him; he certainly cannot plead ignorance. Those are the things which were stated in public meetings, that is the way they sought to capture votes. The hon. member for Charlevoix was away up. His name was mentioned for the portfolio of Public Works and the current saying was that should he win that election, he would certainly be offered a portfolio. People were already addressing him as the hon. minister. I cannot say if such information was reliable or not. But that was the current saying. However, he was defeated that time, and it may be on that account that another man was chosen, and that there was a shuffling of portfolios. In this connection, I remember the fight we had to make to secure the return of the hon. Mr. Préfontaine in Terrebonne. Honourable gentlemen opposite did not then use exactly the same arguments to-day. The Government was taunted for taking away from the province of Quebec the portfolio of Public Works, Mr. Préfontaine being content with taking the Dept. of Marine and Fisheries. That was outrageous. There was no sense in giving up such an important department. Will they take the same stand to-day? That portfolio has been allowed to go from the province of Quebec; it had been assigned to the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier, not because he deserved it, for he had been fighting against his own leader, saying that Laurier's platform was bad enough, but that Borden's was still worse.

Well, times have greatly changed, and the tone of public life has also greatly changed. I might repeat after many others: Oh justice, what great crimes are committed in thy name. Mr. Speaker, I have previously referred to the arrests which have been made, and I will not repeat what I have already stated; but I am confident that the House and the government will soothe public opinion by investigating the truth of the charges made against certain party heelers during the Macdonald election. I forgot to mention the name of another gentleman who accompanied the hon. members for Vaudreuil and St. Hyacinthe, Mr. Arthur Geoffrion, advocate of Montreal and King's counsel, who was subjected to the same vexations. Like the others he had gone over there as a free citizen to discuss questions of general interest. He also was the victim of lawlessness.

When I read in the speech from the Throne that the intention is to grant millions to England, I cannot endorse such a policy. If Canada is prosperous and thus in a position to give away thirty or forty millions, then why should we not improve the situation of a large number of civil servants who are very poorly paid? For instance, the men employed in the St. Vincent de Paul pententiary have, some of them, been in harness for thirty years on small salaries, and though heads of families, and every day in danger of losing their lives at the hands of convicts, they continue to be underpaid. We have in the civil service, in this very House, for instance, officers of twenty, thirty and even

forty years standing, our reporters, among others, who work day and night, I see some whose hair has turned white in the service of this House, and who are not paid as high as they should be, considering the labour involved and the efficiency shown.

When we ask for an increase of salary in behalf of such employees who fill positions of trust and responsibility, and who perform good work in return for a small remuneration, the Government answers that it has not the funds. At the customs house, Montreal, there are heads of large families, who earn only small salaries, and when they apply to their member to get an increase, the latter is told that there are no funds, that the Government cannot do anything. There are here messengers whose health and life have been spent in an every day toil, and who earn only a nominal salary of eight hundred dollars per annum, and when they apply for an increase the answer is invariably that funds are lacking. Even magistrates occupying the highest positions, men of sterling worth, have been obliged to resign, owing to the insufficiency of their remuneration. I may give the name of Sir Alexander Lacoste, one of the most learned judges of the province of Quebec, and even of the whole Dominion, and who was obliged to renounce his position owing to the insufficiency of the salary attached thereto.

I might also name Mr. Doherty, a former judge of the Superior Court, an eminent jurist, who holds to-day the portfolio of Justice, a man of superior ability, who has also been obliged to give up his position for another.

Mr. PROULX: (Translation.) What about the pension?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) I will not make any reference to that. I do not wish to say anything offensive. I am dealing with another aspect of the question. Mr. Ouimet, a judge of the Court of Appeal has resigned to accept a better paid position. When increases are asked for judges who give their whole time to fulfilling their duty, and who have been eminent lawyers constantly working in the public interest, the answer is invariably that there are no funds on hand. For a good many years past it has been claimed that the salaries of judges of the Circuit Court should be increased. Three competent judges make up the court, Messrs Leboeuf, Dorion and Purcell, talented and painstaking men, whose salary, nevertheless, does not exceed three thousand dollars per annum, the salary of a fifth rate commercial traveller. But when an increase in salary is requested for them, the same answer is given: No funds; we are too poor. Additional judges are required for the Superior Court in Montreal, as three country district judges must continually be summoned to Montreal, it being well known that we have not enough judges. And the answer is invariably that there is no money. Nevertheless the intention is to give away millions. But I hope that before donating such an amount, due consideration will be given to the matter. Before giving forty millions to a country which is in no need of it, an effort should be made to increase the salaries of the underpaid.

If there is such a large surplus that the Government do not know what to do with it let them distribute it among those who are deserving, let them do justice to whom justice is due. Great Britain has no need for it. I feel ashamed at the thought of discussing such questions. To think that Great Britain needs our money to maintain her supremacy among the nations of the world. What a set back for British pride! Great Britain does not need our millions, she the leader among the great powers. We would, I understand, borrow millions from her which we would right away hand over to her, and then pay interest on that loan until the capital is refunded. Is there a man with a grain of business sense who will undertake to get the people to believe that?

You may succeed, Sir, I would say addressing the Prime Minister, in getting your followers to agree to such a proposal and to vote these millions; but the people will have their way. They are the best judges, and their decision is final. It will be no use arguing that such a measure was necessary, that Great Britain needed such a contribution. Nobody will believe you. You will find out that the people's vengeance is hard to bear; you will find that when the people kick, the blow is a hard one.

Should not hon. gentlemen in this House, to whatever party they belong, insist before voting these millions, on having the members' indemnity increased? Where is the man who can say that $2,500 is a sufficient allowance for spending here the two, seven, eight or ten months that a session lasts? Election expenses are ruinous, especially when you have to fight unscrupulous opponents who receive millions from the Canadian Pacific and other great corporations.

Mr. PELLETIER: (Translation.) At what figure does the hon. member think that the sessional indemnity should be fixed?

Mr. PELLETIER: (Translation.) Five thousand dollars ($5,000) at the lowest. And I feel the freer to make that suggestion, that personally I have no need for the money. Those who are acquainted with me

know that it is not a craving for riches that induces me to speak in that sense. My only motive is that I would like to see justice done to hon. members. They should rise on both sides of the House and all together say: It is time that members of parliament cease working for such a meagre indemnity. The ministers' salaries should also be increased. In passing let me point out to you that the salary of the Montreal city solicitor has been raised to $15,000 and offered to a judge of the superior court, who renounced a judgeship to accept this position.

Members of the Quebec legislative assembly draw an indemnity of $1,500 for a session which lasts six or seven weeks. Can that be compared with what we get here?

When a few years ago the question came up of increasing the sessional indemnity, some would say: the people will be down on us and we replied: Yes, the people will be down on us if we are divided, if one side of the House wants it and the other rejects it. But if we agree and if we all stand by one another, then the people will abide by our decision, as they have done when the sessional indemnity was raised to $2,500. The question was not even discussed before the people, as the vote had been unanimous. Such steps must be taken unanimously.

When the proposal for increasing the judges salaries was submitted, the same objections were made. The judges were drawing $5,000, their salaries were raised to $7,000. Did the people kick? No, and why? Because both sides of the House had joined hands to vote that increase. The salaries of superior court judges are insufficient, and those of the circuit court judges at Montreal, ridiculous.

Let us now consider how a member's money goes. Every day people come to my office for subscriptions of various sorts. It may be a poor farmer who has lost a part of his crops, or some animal in a fire; or it may be the christening of a bell or some charity sale. Or else it may be some agricultural meet or competition, for which the gift of a plough or a whip is in order. Then there are ploughing competitions and annual district fairs. To give less than $20 for any of these purposes would result in being rated as a niggardly individual.

Let us help ourselves before helping others. Personally I am satisfied with the indemnity granted to members, as I can do without it. Providence has been kindly to me. By dint of hard work, energy and moderation, I have succeeded in saving some little money. But is that indemnity sufficient? I think not. I say to the Government: Give us a square deal. When it comes to building railways, or highways, or entertaining, there are millions galore, but when it comes to dealing fairly with the representatives of the people, there is nothing for them. It is proposed to let us have secretaries at $2.50 per day. But who will be found to work at such a salary? We cannot be expected to take on men who can neither read nor write. We are in need of secretaries, for we have a quantity of letters to write, and it is impossible for us to be of service to our electors to the extent we would like to be. If we had a little more leisure, we might give more time to preparing our bills, our speeches; but under present conditions we have not the time; we barely have time for sleep and meals, and we are obliged to travel at night. Those forty or fifty millions would enable you to treat fairly the representatives of the people.

I hope the hon. minister will not forget to build for me that post office, which was so unfairly struck out from the estimates.

If you have millions to distribute, distribute a part in the shape of grants to cheese and butter factories, to district agricultural fairs, to the tobacco industry. There are numbers of ways of expending those millions which it is proposed to give to Mistress England. I love England, but only as a step-mother. Our first concern should be with our wives and children. To begin with, let us work for this country, let us develop its resources, and let us build the Georgian bay canal.

Hon. gentleman opposite refer to scandals; that is really laughable. Are not their forerunners responsible for the most outrageous scandals recorded in the pages of our history: the Pacific, St. Louis, Pont-Caron, McGreevy, Connelly, Langevin, Caron and Chapleau scandals? Was it not to them that Sir Mackenzie Bowell was referring when he said he was surrounded by a nest of traitors? You are the successors of all these men, and you dare lift up your heads? You have spent your life in the midst of the worst political scandals and you have not the right to speak of others. You live in a glass house and should not throw stones at your neighbour.

So, I say to the Conservatives: show some respect for your opponents; do not make any reference to scandals, since scandals have brought about your downfall in former times.

Sir, I have spoken at great length. I regret it for hon. members who have speeches to deliver; but as the session is bound to last for some time yet, they will be given an opportunity to speak in their turn. I thought it proper to make these remarks in the interest of the Liberal party. I shall vote against any measure providing for a grant to Great Britain. The Liberal party have carried out the resolution voted by this House on March 29, 1909. By that resolution we stated that it was expedient to do something. I succeeded in satisfying my electors that the only policy acceptable

was that propounded by Laurier. I have not changed my mind, and I am anxious to know what amount the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister will ask the House to vote. I would willingly vote millions if they were to be applied to the objects I have just set before the House.

Let the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister in the first place pay up the country's debt. As we know it now exceeds $350,000,000, and it is proposed to increase it by $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 more in the shape of a gift to Great Britain.

I say with all due respect to the Rt. Hon. Prime Minister: No, you have no right to give away the millions which are the property of the people. That money does not belong to the Government, and you have not been elected to give away the public funds. You were elected as trustee, and your powers do not extend beyond those of a trustee. You are not vested with any extraordinary powers, and consequently you have no right to give away what does not belong to you. Now, I say the millions which the Prime Minister and his colleagues are anxious to dispose of are not his property, and the people will want to know why he has given away millions to a power which is undoubtedly the greatest under the sun, though, through the mouths of a few gentlemen, whom, however, I respect—I am not here to cast aspersions on any one—she makes such an extraordinary request. I am in the habit of speaking out boldly what is in my mind.

I say that to allege in this House that Great Britain is in need of money, is disrespectful to her, and of a nature to throw some discredit on her. It means practically that she is not able to maintain her world-wide supremacy without the help of her colony, which is expected to contribute in consequence thirty or forty millions, though her debt already amounts to 350 millions, we to borrow these millions from Great Britain and thereafter pay interest on the borrowed capital.

In concluding I am fully confident that my constituents will stand by me and say as I say that Canada is in too great a need of its funds to donate them to the Mother Country.

When these gentleman talk of loyalty, I am frightened. I am afraid of a woman crying in the street: I am an honest woman. Is not Canadian history full of facts bearing testimony to the loyalty of the French Canadians? Then why should we talk of loyalty? Therefore, it is not necessary to give presents in order to show our loyalty. When we were told that vessels should be constructed, that we needed them, we did not hesitate, but now this gift is useless.

In concluding, I beg my hon. colleagues to forgive me for having taken so much of their time.

Mr. LAFORTUNE.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to try to follow the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House regarding the irregularities in Macdonald. However, before passing to what I have risen to say, I want to refer for a moment to that matter. I listened with a great deal of surprise and a good deal of amusement to the efforts of the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and other hon. gentlemen opposite, to work up a feeling of indignation at the alleged irregularities in Macdonald. One would think that these hon. gentlemen had imagined that the public had forgotten the record of the Liberal party in Canada. When one looks back over that record for 15 or 16 years and realizes what took place in the different constituencies —in London, for instance, where imported thugs and personators were brought over by the Liberal party and paid out of the Liberal fund to steal the election there; when one realizes what took place when this country was covered with trick ballot boxes, and when they buried six or eight of them in Sharbot lake to hide the shame of the Liberal party; when one looks over the great province of Manitoba and the western country and realizes that for years the Liberal party held office there by padded lists, by personation, and by every conceivable thing that could possibly be done by any party or any set of men to hold sway in this country;—I say when one realizes these things, it is not hard to imagine that hon. gentlemen have been endeavouring to cover up as best they could by their unfair attack on the Government the most signal defeat that they have received at the hands of the electors of this country. They went to Macdonald with the determination to carry it; they imported nearly every man who was importable from Saskatchewan, headed by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), with every member of the House of Commons from that province with the exception, I think, of the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)—and people are wondering why the hon. member for Assiniboia was not there. I presume he had good reasons, and I presume he could tell the House why he was not. But, in addition to every member of the House of Commons from Saskatchewan, we had one or two cabinet ministers from that province, and we had hon. gentlemen from Quebec. Others came from Saskatchewan who were caught absolutely redhanded in their efforts to corrupt the electors of that province. These men were arrested; and, because the Conservative party were good-hearted and generous enough to allow these men

to go without trial, we find hon. gentlemen now rising in their places and trying to work up a lot of sympathy to cover up one of the greatest defeats their party ever received at the hands of the Conservative party. The hon. member for Edmonton was so sure of the defeat of the Conservative candidate that he gave an interview to some of his friends two or three nights before the election, in which he said: 'Boys, it is all over; we will have at least from 200 to 400 of a majority, and it is going to be just the same as the next Dominion election will be—and I agree with him.

Mr. OLIVER: Where did my hon. friend get that remarkable information?

Mr. BRADBURY: I got that statement from men that my hon. friend is supposed to have made it to, and I presume it is right.

Mr. OLIVER: Their names, please.

Mr. BRADBURY: Of course, if the hon. gentleman says he did not make the statement, I will accept his word.

However, I did not rise for the purpose of referring at any length to that election, but I did rise for the purpose of drawing the attention of the House to the unpatriotic action of the hon. member from Edmonton and the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) regarding the condition of the cement duties. I desire to quote what the right hon. gentleman said on this question. I am reading from 'Hansard,' page 34.

I do not believe that it is possible now, or will be for many years, to raise our revenue in any other way. But whether we approve of that system or not, whether we are free traders or protectionists, we are agreed that once a duty has been imposed that duty should not be lightly interfered with. In the first place, a duty should not be levied except after ample consideration as to the amount of revenue that it may produce, and the effect it may have; because the effect of any customs tariff, even if it be for revenue only, is to create a different atmosphere and therefore likely to produce very serious consequences. For that reason I say that no changes in the tariff should be lightly made. We made in our day a change in the tariff when we abolished the coal duty west of Lake Superior, but we gave the reason. The West was threatened with a coal famine, and it was to avoid that most dire calamity in a country like Canada in the winter time that we resorted to that method. But what is the justification for the course which was taken last June? We were told all of a sudden that the duty on cement had been reduced by one-half. On this subject there was published in the Canadian Courier in the month of July last, a most illuminating correspondence, in which the charge was made, that the duties were reduced not as a matter of policy, not because of the condition of the country, but simply with the object of influencing an impending election in the province of Saskatchewan.

But he takes good care that he does not make that charge. He goes on to say:

I would not venture to make the suggestion myself.

He would not veture, but he would build up an attack on the Government of the day on a letter written by a disgruntled manufacturer who was being hit by the reduction of this duty. He built up an attack against this Government on the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) realized the conditions in the Northwest, realized that there was a real cement famine, not a threatened famine, and took advantage of the powers conferred upon the Government by the Customs Act, and did exactly as the leader of the Opposition did at the time a coal famine was threatened in order to give relief to the people there. Instead of the right hon. gentleman being generous or fair enough and broad enough to give credit to this Government for stepping in and relieving a situation that threatened the loss of millions of dollars to the people of the West, and threatened to turn out of employment hundreds and thousands of men, he takes advantage of a letter written by a man who was being hit, one of the disgruntled manufacturers who felt the reduction in the duty and saw his profits fading away and objected to the Government doing what it did to assist the Northwest. The right hon. gentleman stated that he could not see any good reason why the Government should have acted as it did at that time. in face of the fact that the western press, Liberal and Conservative alike, were calling on the Government to give them relief; in face of the fact that he must have known that the cement famine was a serious matter, not only in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, and that all over Canada great public works were being tied up. And what is to be said about the attitude on this question of the hon. member for Edmonton, the leader of the Liberal party in the West; a man who must have known the true condition that existed in the West last summer? Above all men we would have expected him to rise in his place and thank the Government for taking advantage of that clause in the Customs Act to extend relief to his friends in Edmonton and Calgary and all through the western country, which was absolutely necessary if the great building undertakings were to proceed in the West. What did the hon. member for Edmonton do? He rose in this House, and, instead of thanking the Government for what it had done, he followed in the footsteps of his leader, and he made this statement:

We had freedom from half the cement duty during the summer, but we are paying the whole of the cement duty now, and I say again that while there may be emergent circumstances such as occurred in the case of the removal of the coal duty by the late government, there are no such emergent circumstances in the case of cement.

Well, Mr. Speaker, one is at a loss to understand such a statement as that coming from the hon. member for Edmonton. He has a paper in Edmonton known as the Edmonton Bulletin and which is regarded all over the West as a newspaper belonging to him, and that paper published article after article, calling upon the Government to either reduce the duties on cement or abolish them in the interests of the people of the West. I will read one or two of these articles, and when you contrast them with the language of the hon. gentleman in this House, you will have demonstrated the inconsistency of the hon. gentleman:

I quote from the Edmonton Daily Bulletin of June 1, 1912.

A shortage of cement is reported from Saskatoon. The cement merger still enjoys protection against the competition of foreign cement-makers. Who, besides the holders of its watered stock, benefits through the restriction thus imposed upon building operations and commercial enterprise?

The Edmonton Bulletin of June 6, 1912, says:

Asking the Boss.

A chorus of complaints is going up from western cities against the shortage of the cement supply which is retarding building operations and threatens to do so to a far greater extent. The Canadian market is ringed about with a protective tariff which 'preserves' the home market to the home cement manufacturer. The home manufacturer being in this case a merger, has done as mergers usually do in like cases—marked up the price without increasing the output, if it did not actually cut down the output while hoisting the price. The result is a two-fold discouragement of building. Where cement can be got at all, it is only at an unduly and unreasonably inflated price; and in a great many places at the present time it simply cannot be got at all. As a relief, the western builders are asking the Minister of Finance to suspend the duty on foreign cement for a time and allow a supply to come in, that it may not be necessary to cancel arrangements already made for the erection of new and badly needed residences and other buildings. At last accounts the minister was in consultation with the head of the cement merger—and we can guess from that whether the duty is to be suspended.

The Edmonton Bulletin of June 6, 1912, says:

Is the Merger willing?

The manager of the cement merger says that to suspend the duty against foreign cement would not relieve the western situation, because cars could not be obtained in which to bring in cement from the United States. If that is the case the merger should have no objection to the duty being suspended. Hasn't it?

The Edmonton Bulletin of June 10, 1912, says:

Barrier reduced but not removed.

The volley of protest that has been sent in to Ottawa from all parts of the western country in regard to the cement situation has produced some result, though not as much as was hoped. . . As the remaining duty amounts to 26 cents per barrel, it is evident that the reduction will neither smash the cement merger nor put very much pressure upon it to cause it to supply the western market.

Under the extraordinary conditions existing throughout the whole western country, the least that can properly be done by the Government to relieve the situation is to cancel the duty on cement altogether for the summer. The building programme of the prairie country is beyond all precedent. The works planned by municipal corporations aggregate a larger expenditure than has been made before in a single season. Unless the situation which has existed in regard to cement be relieved both private and public enterprise must be checked and many projects on which work has begun will have to go over to another year. Already contractors have been forced to suspend operations and workmen have been thrown out of employment by the lack of this essential and should the scarcity continue much longer, we may expect to learn that buildings planned for this season have been struck from the list and left for future consideration.

In face of articles of that kind published in the hon. gentleman's own newspaper, it is hard to understand how he could rise in his place in this House to condemn the Government for doing exactly what his own newspaper and the press generally was calling on the Government to do. The newspapers of the West were pointing out the conditions that existed, showing that unless they got relief large enterprises and public works would be suspended, and that workingmen would be turned out on the streets without work. But, Mr. Speaker, there is more than that. The Edmonton Bulletin was not the only paper that was crying out to the Government. We had the Manitoba Free Press, a paper which I do not think any hon. gentleman in this House will say is very friendly to the Government, crying out for relief. On June 1, 1912, it said:

The Need of Cement.

The builders of Western Canada, unable to go on with their work for lack of cement, want access on reasonable tariff terms to the sources of supply in the United States. They do not want to listen to assertions by Manager Jones, of the Cement Trust, that the railways are to blame. Let Mr. Jones and the railways fight it out along that line to their hearts' content; but in the meantime it is cement, not talk, that is urgently needed in this country.

There is a prediction which it is perfectly safe to make. It is that if the Dominion Government were to do its duty by reducing the duty on cement, so as to give Western builders reasonable access to the cement market of the United States, the cement trust and the railways would be found working together like beavers to hold the valuable market here in the West.

The Minister of Finance, in his letter of January 22 last, in the course of the correspondence resulting from the demand of the Winnipeg Board of Trade that an investigation be made, under the terms of the Customs Act, into the whole question of the excessive cost of cement, promised that such an investigation should be held. Now there is the cement famine. The need of a searching investigation is as plain as daylight.

Meantime there is a still more urgent need of cutting down the duty on cement by an exercise of the emergency power which the Government possesses, and which was exercised last year in removing the coal duties on account of the situation created by the strike in the mines of Southern Alberta.

That is exactly what the Minister of Finance did. He took advantage of the emergency clause in the Customs Act to cut the cement duties in two, and still we have the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and his friends protesting that the Government was wrong in doing so and blaming the Government for coming to the assistance of Manitoba and the other great Western provinces. Then, the Winnipeg Tribune, a newspaper that no one would say is very friendly to this side of the House, had this to say on the subject in its issue of June 4, 1912:

Scarcely Interested.

The Winnipeg Board of Trade represented to the Borden Government the injustice imposed on the West by the duty on cement. No party politics entered into the question here. The members of the board, almost without exception, were unanimous in denouncing the extortion.

Conservative M.P.'s who were indignant over the extortion under Laurier, are, seemingly satisfied to have it practiced under Borden.

The voices of Arthur Meighen and Geo. H. Bradbury are silent.

The eloquence of J. A. M. Aikins is not heard on behalf of the farmers and builders of Brandon.

Meantime building operations may stop, or the builders of homes and factories may import from the United States and pay the extortionate duty.

This is another evidence of the crying demand for relief. Still these hon. gentlemen have the courage, or audacity rather, to claim that that action of the Government was intended to influence the election in the province of Saskatchewan. Were the Winnipeg Tribune and the Winnipeg Free Press anxious to help the Conservative cause in Saskatchewan? Was the Edmonton Bulletin, an organ belonging to the member for Edmonton anxious to help in that election? The proposition is too absurd to be thought of. Here is a telegram from the Board of Trade for Edmonton:

Edmonton, June 5, 1912.

A special general meeting of Edmonton Board of Trade called to discuss cement situation unanimously approved action of our president yesterday in signing telegram asking for removal of duty on cement for period of four months to permit building operations here to proceed. It is pointed out unless immediate relief afforded more men will be idle in West owing cement shortage than are employed in entire cement industry of Dominion.

Does the hon. member for Saskatoon say that there was no emergency or famine at that point that called for the immediate action of the Government? Here is a telegram from Saskatoon:

Saskatoon, June 5, 1912.

Situation serious regarding shortage of cement. We have five million dollars tied up in this city for want of supplies. Strongly urge remission of duty for four months to enable us to get supplies from the United States. Work delayed during our short building season is a serious blow to development in construction work of all kinds. City contractors state they are losing one thousand dollars per day by the enforced idleness of their labourers.

Yet the hon. member for Edmonton, coming right from the heart of the province of Alberta and realizing that the adjoining province of Saskatchewan was suffering from want of cement, instead of approving of the Government's action, rises and enters a protest. Here is another clipping from the Edmonton Journal, June 7, 1912.

The Cement Shortage.

There is no difference of opinion in the West as to the need of relieving the shortage of cement which threatens to interfere so seriously with what would otherwise be the greatest building season in the country's history. The temporary removal of the tariff is the obvious remedy and there should be no delay in bringing this about.

The editor who wrote this article had evidently had not consulted the hon. member for Edmonton, the proprietor of the paper because there was a very great difference of opinion between them. From the action of the hon. member, he apparently did not see that there was any necessity for the Government to use the power given to it under the Custom's Act to give that province and the western country the relief it was calling out for.

Winnipeg, June 7, 1912.

Please refer this Board's resolution December nineteenth and subsequent correspondence re cement merger contending rate of duty on this necessary article is excessive and petitioning Dominion Government for reduction or abolishment of duty. Since your letter March eighteenth stating matter would be laid before Government for consideration

this board without any further advice. Serious shortage cement exists throughout Western Canada. Building operations at standstill and erection of many postponed indefinitely. This board urge immediate action by Government in reduction or abolishment of duty as necessary to alleviate present serious situation.

C. N. BELL.

This telegram comes from the Board of Trade of the city of Winnipeg, one of the greatest cities in Canada. That city had over $19,000,000 of work under contract last year, and its progress was threatened. In conjunction with other cities and municipalities throughout the West, it was calling upon the Government to interfere and grant them relief. Still these hon. gentlemen insist that this action was taken to assist in the Saskatchewan elections. No more ridiculous proposition has ever been presented to this House.

North Battleford, Sask., June 8, 1912.

Cement shortage renders situation here critical. Construction work of all kinds suspended owing to lack of supplies. This delay is serious blow to general development. Strongly urge temporary remission of duty which will enable us to obtain cement from United States so as to obviate further commercial distress.

This telegram comes from my hon. friend's constituency. I could go on reading article after article, but I want to quote just one more from the Winnipeg Free Press, a paper that is very friendly to the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House:

Cutting Down the Cement Tax.

The action of the Dominion Government in making use of its emergency power to cut the duty on cement in half, the reduction to continue in force until October 31, is to be commended. It is hardly to be doubted that a survey of the whole situation would disclose ample ground of justification for a complete cutting away of the duty. Still, reducing of the duty from 52 cents to 26 cents per barrel must be accepted as a substantial reduction, for which the country thanks the Government.

This paper is fair enough to acknowledge that the Government has done its duty, yet we find men, who are sent here to represent the people of the West, trying to make political capital out of what the Government has done in this regard. This article continues:

That it is temporary is satisfactory in the sense that the people of this country do not want any assumption of autocratic power at Ottawa. The tariff can only be made by Parliament. It cannot be made by Order in Council; all that the Government can do is to make use of an emergency power conferred on it by the Customs Act with a view to such contingencies as the cement famine which has been retarding building operations throughout the West.

Mr. BRADBURY.

I would commend this to the consideration of the hon. member for Edmonton. One of his arguments was that the cut in the cement duty, which expired on the 31st of October, should not have been put back again. The Free Press, however, points out the constitutional method, which my hon. friend must know, that this emergency clause is only used where there is an emergency, and when that emergency ceases to exist, the clause becomes ineffective. When the duty is to be dealt with, no doubt it will be dealt with by Parliament. The Government took the only course they could have taken. The former Government took the same course in connection with the coal famine a year or two ago, and as soon as the famine was over they restored the duty. That is exactly what this Government has done, and instead of being fair and just, we find the hon. gentleman not rising equal to the occasion, but playing the game of politics. I have grave doubts even, that he has played that well. Realizing the intelligence of the electors of the western country, I feel sure they will resent the position that the hon. gentleman and his friends have taken in this House. I believe that the boards of trade and great municipal bodies throughout that country who appealed to the Government for redress will resent the attitude taken by the hon. member for Edmonton and his right hon. leader and other gentlemen on that side of the House. The Free Press goes on to give despatches from different places, and even from Edmonton :

Edmonton, June 10.—Reduction in duty by one-half will enable contractors to import sement at a price plus freight, of $3.25 to $3.30 a barrel, which is the price they figured on for the Canada Cement Company's product at the opening of the season, according to Secretary Whitmore, of the Builders Exchange.

Brandon, June 10.—Though the market has been somewhat stiff it does not appear that the shortage of cement has been felt so acutely here as elsewhere.

Travellers here this morning stated there would be an abundant supply should the duty be reduced. The news which reached the Free Press office here this afternoon that the duty on cement was reduced by one-half has given general satisfaction.

I do not intend to go on building up evidence ; it is not necessary. It must be apparent to every hon. member of this House, and I am sure it is apparent to the country from one end to the other, that hon. gentlemen opposite have been unjust, and unfair, and that they have refused to give to the Government the meed of praise which might reasonably be expected from opponents who were endeavouring to play the game fairly. Rather they have taken advantage of the

circumstance that an election was taking place in the province of Saskatchewan to try to have the western country and the people generally believe that that reduction in duty was not made for the purpose of helping them, but was made to assist a political party in Saskatchewan. A more absurd proposition could not be presented to any body of intelligent men. I have no hesitation in saying that the people of the West will place their stamp of disapproval upon the conduct of the hon. gentlemen who represent the western country, and upon that of the leader of the Opposition, in taking that unfair—I was going to say unmanly—attitude. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) would not venture to make the suggestion himself that the Government had reduced the duty for the purpose of assisting a political party in Sasatchewan, but he was not above reading a letter from a man who had claimed to be a supporter of the Conservative party, one of the small manufacturers who was being hit and was suffering under the smart of reduced profits, and on the basis of that letter he tried to make a point against the Government. I can only say that it is not a very dignified position for the right hon. gentleman to occupy before this country.

I do not wish to delay the House at too great length. There have been other speakers on that side who have taken a similar attitude to that of the hon. member for Edmonton. I wish to refer for a moment to an argument offered by my venerable friend from North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie). That argument reads as if it might be from the pen of Jules Verne or Rider Haggard. It would be hard to imagine an hon. member on this side of the House being guilty of placing on 'Hansard' such arguments as those I am about to read for the edification of the House. The hon. member for North Cape Breton spoke on the 27th of November. I have to quote somewhat lengthily in order to give the House a sample of the arguments that are brought before us from down by the sea :

> For myself I should be sorry indeed to doubt any statement of fact which would be made by the Minister of Finance (Mr. White). I believe that he means well, that he is a man of wide experience and of proper and good natural instincts. But there is such a thing as a man being deceived. There is such a thing as others having ways that are dark and tricks that are vain. There is such a thing as evidence being put before the Minister of Finance which in the simplicity of his heart, he believes, but which is no real evidence at all. We are a little too old in the world—

That is the trouble, I am afraid.

> —to believe that the great performer who had charge of the Saskatchewan election would ask the Minister of Finance to make this cut in rates without giving him some material. That great leader, and I am afraid the boss of the Government, was too shrewd, too calculating, to think for one moment there would be any use in going to the Minister of Finance and asking for a cut unless there was evidence, and such evidence as could with some plausibility be submitted to the House when the crucial moment came.

Then the hon. gentleman goes on to ruminate:

> I could imagine to myself such a thing as this boss of the administration, this performer, going to boards of trade, going to building combines or associations and telling them: Now I am here for a purpose. I am here to help run an election and to win it. I must have something startling in this province. I must have something that will attract the attention of the people and one of the things would be to cut rates of duty on something that enters largely into the economic consumption of the people of this province. Just now I think cement would be a good subject. What is the matter with you sending a resolution to the Minister of Finance telling him that this must be done? Very good.

This is supposed to be the answer of the boards of trade and municipal bodies.

> Very good. If that is necessary we are good loyal party men and we will do that, but do you suppose Mr. White will believe that such an emergency exists? Believe? Certainly he will believe; he is a good innocent fellow, he knows nothing about these intrigues and he will believe it. This was done all over the country and this deluge of telegrams and resolutions was poured upon the innocent head of the minister and how well they succeeded was shown yesterday in the vigour and strength of the words with which he backed up this delusion which was heaped upon his head.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to believe that any hon. member would so far forget himself as to commit arguments of that kind to 'Hansard.' I am not an old parliamentarian, as my hon. friend claims to be, but I should feel ashamed if I put arguments of that kind upon 'Hansard' without one tittle of justification. The hon. gentleman builds up out of his own diseased political mind a case of almost inconceivable happenings through the western country. He would have us believe, without evidence, that this 'great boss' that he speaks about, this 'great performer' could go to the different boards of trade throughout the Northwest, and to building associations and municipal bodies and appeal to them successfully to help him win the Saskatchewan election. Does not every hon. member of this House know that there are as many good Liberals in the boards of trade in the West as there are Conservatives, that there are as many Liberals who are contractors and belong to contractors' associations as there are Conservatives ? Why,

it is childish to ask the country and to ask this House to believe an argument that would tend to prove that action such as is indicated had been taken by anybody. But the hon. gentleman does not stop there. He deliberately maligns and insults the great boards of trade throughout the Northwest. Speaking of what had taken place in Nova Scotia over some shortage of coal and steel, he says:

We have samples of that sort of thing in the Island of Cape Breton, when the Dominion Coal Company, or the Nova Scotia Steel company, owing to pressure on their works, are unable to supply coal or steel rails, as the case may be, and have to go across the line, pay the duty, and fulfil their contracts. There is no such thing as coming to the Government to ask them to remove the duty. That was possibly another delusion practised upon the minister. It is quite possible that those combines and trusts, went to the contractors and got them to raise a howl to frighten the minister, saying: 'we know we have to pay you the difference for any loss you may suffer, but we do not want to pay duty to bring in this cement, and if you cry loudly enough it will come in free.'

This was a new argument. A few moments before it was the boss, the great performer, who had done this. Now he says he can understand that these combines and trusts had gone to these men and told them to raise a howl and that the duty would be taken off if they raised a loud enough howl. He says:

It is quite possible that that was played upon the minister, and that he was persuaded to let this in free without the necessary evidence being before him. My hon. friend (Mr. White) is not a child in regard to the things that go on in this world, or in regard to the civil or municipal institutions of this country, and he knows that boards of trade are the most delusive bodies that ever existed on the face of the earth. If there is anything to which I would pay little attention it is to the resolution of a board of trade. These boards are the most irresponsible and unrepresentative people that were ever permitted to live in this country.

He says further:

One or two members can pass a resolution; one alone can move and second it, sign it as president or secretary, and send it to the department. That is all the hon. minister has got, and yet he stands up boldly and says: 'Where is the member for Saskatoon, I dare him to oppose the resolution of the members of the board of trade.' The chances are that when he goes up there to look for those members he will be unable to find one that would take the responsibility of saying that he ever saw or heard of a board of trade. That is the kind of evidence that is submitted. We heard it said yesterday with a great flourish of trumpets, that the leader of the Opposition was making strong bold statements based on nothing but newspaper scraps. I assure the Minister of Finance that he never saw a poorer scrap of any kind than a resolution of a board of trade, and that is the only evidence upon which he based the great case which he tried to make out here yesterday.

I appeal to any man who knows the calibre of the boards of trades of Manitoba and the West if this is a fair attack. Take the board of trade of the great city of Winnipeg, composed of the very best business men in that city, big men in every way, men with whom the hon. gentleman who has made this onslaught would hardly be fit to sit in the same room, as far as mental powers are concerned, great business men. These men have been maligned and insulted by this attack. Take the board of trade of Saskatoon, the board of trade of Edmonton, composed of the very best business men of that country. Who would suppose that any hon. member of this House would attack and insult them as the hon. member has done? His action was certainly not very dignified or edifying to this House and the hon. members from the West who sit opposite will be held responsible because while the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) was making these statements these hon. members listened to him and smiled and applauded. No man who knew the true position and personnel of our boards of trade, and our great building associations, would ever expect such an attack to be made on them, and any hon. member who maligns these bodies, as this hon. member has done, must answer to the board of trade and building associations of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Now, where does the responsibility lie? If there has been any suffering in this country, as my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) would lead the House to suppose, from the effects of the high duty on cement and from the effects of this merger, who is responsible? Early in my parliamentary career, on November 16, 1909, I called the attention of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who was then on this side of the House and his Finance Minister to the formation of this combine. I shall read to the House a question I then put to the Finance Minister:

Mr. BRADBURY asked:

1. Has the attention of the Government been called to the cement merger that has taken place, by means of which the Canada Cement Company, Limited, has taken over ten of the largest cement companies of Canada with a capital of $30,000,000 and that on account of this merger the prices of cement to the consumer has been very much increased?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to take action to protect the public against this merger, which threatens to be a huge combine thereby increasing the cost of cement which is almost a necessity to-day in great works?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance): The government are aware from information in the public press, that a number of cement manufacturies of the Dominion have been consolidated under one large company. Whether this consolidation has unduly enhanced the price of cement is a disputed point.

The law provides two methods of dealing with combinations which unduly enhance prices. One of these, in the case of dutiable articles, is by abolition or reduction of customs duties, after the facts have been established by judicial inquiry. It is proposed to introduce, during the present session measures to make this portion of the law more effective. The other method is under the Criminal Code, the administration of which comes under the direction of the Attorneys General of the several provinces.

This is conclusive evidence that the attention of the late Government was called to the forming of this merger, and to its effects, and the Government was asked to intervene, to make an investigation and apply the remedy. But the Government made no move. Six months later I again called the attention of the Government to this matter when the then Minister of Labour introduced his Bill to investigate combines. I shall again quote from 'Hansard'. I said:

In the early part of the session I drew the attention of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to the effect that the cement merger was likely to have in increasing the cost of cement in the province of Manitoba and throughout the Dominion. I hold in my hand the Winnipeg Tribune of the 23rd inst., a paper that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side used to swear by.

And, I expect, they will swear by it to-day, just as they did of old. It is as follows:

High tariff and combines. The advocates of high protective tariff would do well to consider the effect of high duty in the case of cement.

In the course of last year, about 400,000 barrels of cement passed through Winnipeg, and roughly speaking, about half of this quantity was used in Winnipeg, or for Winnipeg works. In view of the inordinate amount of building in the city and such works as the new bridges and the power plant at Pointe du Bois which will only require at least sixty or seventy thousand barrels, it is more than fair to assume that at least the same quantity will be required by Winnipeg ratepayers this year, namely, 200,000 barrels.

How much more will this amount cost this year than last? At the present time contractors in the city are paying $2.40 a barrel for the same grade of cement as they were purchasing as low as $1.80 last year before the merger was formed, which was brought into existence by the high protective tariff—an advance of 60 cents. This means that if this rate is maintained—and there is no reason for supposing anything else—Winnipeg alone will pay $120,000 more for its cement than last year. At the present time the merger is selling cement at from 10 to 15 cents a barrel less than the price at which it can be brought in from the United States. They have protection of from 51 to 52 cents per barrel, which is prohibitive. A barrel of cement can be sold at the factory anywhere in Ontario in round figures, at $1 a barrel. The duty is, therefore, over 50 per cent.

If the duty were reduced to 30 per cent, which is the average charge on manufactured goods, then it would be possible for the consumer of Manitoba to import their cement from the United States, if the Canadian merger did not make a fair price.

After reading the article from the Tribune, I made a few comments. I stated as follows:

I would like to emphasize what I said in an earlier part of the session when I had the assurance of the Minister of Finance at that time that a Bill was under way which would deal with this matter. It is very important to the western country. I may say that in all our great structures to-day, due perhaps to the increased cost of lumber, we are using cement very largely, and while the Tribune estimates that 400,000 barrels of cement will pass through Winnipeg this year over different lines, I think it would be safe to say that a far larger quantity of cement will have to pass through Wininpeg to supply the needs of that growing country. I would like to ask the minister in charge of this Bill if he intends to make an investigation and take such proceedings as to cause the merger to do what is fair with the people of the West. The suggestion of the Tribune that the protection should be reduced on this article, I think, is a very fair and wise one.

Where was the member for Edmonton then?

I think that when we find that mergers are causing an increase in the cost of commodities, which they are producing, which is unfair to the consumer, the Government should reduce or take off the duty altogether, if it is necessary to force the combines to give the people the product, whatever it may be, at a reasonable price. There is no doubt about this cement merger being a serious drawback to the West. You could get cement at $1.80 last year, now it is $2.40 a barrel. That is brought about, I am satisfied, by the merger, and the Government ought to take immediate action to protect the consumer in this matter.

This shows conclusively that the late Government was warned of what was taking place under this cement merger. Then, the Tribune claimed that there was an excessive cost, and if the hon. member for Edmonton had been as serious and as anxious to protect the West as he appears to be to-day, in believing that this duty should be cut off or abolished, he certainly lost his opportunity when he was a minister of the Crown sitting on this side of the House. Yet, knowing all that, he was one of the men who helped to create and foster this great combine that exists in Canada to-day. That combine was fostered and nurtured under the Liberal party. They did not investigate, and why? Because nearly every leading member of

that combine, including the president of the company, was a Liberal. No man would say that the Hon. George Cox of Toronto, was a Conservative, or the Hon. Senator Edwards, or the Hon. Mr. MacKay. When I drew attention to that merger in 1909-10, every one of the prominent men connected with it was an active Liberal, and that is, I suppose, a good reason why the member for Edmonton, and his right hon. leader sat so quiet, and allowed this merger to work its sweet will on the people of the West. But now, things are changed. He is in opposition, and the Conservative party are in power, and he is calling upon the Conservative party to do what he and his friends dared not do. They are playing the game, just as they played it before 1896, when they went up and down the country preaching reduced tariffs, reduced taxation, and free trade as they have it in England. But as soon as they came into power they became the friends and colleagues of the trusts and combines in this country. They are directly responsible for the increased duty on cement. If the duty on cement is too high—I am not prepared to say that it is—I am prepared to ask this Government for a thorough investigation into the whole matter, and if the duty is too high, I expect that this Government will do, just as other great Conservative Governments have done, apply the remedy, and reduce the duty in the interests of the people of this country. I have the records in my hand regarding the duty. When these gentlemen came into office they found that the duty was not so high as it is to-day. In 1894, under the old Conservative regime, the duty was as follows: (I am reading now from the customs returns):

1894, item 184, cement, including Portland or Roman, and hydraulic or water lime, 40 cents per barrel, including the duty on the barrel.

1897, item 187, cement, Portland and hydraulic, or water lime, in bags, barrels or casks, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty, 12½ cents per 100 pounds.

One of the very first things that the late Government did was to increase the duty on cement. In 1897, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition came back fresh from the country with a great majority gained by promising reduced duties and free trade as they have it in England, and the very first thing he and his party did was to increase the duty on cement. In 1906, there was another increase:

Item 290, cement, Portland and hydraulic or water lime, in barrels, bags or casks, the weight of the package to be included in the weight for duty.

That is, in addition to paying the increased duty on the cement itself, the people were paying duty on the weight of the bag, or barrel, or cask, or whatever the cement came in. And that is not the worst feature, because I find under item 291:

Bags in which cement or lime mentioned in item 290 is imported under general tariff rate of 20 per cent.

Briefly, here is what happened: In 1894, under the old Conservative regime, and until the Liberals came into power, the tariff in existence was 40 cents per barrel, including the barrel; when the Liberals came into office in 1896, it was increased by them to 43¾ cents per barrel, including packages, making an increase in the duty of 3¾ cents in addition to the weight of the bag, or an increase of about 5c. per barrel. But, in 1906, not satisfied with increasing the duty, this free trade party further increased it to 51¾ cents. When the Liberal party came into power they found a lower duty on cement, they built up a higher tariff and they created this merger through that tariff because it is safe to say that without an increased tariff there would have been no great inducement for the formation of this merger in Canada. If the duty on cement is burdensome to the people to-day the whole responsibility rests upon the shoulders of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, the member for Edmonton and their colleagues all over the country. They are the men who put this increased duty on cement. There is no doubt at all that it will remain for the Conservative Government to reduce the tariff and see that a fair and equitable duty is levied. Before taking my seat I want to point out that there was a Bill before this House last session that was killed through the advice and influence of the leader of the Opposition, and this measure would have made it possible for this House and the country to have known exactly where the cement company stood. That was the Tariff Commission Bill. If we had a tariff commission to-day that commission could go into the office of this merger, take control of their books, ascertain immediately where this merger stood and whether they were receiving too much protection or not. The protection was increased by the Liberal Government by nearly 30 per cent and still these hon. gentlemen have the audacity to stand up and try to hold this side of the House responsible for the increased cost of cement.

Now, I am not going to detain the House any longer, but I only wish to say in conclusion that hon. members from the West will have to be more consistent if they want to win the ear of the West, they will have to be more patriotic to the West and more loyal to the West. The men who represent the West cannot ride two horses, one in

the West and one down here. It is all right enough for them to go back to a little schoolhouse and discuss the high cost of living and the high cost of cement and then come down here and protest against the Government interfering as they have done to alleviate the conditions that existed in that western country. There is no doubt that the Government intervened when there was a serious famine throughout the country. Millions of dollars of public works were threatened with being closed down, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of public work had already been closed down, thousands of working men had been turned loose on the streets without employment, and the consequence would have been that, had not the Government intervened, hundreds of thousands of working men would have been turned out of employment. Yet, in face of all this we find hon. gentlemen taking the unpatriotic and unfair position of trying to make a little political capital out of the reduction of the duty on cement which was done entirely in the interests of the people of the country.

Mr. D. B. NEELY (Humboldt): Mr. Speaker, along with other members, I appreciate very much the good advice which is given us by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). With that deep personal interest that I know the hon. gentleman has in the re-election of the Liberal members from the West, he has advised us not to attempt to ride two horses, one here and one at home. Well, Sir, it does not appear to me as if the hon. gentleman is riding the same horse he was riding two or three years ago. He has told us in his address, part of which is a repetition of some remarks that he favoured the last Parliament with, I think, in the session of 1909-10, that he brought this matter of the formation of the cement merger and the high price of cement to the people throughout Canada as a result of the formation of that merger to the attention of the late Government. It is a fact which does not need any demonstration that the hon. member for Selkirk has been in this House since 1911, and that during the whole of the first session, in fact, during all the time that his friends have held office, this is the first time the hon. gentleman has ever brought to the notice of the House this serious condition of affairs in connection with the operations of the cement merger in Canada. So far as the hon. member for Selkirk is concerned, I do not think that he is just exactly riding the same horse that he was riding when the Liberal party held office.

The Speech from the Throne appeals to me as a very remarkable document, both for some of the things which it contains and many of the things it does not contain, that, in my judgment, ought to be included in the programme for the consideration of this Parliament.

In the first place, our attention is drawn to the general prosperity throughout the length and breadth of this country. Well, our friends on the Government benches have been in office but a short time and they hardly expect us, I suppose, to infer that they are responsible for this general prosperity because they have not yet had sufficient time to disorganize that splendid machine left them by the late Government which is responsible in a very large measure for the general prosperity of the country. Our attention is called particularly to the increased trade of this Dominion with other countries. It does seem a somewhat remarkable thing on which to congratulate the House, coming from a Government who were elected to office in opposition to a trade agreement that would have increased our trade ten times the increase we have had since this Government came into office. It is a remarkable thing that they should congratulate themselves and the country on this increase of trade when the slogan that brought them into office, the platform that brought them to power, if it meant anything, meant the continued restriction of trade between this country and one of the greatest countries of the world, the republic to the south of us.

We are asked to congratulate ourselves and the country on the consummation of a trade treaty with what ? With the British West Indies, and it has been brought to the attention of the House how much of an increase in trade that means. That trade agreement with the West Indies is undoubtedly right in principle. The principle is good but the effect is almost nil as every member of this House knows. And yet we are asked to congratulate ourselves on the negotiation of this reciprocity treaty with the British West Indies, immediately following the defeat of an agreement with a nation of one hundred millions of people.

The prominence given, in the discussion up to the present time, to our old friend the reciprocity agreement, must have impressed itself on every member of this House. Members of the Government are constantly bringing before our notice the question of reciprocity. It formed a very important item in the speech of the Finance Minister, and the one thing that struck me in connection with that speech was the evident deep concern of the minister over the question of reciprocity. He was very much concerned to get the consent of the members of the Opposition to

bury the whole subject out of sight. It must be giving the hon. gentleman a great deal of anxiety and worry when he calls on the members of the Opposition to assist in putting that whole question out of sight and out of sound. Well, Sir, the Liberal party do not propose to put the question out of sight and out of sound. The hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) found that out the other evening when he propounded his questions to certain members on this side of the House. The particular agreement that was submitted to the people of Canada on the 21st of September, 1911, is undoubtedly a thing of the past, but Sir, while that particular pact or agreement is dead, the principle that underlies it will never die in the history of this country. Do hon. gentlemen opposite think that because they have won a temporary victory by the defeat of this one particular trade agreement with the United States, the people of Canada are forever going to bury the principle of wider markets? If hon. gentlemen opposite have come to that conclusion, I do not think it will be very long before they will awake to find that they have been resting in false security. The Liberal party believe still in the principles of the late reciprocity agreement or pact; they have always believed in those principles; there is no inconsistency in that. It probably is within your knowledge, Sir, that there are hon. gentlemen sitting in this House on the Government seats, who, when that agreement was brought into this House, were just as much in favour of it as were the members of the Liberal party in this House. We are consistently in favour of the principles that underly the reciprocity agreement; but, on the other side of the House there are hon. gentlemen who, by their applause when that agreement was brought into this House, evidenced what their thoughts and views on it were. But the exigencies of party, the political expediency that was brought to bear upon these gentlemen, led them to forsake the principles that they believed in, and to join with the others of their own party who thought it best to mislead the electorate by an appeal to a false sentiment which they themselves had created throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Mr. STANFIELD: What about what happened on your side of the House?

Mr. NEELY: If my hon. friend had been listening to me, he would have heard what I had to say so far as this side of the House is concerned.

We have been asked to believe that even very many of those who in 1911 voted in favour of the principle of reciprocity have changed their minds, and the illustration we are given of that is the result of the election in the constituency of Macdonald in the province of Manitoba. As you are aware, Sir, the Government candidate was elected in that constituency. It certainly was a surprise to many that the Government candidate received the majority he did. The independent candidate in that election had taken the trouble, some months before the election was held, to visit every important part of the constituency and hold public meetings and wherever he went he was met with enthusiastic support and applause. Apparently in the month of August the sentiment of the constituency of Macdonald was overwhelmingly in favour of wider markets and freer trade; but when the election came in October, it was discovered by Mr. Richardson and his friends that this sentiment was not expressed at the polls. Why was it not expressed at the polls in October if it had existed in the month of August when Mr. Richardson made his tour of the constituency? I do not think that at this stage in the debate it is necessary for me to undertake to demonstrate in the House the reason why the sentiment which in August prevailed in the constituency of Macdonald was not represented at the polls in October, the reason being, as has been stated by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) and other members on this side of the House, that the electors of Macdonald were not given an opportunity in October of expressing their unbiased opinion on the great trade issue that was presented.

In connection with the amendment before the House, there has been brought to our attention a condition of affairs in Manitoba that it is surely time the people of Canada should become aware of. In view of the large farmers' deputation that came to Ottawa in December, 1910, asking for reciprocity with the United States, it must have been a source of considerable surprise throughout the length and breadth of Canada that the people of the pioneer prairie province of Manitoba saw fit to send only two Liberals, out of ten representatives from that province. The answer to that enigma is given to us to-day in the result of the Macdonald by-election. The methods that were adopted by the connivance and apparently with the approval of the Minister of Public Works; the methods that were adopted by his old colleagues in the Government of the province of Manitoba; those methods that existed to such an extent as they have done in the constituency of Macdonald in the recent by-election, were the methods that in election after election, federal as well as provincial, prevented the people of Manitoba from giving expression to the sentiments

which really animated the majority of them. For years back, ever since the Roblin administration has been in office in the province of Manitoba, every Liberal candidate, every Liberal worker, has had to face conditions similar to that portrayed as having existed in the recent Macdonald by-election. In fear and trembling, Liberal workers have sought by fair and legitimate means to influence the electorate of the province of Manitoba, as they knew that the whole machinery of the Department of Justice of the province was in the hands of a great body of officials who were ready at any moment to prevent an honest expression of the sentiment of the electorate at the polls on election day. This House will not soon forget the remarkable speech made the other day by the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Rogers), in which he attempted to vindicate himself, his late colleagues the Manitoba Government, and the Conservative organization generally, in connection with the recent Macdonald by-election. From the speeches delivered by the Minister of Public Works and Sir Rodmond Roblin, Premier of Manitoba, during that election, one would have thought that the constituency of Macdonald was about to be carried away bodily and planted somewhere in the province of Saskatchewan by that 'host of thugs and thieves,' who were being imported from that province. What are the facts? Out of that host of thugs and thieves, one lone individual, Mr. J. J. Sullivan, was arrested. The other three were residents of the province of Manitoba and therefore the term 'imported' could hardly be applied to them. When I asked the Minister of Public Works the other day why these men were not prosecuted, his answer was, 'One of them was a public nuisance, and had been for years.' Surely, that was all the more reason why he should be prosecuted, if he had been a public nuisance for years, and on top of that had been doing crooked work in the election at Macdonald. What was J. J. Sullivan arrested for, according to the Minister of Public Works? We have heard of the sins of the fathers being visited upon the younger generations, but it is the first time I ever heard it announced that the sins of uncles were to be visited upon nephews. The Minister of Public Works claims that the fact that this J. J. Sullivan was the nephew of a gentleman of the name of 'Cap' Sullivan of years gone by, was a good and sufficient reason why he should be arrested when he appeared in the constituency of Macdonald. If that argument is good, where does it drop to when we discover, as we have discovered, that Mr. J. J. Sullivan is no relation at all to the famous 'Cap.' That at least is what Mr. J. J. Sullivan says.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): People in the country know him; people in Ontario know him.

Mr. NEELY: We have a telegram from him to that effect.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): You should get better evidence.

Mr. NEELY: I did not know my honourable friend, the hon. member for Lisgar, belonged to the medical profession; in other words, I was not aware that he was present when Mr. J. J. Sullivan was introduced into this world, but apparently the hon. gentleman was somewhere around on that occasion. Does the hon. member know it himself?

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): I never saw him, but I know it.

Mr. NEELY: That is where the hon. member and his friends have fallen into the trap in this, in going by hearsay.

Mr. BOYCE: Apply that to the hon. member for Edmonton, about the hearsay. He is the greatest one for hearing in this House.

Mr. NEELY: The hon. member for Edmonton can answer that for himself. When it comes to the prosecution of Mr Sullivan, notwithstanding the awful name he bears, and the record of his supposed relative in days gone by, it is discovered that there is actually no evidence at all against him; and my friend from Selkirk—I am sorry he has gone out—would have us believe that the waiving of these prosecutions was due to the magnanimity of the Conservative party in the province of Manitoba. I would prefer if my hon. friend would tell that to the marines, because so far as I am concerned, while I admit there are proper and good elements in the Conservative party, to tell us that the Conservative organization in the province of Manitoba did not prosecute these four individuals through generous feelings, is something I am sure every member of this House will have to take with a very large portion of salt. That is the strength of argument by which the constituency of Macdonald pronounced against reciprocity. I do not say that a trade question is a provincial question, but sometimes, federal issues get into provincial politics, and if the Minister of Public Works claims that the result in Macdonald spells ruin to reciprocity, I wonder what that hon. gentleman thought when he heard the result of the provincial elections in Saskatchewan, because, whether it was right or not, in that election reciprocity, according to the Conservative leader in that province, played a very important part. It is bad enough

in the constituency of Macdonald, that Liberal workers have been thrown into jail without cause; that personators in the Conservative interest have been allowed their liberty with too light a penalty, and by unlawful means; but what I consider the worst feature of the case is that since the amendment has been introduced by the hon leader for the Opposition, the only argument brought forward against that amendment is that 'you did the same when you had the opportunity.' That was the argument advanced by my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury). That was the argument advanced by the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler). It is an argument one might expect from hon. gentlemen of their calibre—lesser political lights with lower ideals than we expect their leaders to have, perhaps. But, Sir, when we find the Prime Minister of Canada (Mr. Borden), and his right hand man the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds), when we find the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) the holder of one of the most important portfolios in the Government, with no argument in defence of their position with relation to these atrocities except: 'You did it, therefore we are justified in doing it,' that of itself is a far more serious aspect of this situation than even the actual occurrences in the Macdonald by-election. I wonder how the people of Canada will view the net result of this discussion on the electoral methods in this country, when the best answer that even the Prime Minister can give to these proven charges of wrong-doing on the part of his supporters in this by-election—for which wrongdoing, the Minister of Public Works must hold himself personally responsible because he was personally cognizant of the occurrences—is that because irregularities occurred in days gone by we must look lightly on these occurrences in the constituency of Macdonald. It is true, irregularities have occurred in days gone by. But I would like to know from hon. members who have made these references if they can give me a single instance in the history of a single province of Canada when, under a Liberal Government, the rights of citizens have been taken away as in these instances when men were thrown into jail and denied the first liberty of British subjects.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar): The hon. gentleman has asked for an instance. I will give him one, Saskatchewan last summer.

Mr. NEELY: My hon. friend will have to give us more than that to convince us on that point. And he will have an opportunity in the very near future. My hon. friend speaks of wrong having been done in the Saskatchewan elections last summer. While that is a forbidden subject under the ruling that has been made, yet, if the hon. gentleman wishes to discuss that, let me point out to him one difference between the conduct of this Government and the conduct of the Government of Saskatchewan. It was stated by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) that the Liberal Government of Saskatchewan had obtained power by wrong-doing in the elections last summer. Well, Sir, what was the first thing that the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan did at the opening of the first sitting of the legislature following that election? Why, Sir, he presented the charges made by the Minister of Public Works to the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections with a mandate from the Government to make the most thorough investigation into those charges. That is something not done by this Government.

Mr. BOYCE: Does not the hon. gentleman think that would be a rather reasonable request to make of this House—a request for a reference to the Committee on Privileges and Elections—rather than make a direct charge on evidence that is not before us?

Mr. NEELY: The Government have had every opportunity of saying what they would like to say and proposing what they would like to propose in this matter. They have had evidence presented to them that they have not refuted nor undertaken to refute. The question of my hon. friend is one which he ought to put to the Prime Minister of Canada and not to myself.

This is the contrast between the two governments. I have no doubt that hon. gentlemen opposite may say, 'Oh, well, it is only an insincere attempt after all.' I take it for granted that the government of Saskatchewan will welcome the evidence of the man who made the charges in connection with the Saskatchewan election, the Minister of Public Works himself. The condition of affairs is one that cannot be tolerated. It is not the custom of churches in this country—I shall not be sneered at now, because the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) is not here—to openly and unnecessarily take part in the discussion of political and public affairs. But every member of the House knows that, so flagrant were the atrocities in the Macdonald by-election that the Presbyterian Synod of the province of Manitoba felt compelled to pass a resolution of censure on those who had permitted those atrocities. I think our friends on the Government benches have extracted too much honey from this victory, or supposed victory, in the by-election in Macdonald. I know nothing of the gentleman who sits for that constituency in this House by virtue of that election. I trust, however, that he

is a gentleman of such moral fibre that he would not accept his seat in this House had he known that his first election had been brought about by these methods. And I trust that, having come to this House, and having discovered that his seat was won by these methods of the Conservative party in his province, he will say : 'I will not hold a seat gained by such methods, but will go back to the people from whom I came, and will give them a fair, full, free opportunity to express their sentiments once again at the polls. Now, we are told that this matter is to be gone into further.

Some hon. MEMBERS : Hear, hear.

Mr. NEELY : Hon. gentlemen say 'Hear, hear.' I am glad of it. But the statement made to us by the Minister of Public Works the other day was that a counter petition had been put in against Mr. Richardson, the defeated candidate in that election. There are a number of legal gentlemen in this House on both sides. And any member of the bar knows perfectly well, that while a man may be disqualified as a voter as a result of evidence submitted before the courts in the hearing of an election protest, that does not constitute a criminal action and procedure. The gentlemen who were arrested and thrown into jail, so far as criminal prosecutions are concerned, are free under the law according to the statement made by the Minister of Public Works. There is no criminal prosecution and, no matter what they may do in the matter of a counter protest, by their refusal before the Court to prosecute these four individuals according to the information laid against them, they have practically admitted and avowed that there was no charge which they could prove against them. We have listened to a very severe arraignment of members of the Opposition, especially the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), because of a certain proposed position they have taken on the question of the reduction of the duty on cement. It seems to be the last resort of the members on the Government side, when they have nothing substantial to attack in the position of the leader of the Opposition, to erect men of straw and to attack those men of straw, the attacks being made—shall I say deliberately made—by the different speakers on the Government side who have discussed the question of the reduction of the duty on cement, in order to lead the House and the people of this country to believe that the leader of the Opposition and the member for Edmonton are opposed to a reduction of duty on cement. How any sane intelligent man can draw that conclusion from the speeches of the leader of the Opposition and the member for Edmonton, I absolutely fail to see. There is not, I am satisfied, a single individual on this side of the House who has spoken on this question who is not in favour of a reduction of the cement duty. It was not a very big thing, perhaps, but the trade agreement that was defeated on the 21st of September, 1911, did make provision for a reduction of the duty on cement.

Mr. EDWARDS: How much?

Mr. NEELY: I said a reasonable reduction. I think about 2½ cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. EDWARDS: 1½ cents.

Mr. NEELY: Perhaps my hon. friend is better informed than I am, I am not discussing that point; I am discussing the point that a reduction was proposed and that the hon. gentlemen on the Government side, to a man, opposed it, whatever it was.

The hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) assumed a position of outraged dignity and great indignation because he claimed that the leader of the Opposition had attempted to put his position in a false light before the country; in other words, because the intimation was given that this reduction on cement was made for the purpose of influencing the Saskatchewan election.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NEELY: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I was calling attention to the complaint of the Minister of Finance that his position, with reference to the reduction of the duty on cement last June, had been misinterpreted by members on this side of the House. In fact, the Minister of Finance became very emphatic and called upon the leader of the Opposition, and the member for Edmonton, to give him an apology for the explanation they had given of that reduction. A reduction of the duty on cement at any time meets with my approval, because I think the duty is altogether too high. I am satisfied that the reduction made by the Government did bring a practical and material benefit to the people of Western Canada, if not to the people of all Canada. But I am reluctant to extend, on my own behalf, or on behalf of any member on this side of the House, anything in the nature of an apology to the Minister of Finance for the position taken by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition with reference to the object and motive behind that re-

duction. The Minister of Finance makes the statement that he had no other object in view than the benefit of the people. I take the minister's word unreservedly, but I refuse to believe that that was the only motive which actuated other members of the Government who necessarily gave their consent to the reduction of the duty at the particular time it was made.

In the correspondence which the Minister of Finance gave to the House, I notice a letter from the Winnipeg Board of Trade, dated Winnipeg, June 7, 1912, a letter which was quoted, unfortunately, by the member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury). In that letter I notice references to a correspondence between that board of trade and the Minister of Finance and the members of this Government, dating back as far as December, 1911. It was hardly what you would call an intermittent correspondence, because, judging from the references here several communications had passed between the Winnipeg Board of Trade and the Minister of Finance and the members of this Government. That board of trade took a strong position on the question. They said the duty was too high, and the price of cement was too high, and in the previous correspondence they called upon the Government either to cut that duty very materially, or to abolish it altogether. I have not that previous correspondence before me; the Minister of Finance was not good enough to give it to the House, but it is perfectly evident that the Winnipeg Board of Trade anticipated exactly what did happen, namely, a shortage of cement throughout the Western provinces. It anticipated that shortage, not merely on the 7th of June; but for months previously the Winnipeg Board of Trade had sought to impress upon the Government that it was their duty to reduce or to abolish the duty on cement. The Minister of Finance would have this House believe that this urgent demand for the abolition or reduction of the cement duty was the matter of a moment, that it arose in a few days. The Minister of Finance must know, as surely the members from west of the Great Lakes know, that for weeks previous to this final urgent demand, everybody in Western Canada knew that there was a serious shortage in cement, and that the building operations throughout the season were bound to be seriously hampered unless provision was made. I venture to assert that for a considerable period before this House prorogued last session, that knowledge was in the possession of the Minister of Finance, and of other members of the Government, if not every member of the Government. They must have had that information. The Winnipeg Board of Trade was keeping them constantly reminded of the situation, and had been doing so as far back as December 1911, and it is idle to come to us to-day and say we did this because of the urgency of the need, when the urgency of the need had been patent for months previous to the time the reduction was made. That the need was urgent I do not deny. Simply do I affirm that it was urgent for a long time previous to the actual reduction. Now, the position that I, as a western member of this House, take in this. I am glad that the duty on cement was reduced, and very sorry to see it put back again; but our case for a reduction of the duty on cement is not so weak, nor so poor, that we want this matter presented to this House and to the people of the country as an emergency proposition. We want a reduction of the duty on cement, but we want it, not as a temporary provision, but as a permanent provision, and that permanent reduction can only be made by this Parliament. Therefore, having had the information in their possession for months previous to the reduction, this Government should have made the reduction during the last session of this Parliament.

The Minister of Finance introduced almost a new word into the debates of this House, and he used it a number of times. He asked us to believe that the reduction of the duty simply synchronized with the approach of the elections in the province of Saskatchewan. Well, there is no question at all about the synchronizing, because the first public announcement with regard to the reduction was made by the then Minister of the Interior, now the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Rogers), at a banquet in the city of Regina, which one hon. gentleman said he gave to himself, though I cannot vouch for that, on the night of the 10th of June. At that banquet the Minister of Public Works announced that he had just had a telegram from the Prime Minister.

Mr. OLIVER: Not from the Minister of Finance?

Mr. NEELY: No, from the Prime Minister, to the effect that the duty on cement had been cut in two. Of course that announcement by the Minister of Public Works at a political banquet in the city of Regina, on the eve of an election in that province, was just a synchronism. I quite concede the point made by the Minister of Public Works that the writs had not been issued at the time he made that famous speech; but it was on the 11th of July that the Saskatchewan elections were held, and this announcement was made on the 10th of June, so that it was not very long after the announcement before the writs were issued; in fact everybody in the province, and in the West, knew that the Government of Saskatchewan proposed issuing

the writs in a very short space of time. The Minister of Finance calls this a synchronism. Having a somewhat suspicious nature in regard to these synchronisms, I must say that, while it may be largely a synchronism, as far as the Minister of Finance is concerned, I regret to say that I cannot accept that explanation for the other members of the Government. We have had an experience of the benefits which have been derived from this reduction and we have a letter here from some member of the Government—I wish they would sign their names when they send these letters out, because we want to quote and quote correctly—to a cement manufacturer in which he points out that although they had cut the cement duty in two it still remained at the high mark of 30 per cent. That reduction to 30 per cent was a great benefit. I would like to know what the Minister of Finance and other members of the Government, having provided for the emergency of the past season, and in view of the benefit of the recent reduction, and of the information which they have derived as to the condition of affairs in the West, propose to do at this session of Parliament to prevent a similar shortage in the supply of material for building operations in the West next season. If the Minister of Finance will make this reduction permanent by means of proper legislation in this House, he certainly will have my support, and I believe the support of every member sitting on this side of the House who comes from west of the Great Lakes. The position was taken by the Minister of Finance that we owed him an apology. Perhaps personally we will have to admit the innocence of the hon. Minister of Finance, but as far as the Government are concerned, we are not yet ready to deliver the apology demanded of us by the Minister of Finance a few days ago.

The Prime Minister the other day, in his reply to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, made a very strong case for himself in his concluding remarks by comparing the record of his Government in the short time it had been in office with the record of the Liberal Government, which had preceded him in office for fifteen years. He enumerated the number of good things that had been done by this Government. One of the things he referred to was the reorganization of the public service. Well, it was noticed that the Prime Minister did not elaborate on the efforts put forth by the Government for the reorganization of the public service. I believe this Government have reorganized the public service. They have reorganized it to a very considerable extent. One of the very first acts of the Government was to appoint a public service commisison for the reorganization of the public service; but, that commission had operated only a few months when it was found necessary to reorganize the commission. I believe that the reorganization has been completed recently by the appointment of another chairman in place of the gentleman who, for some reasons best known to himself, resigned since this House was prorogued some months ago. I have been watching, up in my part of the country, the effect of this reorganization, and, so far as I could discover in my province or in the constituency I represent, this reorganization seemed to be a process of decapitation, taking off the heads of Grit officials and putting Tories in their places. It was a reformation with an axe. The country generally understood that, when the Prime Minister spoke of the reorganization of the public service, having heard his professions for many years in opposition, it would be with the object of putting it on a non-partisan basis. There has been a reorganization of the service, but I fail to see where the service has been improved. The reorganization has put Tory partisans in the place of Liberals whether they were partisans or not, of which I have had some very practical illustrations in my own constituency. I do not propose to discuss provincial elections in this debate, but I think I am justified in calling the attention of the House to the character of the appointments which have been made by this Government in the reorganization of the outside public service, and in calling attention to the way in which these officials have been conducting themselves since their appointment. In the West the department we come in contact with mostly is the Interior Department, which, until recently, has been presided over since this Government came into office, by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Rogers), now Minister of Public Works. The hon. Minister of Public Works reorganized the service in my constituency. How did he do it? By putting out of office all the homestead inspectors who had held their positions under the late Government. Almost every individual in the service of the Interior Department was asked to resign or was dismissed without any investigation, as far as I know, of any sort or description whatever. There were others put in their places, and among the others, just as an illustration, there was one gentleman, by the name of Smyth appointed as a homestead inspector in the place of one who had been dismissed. This Dominion homestead inspector who, in this reorganization of the public service, had been appointed to take the place of an official of the late Government, undertook to take some part in the Saskatchewan elections in

the interest and on behalf of the Conservative party. For the small part he took—it must have been very small, judging from the result of the election—an information was laid against this homestead inspector, an official under this Government and appointed by this Government, charging him with the intimidation of voters. I have a copy of the information here which was laid against this gentleman. He was brought before the courts of the province on the charge, and fined $50 and costs. I think the costs ran up probably another $50 on top of the fine. A Dominion Government homestead inspector intimidating voters, complained against, informed against, convicted by the courts of the province and condemned to pay a penalty of $50 and costs.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is his name?

Mr. NEELY: Arthur Smyth is the full name of the gentleman, I think.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Has he been dismissed for engaging in these practices?

Mr. NEELY: I was coming to that point. This is a matter of public notoriety. The Minister of Public Works cannot say that he did not know what occurred, because, strange to say, when the late Government went out of office it was a remarkable thing that the hon. gentleman who succeeded the hon. member for Edmonton as Minister of the Interior seemed to know the personal record of every Government official throughout the length and breadth of the country. He knew what every one did. Therefore he must know what this particular official did and what he was guilty of in the Saskatchewan elections. If this gentleman had appealed the case and won the appeal, we could have said that there was something wrong, that he had been wrongfully convicted and that he had had to pay the penalty wrongfully; but, while it was proposed by the defendant to enter an appeal in the courts against this conviction, he failed to do so, and the result is that this conviction stands and that this Mr. Smyth, homestead inspector, has paid the fine and the costs of the court.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The Prime Minister will dismiss him.

Mr. NEELY: We would like to have had that done a little sooner.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): He will have to do it now.

Mr. NEELY: So far as this official is concerned, the last information I had from the district was that he was still acting in the capacity of homestead inspector under this Government. But that is not all. I happened to be in that part of the province during those elections, and I discovered that not only the homestead inspector was busying himself in the elections, but that the agent of Dominion Lands at Humboldt, appointed by this Government, was also interesting himself. One of the first gentlemen I ran across in Saskatchewan indirectly, after the election campaign had commenced up there, was another Dominion official,—no less a person that the famous Mr. Jackson, who, I understand, is Chief of the Dominion detective service at the present moment, although previous to his appointment to that office by this Government he held a similar position under the Manitoba Government. I have a copy of a letter here from the Agent of Dominion Lands at Humboldt, in which he introduces this Mr. Jackson, Chief of the Dominion detective service to this Mr. Smyth, the Homestead Inspector, who was convicted of attempting to intimidate the free electors of the province of Saskatchwan. I say I have here a copy of a letter in which Mr. Oliver, that is the name of the gentleman, asked Mr. Smyth, the Homestead Inspector, to kindly give any assistance and information he may require to Mr. Jackson, who is the Chief of the Dominion Detective Service. I understand that this Mr. Jackson was one of the chief actors in the recent Macdonald by-election; this Chief of the Dominion Detective Service who in the constituency of Wadena in the province of Saskatchewan was arrested on a similar charge made against Mr. Smyth, the Homestead Inspector, and was taken to Regina. He was not prosecuted like our Liberal friends in the constituency of Macdonald, for the one and very sufficient reason that he turned King's evidence, and gave information to the court as to the other numerous gentry of his own calibre whom he had brought with him from the province of Manitoba into the province of Saskatchewan. That is the reformation and reorganization of the public service, to which we have been treated up to date by this present administration. I do not think that it is a reorganization that the Government can feel justifiably proud of. Certainly it is not a reorganization which harmonizes very well with the pre-election promises and pledges of the Prime Minister

Mr. GRAHAM: It does not synchronize.

Mr. NEELY: It does not. There is a very serious omission from the Speech from the Throne and that omission is the failure to make any reference to the bringing in at this present session of

a redistribution measure so as to give proper representation in this House to the different provinces of Canada. In the old days, when we had a Conservative regime once before, it did not make very much difference to Western Canada whether there was a redistribution or not, because the population was so small that there was very little change from year to year in the representation. But times have changed in that western country. It is now represented west of the Great Lakes by 35 members and we are entitled to 56 or 57 members based on the returns of the recent census. The Prime Minister undertakes to say that we should not be impatient in this matter; he says we need not worry about redistribution; that this Government has three or four years more to live and that so long as we have redistribution before the next election no one will suffer. I can hardly appreciate that position of the Prime Minister. How can he say to-day that some crisis may not develop in the affairs of this country or in the affairs of this House that will necessitate an immediate appeal to the country? As evidence of that possibility, I want to point out to this House, that if some 20 odd members sitting in this House, from the province of Quebec, yes, and a few odd members from the province of Ontario are true to their anti-election pledges and promises as to submitting any naval assistance to the people, by referendum, then we are going to have a crisis in the affairs of this Government in the very near future. The Government tells us there is no trouble in sight. Is it not a fact that over twenty members from the province of Quebec owe their positions in this House to their opposition to the assistance that this Government, or any government, might render to the Empire's defences by contribution or otherwise. And, unless rumour and newspaper statements are altogether false, there are a few members from the province of Ontario in a similar position. If, when this Government brings forward their proposition, no matter what its nature may be, whether it be contribution or whether it be a settled Canadian naval policy, if these gentlemen keep their pledges to their constituents, we will have a crisis in the affairs of this Government in a very short time. That being the case, our demand for a redistribution measure during the present session is a fair demand; it is a right demand, and the Government have given absolutely no justifiable reason why that demand should not be met at once. This question of redistribution is therefore a serious matter. The census returns are complete, according to our information. Why does not the Prime Minister or some member of the Government tell the House the reason for the delay in the introduction of the redistribution measure? We are told that the representation of the Western provinces in the Senate is to be increased. Well, Sir, that is some information; but surely it is a more insistent duty on the part of this Government to give the electorate their fair representation in this House than in a body appointed solely by the Government. I would like to hear from the Government further than we have heard up to date on this question. I want to say to the Prime Minister, who is not present, and to the other members of the Government, that unless this House does get more satisfactory reasons than we have had up to date for their failure to introduce a measure of redistribution at the present session, they will hear of this question not once, but many times, until our demand is complied with; so far, at least, as it concerns proper information regarding their refusal to bring in a redistribution measure.

We have heard a good deal about what occurred in the Macdonald by-election. We have also heard something about what occurred in the by-election at Richelieu. So far as the latter election is concerned, there has been no defence made for what occurred, not even by any member of the Government. The House is therefore unanimous in the opinion that if the member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) made the promise and the pledge he did in that by-election, and made it conditional on the people voting for the Conservative candidate, we have turned a new page in the history of elections in this country. But bad as that may seem, that is only an attempt to bribe a single constituency. I am sorry that the Minister of the Interior is not in his seat, because the next reference I have to make is to him. The Richelieu case was an attempt to bribe a single constituency, but in language as plain as he dared put it, the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) at the famous banquet in Regina on the 10th of June last, attempted to bribe the whole province of Saskatchewan.

Previous to the elections of September, 1911, the Prime Minister, then leader of the Opposition, made a tour of the West, and made certain definite, well defined pledges to the people of Western Canada. Amongst other things he made the pledge that, if he were returned to power, he would take immediate steps to turn over to the various provinces of the West their natural resources in the shape of timber, minerals, land, &c. He made that pledge absolutely without reservation, so far as my knowledge and information goes, and I think I am perfectly correct in my statement. He made it, not once, but dozens and dozens of times.

When the Prime Minister was making that tour, we thought he was at least fair and honest in the pledges he was giving the people. We did not anticipate that he was going to have an opportunity of making good those pledges, and I don't think he thought so himself. The opportunity, however came to him, whether it was a surprise to him or not, and to-day he and the members of his Government are face to face with those pledges. The Prime Minister did not tell the people of the West, 'We will give you your natural resources if you vote Tory, or if you vote Grit.' No string was attached to his pledge and promise which was, 'We will give you your natural resources.' This is the second session of this House. I have read the Speech from the Throne from beginning to end several times, and I fail to find a single reference in that speech to this ante-election pledge of the Prime Minister. It seems very strange to me that the Prime Minister has not one single word to say about this pledge; but the Minister of the Interior, then Secretary of State, at the banquet in Regina on the 10th of June last, made a plea to the people of the province of Saskatchewan, which was not justified by the course of events in the months preceding the making of his speech, because it ought to be in the information of this House that, although the Liberal party did accept the terms given to those provinces in the Autonomy Bills, for the time being, subsequent to that settlement the Liberal party and the legislature of Saskatchewan placed themselves on record as demanding the turning over of the natural resources of those provinces to the provincial government. That request was not made in view of any change in the Federal Government at all, as the resolutions were passed by the Alberta and Sasatchewan legislatures previous to the Dominion election by which the Liberal party went out of office. They were made presumably to a Liberal Government with every hope and expectation that the demand would be pressed home upon a Liberal Government here at Ottawa. The Liberal party took the position that the Prime Minister was a man of his word. We only knew what he had said in Opposition; we did not know what course he would map out for himself when he became leader of the Government; but in Opposition he had taken a high stand. What does his minister say to the people of the province of Saskatchewan? He addresses himself to the whole province at this banquet in Regina, just four weeks before the election in that province, and, as plain as words could put it, he told the people of the province of Saskatchewan that if they wanted their natural resources it was their inevitable duty to vote for Mr. Haultain, the leader of the Conservatives in that province. We blame the member for Charlevoix (Mr. Forget) for attempting to bribe a constituency. Here is a Minister of the Crown attempting to bribe a whole province. No man can read the words of the present Minister of the Interior at that banquet, giving those words the fairest possible interpretation that can be given them, and take any other meaning out of his words than that the province of Saskatchewan may expect their natural resources restored to them if they vote for the Conservative party in the pending provincial elections, and that they need not look for that turning over of their natural resources if they do not vote in the way indicated; notwithstanding the fact that when we had a Liberal Government holding office here at Ottawa, the whole legislature of the province of Saskatchewan had made an insistent demand upon that Government that those natural resources should be restored to them.

I wish to call the attention of this Government to a condition of affairs now existing in the West. They are probably aware of these conditions, because I believe they have taken certain steps to ameliorate them. Last year there was a serious congestion at the head of the lakes, and that experience is being repeated this year. Of course we would not have reciprocity, but we have had to go to the Inter-State Commerce Commission, so that we might get a through rate to the American inland ports for the purpose of storing our grain. Of course we do not want reciprocity. But just recently, I understand, the coasting laws have been suspended in relation to our inland waters, so that American bottoms can furnish storage at the head of the lakes during the winter months for the grain of our western country. We do not want reciprocity, but we are going to use American bottoms for storing our grain during the coming winter. We heard something a short time ago about keeping navigation open at the head of the lakes for a longer time. But I understand that navigation is closing now and apparently nothing has been done by the Government to carry out the promise given through the press that navigation would be kept open at least a month longer.

Let me further call attention to the fact that the terminal facilities at the head of the lakes are totally inadequate to meet the conditions of the West this year, or any year. Those facilities must be enormously increased in the very near future. Of course the Prime Minister told us that they would take over and operate the terminal elevators at the head of the lakes. The Minister of Public Works announced last summer, at this same notable banquet,

that the Government had purchased forty-seven acres at Fort William to build terminal elevators. I suppose the land could be used for storage facilities by dumping the grain on the ground, but no further provision seems to have been made by the Government for storage facilities at the head of the lakes; certainly no facilities are available at the present moment. If this Government is not capable of meeting the congested conditions from year to year, they can at least render one great service to the people of the West, and that is by assisting in every possible way the investigation that is going on before the Board of Railway Commissioners into the freight and express charges that are so burdensome to our people. And the Government can bring their influence to bear in favour of an appreciable reduction in the freight and express charges for the benefit of the consumers throughout Western Canada.

I am not going to discuss the matter that will be before us in a very short time, the question of Canada's part in the defence of the Empire. I have only this to say, that if I have any knowledge of the sentiments of the people whom I represent in this House, they are prepared to stand by the position taken by this Parliament in March, 1909, and will give unfaltering support to their representatives in enacting any proper measure by which Canada will take her part in sustaining and strengthening the Empire's defences as well as her own.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): I ask the indulgence of the House for a short time while I refer to some of the questions mentioned in the Address, some questions not mentioned in the Address, and some questions that have been raised in the debate. In justice to the amendment that has been placed before us, I refer to that first. We have tried in the province of Ontario to keep our elections fairly clean, and to use fair methods in them. It was something of a shock to me to hear the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) say what he said about the way he was treated in the Macdonald election. Following the hon. gentleman from Humboldt (Mr. Neely), and taking my cue from the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce), I believe that that question ought to be referred to the committee of this House which has charge of Privileges and Elections, or to a special committee, for thorough investigation. I am willing, in the general interest, to try to elevate our public life, especially the holding of elections, and to take any steps that will end in improving present conditions. We can elevate our public life, and it is the duty of men on both sides of politics, especially those who have the honour of seats in this House, to see that a man can vote in an election and that, no matter what his views may be, he can have an opportunity of recording his vote. I believe that is the sentiment of the people of this country; I know it is the sentiment of the people in my own province. And in my own experience in elections, especially in my own riding, we have never had any trouble in having a fair vote and fair treatment of each side by the other.

Now, I wish to refer to the question of cable rates. We are promised a further reduction in cable rates. We already have something in the way of reduction, and we may get something more. The companies signified a short time ago that they proposed to reduce the cable tolls between the Mother Country and Canada. But there will never be a substantial reduction of the cable tolls in this country until Canada has the courage to say that we intend to build a state-owned cable between Canada and the Mother Country and to implement and strengthen the cable line that is now owned by different members of the Empire between Australia and Canada. The cable monopoly which, until a short time ago, had its headquarters in London, but now has its headquarters in the United States, is one of the great monopolies of the world. It will never move in the direction of reduction of rates until it is compelled to do so. The moment it was known, some time ago that Canada was considering a proposal to establish a state-owned cable, they began to make reductions. That fact is sufficient encouragement to our Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), who has given great attention to the matter, to move now, and out of the great surplus Canada has to-day to build and equip a state-owned cable between the Motherland and Canda.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): We have had enough experience now. The former Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) confirms what I say by his 'Hear, hear;' and I exceedingly regret that when he was dealing with the question he had not the disposition to take the stand I now advocate. But I gather from his approving 'Hear, hear' that he is of opinion that the way to get cheaper tolls is by a state-owned cable. I have stated in this House what I learned from information carefully gathered in London some years ago, that the lobby maintained by the cable interests in London had effectually stopped the reduction of cable rates for years and years, and the same will be effective unless this country and the Mother Country take action. England will have to join us in this matter as soon as we say it must be. The onus will not rest upon Canada of starting a

state-owned cable; the Mother Country will have to come in. All that is needed is for Canada to say through this House of Commons and through the Government that we propose to bind the Empire together by a state-owned cable as well as by a system of defence. There is more to be made out of great combinations in matters of trade and closer exchange of public opinion than there is by ships and sailors and regiments of men.

An important question not referred to in the Speech from the Throne is Senate reform. I would like to see some reform of the Senate. Five years more will complete the first half century of our experience with our constitution, the British North America Act, and as it is evident from our experience that some reforms are needed in various directions, a serious attempt to improve our constitution should be made. Reform is brought about in two ways ; we can get it by appeal to the Mother of Parliaments for increased power or we can do it, I believe, by action in this House. I would suggest that as we are approaching the completion of our first half century under our constitution, the government of the day ought to move by inviting the provinces and others to join in a consultation as to how the constitution ought to be improved, and this House ought specially to debate in what way the Senate can be improved. The Senate, of course, is not what it ought to be. Perhaps this House is not what it ought to be, but the people can do something with this House, while they cannot do anything with the Senate. The people of the Motherland, in the Old Country, have found a way of reforming the House of Lords, and it was done in the House of Commons and on the public platform before the people of the country. Something must be done in this country and in this House, so I say that as a House here and as members representing the people, the question of Senate reform is well worth discussion in the House and before the people of the country. A Senate such as we have to-day is an anachronism, and I believe everybody will admit, in fact the Senate will admit it themselves, that some way of improving the character of the Senate, making it more amenable to public opinion, is in order. I trust that a remedy will be forth-coming within a reasonable time.

I come now to the naval policy. I am in favour of an immediate gift, in favour of a Canadian navy and a closer alliance between the Mother Country and the Overseas Dominions, looking to a complete Imperial unity in Imperial defence, and as consequent of that, that we have a proportionate voice in the shaping of the policy of the Empire. I made

two speeches in this House on that question. I was in favour of an immediate gift and of a Canadian navy. I am of that opinion still, I have no change to make in my position. As to an immediate contribution, I would have preferred that it had been made two or three sessions ago and that it had been made without conditions, that it had been spontaneous. I congratulate the Government of today that they intend to make a contribution. I hope it will be a substantial one. But inasmuch as it is an immediate contribution and based on emergency, I wish it had been made two years ago, or last year, even now I wish that that contribution was spontaneous and that it came from Canada and the people of Canada without any conference with the Imperial authorities whatsoever. The onus has now been put in some degree on the Imperial authorities of making a request on us for that contribution. I believe that the people of Canada from one end of the country to the other would have voted for a spontaneous contribution and a large one, and if it had gone forward to a listening world that Canada was behind the Empire with a spontaneous and a generous contribution they would have heard it and the Chancelleries of Europe would have recognized that there was a new power in the world that they had to deal with and that the Empire had a great colony if you wish to call it so, a great associated state, behind her in maintaining the defence of that Empire. Later on it must come, if we make a contribution or if we do not make it, if we wish to remain in the Empire we must have a definition of our relation to the Empire in the matter of Imperial defence.

Mr. EMMERSON: A moment ago my hon. friend said that if any contribution were made now, it was at the request of the British Government. Does my hon. friend mean us to understand that he is aware of any request having been made by the British Government for a cash contribution, or for a contribution?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): No, I do not. I am only taking what I read and the statement made in the British House the other day, that the Prime Minister undertook to disclose an invitation which had been given to the Canadian Government and which would be first handed out in the Canadian House. Whether it is a request or not I do not know, but as I said, in the emergency, I would have liked to have seen a contribution, a generous one, made spontaneously and, so made or made as it will be, it will receive the unanimous support of the people of Canada. Our future relations with the

Empire must be a matter of consultation, of conference and of very careful consideration and can only be evolved with time. The British system of government is a very peculiar one. The great mistake made by the Nationalists of Quebec in opposing any contribution to a navy policy is due to their lack of appreciation of the spirit of the British constitution. Mr. Bourassa is a very acute man, but his mind is so constituted that he wants a mathematical and exact proposition in regard to government. That is not the British practice, that is not the way in which things are worked out under our system of government. They work out gradually and the insticts and the patriotism of the people are relied on in matters of defence rather than any fixed agreement between different parties or any agreement that might be put in a State document as to what the relation of an associated State with the Empire were to be. I say they made a great mistake when they asked for a mathematical definition as to just where we were to be in the Empire, and just how much we were to give to the Empire and just how much say we would have in the Empire. That will all be worked out, but it cannot be worked out beforehand; and when a condition of emergency exists or when we think an emergent condition exists, it is not a matter of exact statement. It is a matter that will be governed by the instincts and the patriotism of the people and I believe to-day that is the attitude of the people of Canada.

As to a Canadian navy, I said in this House on at least two occasions that I believed in a Canadian navy, because I believe in sea power as the back-bone of national life in the world to-day. Sea power is the thing that upholds England to-day wherever she is on the face of the globe and if we are to be of the Empire we, too, must have sea power. We must have sea power, we must be prepared to build ships, we must be prepared to man them; we must be prepared to fight in them, and, if necessary, I say now that I am in favour of a compulsory naval service in Canada in the interests of the country and of the Empire.

If you believe in sea power, you must train your sons to build your ships, to man them, and to fight in them. The days of peace are not yet come. There must be some way of becoming a sea power, and the only one way is by working it out. We have a people in this country who are able to take charge of a navy, and to fight in a navy. We live on two oceans. We are on the Atlantic, and we are on the Pacific, and not only Canada's present condition but her future requires that we have naval power in this country, and seek to develop it. We look out on the Pacific, which is even greater than the Atlantic, and my contention is that within the lives of the rising generation the centre of the Empire will be on this North American continent, between these two great oceans.

Mr. WILSON (Laval): Not in England.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): No; there is a greater England coming on the North American continent; that is my hope and dream, and we see it coming every day. As to having a navy of our own, and building it ourselves, it seems to me that we ought to be able to build not only a navy but the merchant marine we require here in Canada. We have great fleets of our own on the Atlantic, we are getting them on the Pacific, and we will have more and more of them. We have everything in this country that goes to the building of these ships and a policy of naval defence, based on the idea of a Canadian navy, will stimulate the building of our merchant ships in our own materials. I have been in favour of a great ship building industry stimulated by some act of the Government for a good many years. The day is coming, not now in an emergency, but at any early period, when, in connection with our naval policy, the building of ships shall become a great industry of our own. We have everything necessary. All that is wanted is for the people to take advantage of the opportunity, and to make Canada not only great on land, as she is, but great in commerce, and make her, as I believe she is destined to be, the centre of the Empire, and mistress of all the seas, having her commerce on every ocean of the globe.

Now, I want to pass from the question of the navy,which, while a great question, is, to my mind, a question of an hour as compared with that of transportation, which was referred to by the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely); and for a few moments I will discuss that question of transportation as it presents itself to me, in view of all the conditions that exist in this country, and especially in view of the cry of the people of Western Canada for better transportation facilities. Great grievances in regard to transportation do exist in the West. They also exist here in the East, and the problem for us in this House is to find some way of relieving the conditions that exist, of granting substantial and immediate relief to the people of the West, and in other parts of the country. While I have always been friendly to and have supported the idea of the Railway Commission, my contention is that the relief the people want most cannot come from the Railway Commission, but must come

from this House of Commons; and I propose to show the House just where relief can be effected. The question of lower rates in the West, and of rates that are discriminative in the West, has gone before the Railway Commission, and there it has become practically a legal battle which will take years to fight to a conclusion. On the lines along which that investigation is proceeding, lawyers arguments and all kinds of impediments are offered to an early settlement, and it does look to me that the only way to get relief is for this House to intervene. How can this House intervene in this great question of transportation? Let me point out one or two defects in the present Railway Act. There is an absence of a provision for the appointment of expert legal assistance in order to enforce the Act. I have pointed out in this House several times that in the United States, whenever they appointed any great public service commission, or passed a law that was for the benefit of the community, they made provision in the law for its enforcement, and especially, they made provision for the employment of permanent counsel to enforce the law. In the United States they have permanent counsel for the enforcement of the Inter State Commerce Act. We have not any permanent counsel appointed to appear before our Railway commission. In some cases we have appointed special counsel, but they have gone into the cases without experience and without any definite instructions; they have had to feel their way. We should adopt the American system. We have adopted largely their railway act, and we should follow them and appoint expert counsel to enforce that law, and fight the battles of the public before that commission. We should have two kinds of expert counsel in the service of the State, a class of counsel that is expert in the matter of rates, and another set of counsel that is expert in the operation of railways, and in the relation of railways to the public, to municipalities or to communities. There are two sides to the Railway Act. There is a side that controls the service and the rates given to the community; and there is also a side that controls the building and operation of railways, and their treatment of the public as individuals and communities. And we ought to have two sides to that Railway Commission, and especially in regard to the counsel appointed to enforce the Act, we ought to have experts in both departments, to fight the battles of the people. It is not fair to tell the public: 'You go to the Railway Commission and fight your own battles,' or to say to a small community: 'You must go to the Railway Commission and fight your own battle.' There ought to be expert counsel in the service of the state to see that the Act is properly enforced.

Mr. WILSON (Laval): Does the hon. member favour the idea of having also counsel for the public before that commission?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): My contention is that the state should appoint counsel to enforce the railway law, just as it appoints a Crown attorney to enforce the criminal law.

Mr. WILSON (Laval): What about the petitioners?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): The petitioners can join and have their counsel. The thing to do is what the provinces in the West have done. They have appointed counsel to enforce the law. My own province of Ontario has been derelict in its duty in so far that it has not appeared before that commission by counsel in order to get justice for the province. But the greatest defect of this Railway Act is that it lacks definitions, and my contention is that we should put in some definitions in order to get speedy action and speedy justice. It is a matter of investigation as to what the Railway Commission ought to do in dealing with grievances before them. We have put very few definitions into the Railway Act for the guidance of the commissioners; in fact, I have a little memorandum here which makes my point clear.

The definitive clauses of the Railway Act, so far as they apply to rates, are found in sections 314 et seq. The railway company is to propose the rates, classification, &c., and submit same to the Railway Commission. The Act requires: (1) equality of treatment for patrons and freedom from discrimination, but the company may charge less for larger quantities, greater numbers and longer distances than the charge proportionately for smaller quantities, lesser number and shorter distances; (2) the company may not charge more for a short haul than for a long haul in which the short haul is included except to meet competition; (3) the company must give equal facilities to other companies and shippers in the matter of receiving, forwarding and delivering freight and must not give undue preference to one shopper or locality over another or to one kind of freight over another.

These definitions are very general and they are open to wide interpretations when applied to particular cases. While the Act says there must be no discrimination against localities, the great grievance of the West to-day is the discrimination against the West because it is the West. Railway rates to-day are higher in the West than they are in the East. Why should

it be so? The West contributes as much to the building of these roads as did the East. They are all national roads, they stretch from one ocean to the other, there ought to be equality of treatment by these railways from one ocean to the other and the West should not be discriminated against. There is no specific declaration in the Railway Act that tnere shall not be territorial discrimination; in fact, the claim is made that if the Act is properly interpreted, it is justifiable. The railways have their counsel before the commission —and there is an army of them—trying to justify the position that the great Railway Act, which was passed for the relief of the people of all Canada, justifies territorial discrimination in regard to railway, passenger, freight, and express rates. A remedy has been provided by the Act of the commission with regard to passenger rates but it is only in this respect that such action has been taken. We in this House, if we wish to benefit the West, if we wish to listen to the voice of the West—and the people there clamouring for relief—must realize it to be our duty this session to put it into the Railway Act that there shall be no discrimination against the West or any other portion of the country. All portions contributed to the building of these railways. These railways have been built and are running by virtue of the money contributed by the people of all Canada. Lands were given to them, cash was given to them, their bonds are being endorsed by this Parliament for millions and millions of dollars and members from the West are voting for the endorsement of these bonds by the Dominion of Canada and are not putting in the protest: Not another bond shall be endorsed until we get equality of treatment in regard to transportation, and until it is put into the Railway Act that there shall be no discrimination against the West in the matter of any kind of railway rates. If this Parliament wishes to give substantial relief to the people of the West let it put into the Railway Act a clause prohibiting discrimination against any locality as compared with any other locality, or, to put it still more plainly, that there shall be no territorial discrimination of any kind. I may overstep myself somewhat in putting the case of the people of the West in the words of the Grain Growers' Guide which I received a day or two ago but, I find on the first page of that journal, the following statement:

> Who Deserves Most?
>
> The railway, manufacturing and banking magnates are always seeking privileges from Parliament and urging compensation for the great sacrifices (?) they have made in 'building up Canada.' Do they ever consider the real sacrifices being made daily without a murmur by thousands and tens of thousands of men and women in log cabins on the edge of western civilization many miles from railways, schools, churches and doctors, rearing their families and developing the country in the face of physical, social and spiritual privations? A grateful nation might well afford some recognition to these hardy pioneers doing the necessary labour that others shrink from, rather than to heartlessly hand them over to be plundered further by those who dwell in luxury, with every convenience ministering to their comfort.

That may be overstatement, but the people and the pioneers of the West are being stigmatized by this Parliament in allowing them to be charged more for transportation than the people of the East, and it is the duty of Parliament therefore to come to their relief and not send them to the Railway Commission, where they must argue their case and have it hung up for years, by a distinct declaration that will remove that injustice and will ensure to these people the same treatment that we have in the East. What have we to offer the people who settle our West if we say that the first gift that we shall bestow upon them is that they must pay higher railway rates than we pay in the East, and that the railway companies that we have created and subsidized shall be allowed to make higher express and freight charges in the West than those which they make in the East? All our Western railways are overburdened with business and they cannot accommodate the traffic. They are not struggling railways; the Canadian Pacific railway is paying 10 per cent dividend and cutting melons for the benefit of its shareholders, while at the same time unfairly charging the people of the West for transportation. There is not a railway in the West that is not doing a thriving business. Railways are built in the West for less than they are built in the East. There is no justification for this unfair treatment, and the people of the West, when they come to us with this main issue, will demand that they be given relief. They are presenting their case for better facilities in the way of transportation, and they are getting them. The grain is being handled more expeditiously. The farmer of the West is to get relief under the new Bank Act in the way of being able to borrow money on his grain and live stock, but still that is not the relief he wants. The relief he wants is lower freight, express, and passenger rates. How do I propose to reach the passenger question? I propose to reach that question by putting a provision in the Railway Act that the maximum passenger rate on every railway running across the continent shall not exceed two cents a mile. They have so many passen-

gers on both the Western and Eastern roads that they cannot handle them. They would make more money under a two-cent rate than they do with a three-cent rate and they should allow the people to travel by the road of their choice. When they give concessions now, it is on the condition that you have to travel both going and coming on the one road. If you want to go to Edmonton, you should be allowed to go by the Grand Trunk Pacific and come back by the Canadian Pacific railway if it suited you. But, the railways say: If we give you a reduction you must travel both ways on our road. They will give a reduction once or twice a year, at fair time and at Christmas, but I want the people to have the lowest possible passenger rate all over the country from one ocean to the other, and the only way to secure that is to put it into the Railway Act. By putting it in the Railway Act it will come immediately into force, and it will take a lot of work out of the hands of the Railway Commission which it is not very competent to do.

There is another thing that wants to be defined by this House. We have never yet told the Railway Commission what our views are in regard to the proportionate charges on express matter, on passengers, on freight, and on the telegraph service. The railways are taking toll from the people of Canada for all these things, and it has never yet been defined how much should be put on the passengers, how much on the user of telegraphs, how much on the user of the express service, how much on freight. There ought to be a readjustment of that. Better still, I would like to see the whole tolls of railways confined practically to passenger and freight service. If we once put into the Act a definition as to what the maximum passenger rate should be and define what the freight rates should be, then it would be an easy thing for the Railway Commission to say what was a fair charge, and their whole energy could be devoted to finding out what were fair passenger and freight charges in this country, based on the idea of absolute equality of treatment. For instance, the two big railways in Canada have told the people of Toronto and of Ontario that they are not to have a suburban service out of the city of Toronto, or commutation tickets, such as are given in the city of Montreal. That is a discrimination against that community and it has existed for years. I brought it up in this House, I brought it up at my own expense before the Railway Commission. The city of Toronto brought it before the Railway Commission; and it is hanging up there yet and will I suppise hang there for years until this House inserts in the Act a clear definition providing that if the railways give the city of Montreal a suburban service with commutation tickets, they must give a similar treatment to the city of Toronto, which is more in need of it than Montreal. We have heard the railways contend in the courts that they are not governed by the Railway Act in that matter, that it is a matter of grace on their part to give it to Montreal and to deny it to Toronto. That must be settled by the Railway Act and relief must be given.

My idea is that to make the Railway Act more effective and more rapid in giving relief, this Parliament must insert certain definitions which should have been in the Act long ago. We should not leave the policy of the country in regard to railway charges, to any commission when the jurisdiction is in Parliament. And, if it takes weeks and months of our time, we should devote ourselves to finding out what are reasonable definitions in regard to the questions I have raised in this House to-night and on many an occasion before.

How do I propose to deal with telegraph and express charges? The day has come in Canada when we must have state-owned telegraph lines and we should now take the lines over from the railways. These telegraph lines are in connection with the postal system in every country in Europe, and they should be in Canada also. If the telegraph companies do not agree to surrender the lines at a fair price, let us go into the telegraph business on our own account in connection with the post office, and let us begin at the productive end of the business. We have state-owned telegraphs in Canada, but we put them in Godforsaken places where there is hardly any telegraph business. Put a state-owned line between Toronto and Montreal and between Toronto and Ottawa, and chain it up with Winnipeg and the West, and telegraph tolls will be cut in two. The telegraph rates to-day are higher in the West than they are in the East and the telegraph companies of Canada, with the exception of the Canadian Pacific railway, are more or less under the control of that great combination and monopoly which controls the cables, and which controls the Bell Telephone Company in the United States. And this monopoly has an effective club even over the Canadian Pacific railway as to telegraph and cable rates. We in Canada are at the mercy of a great monopoly in the United States, which will never be broken until we undertake to start a state-owned telegraph system in connection with the post office. The time is ripe for it. No harm will come from asking the railway companies to surrender their telegraph lines at a fair compensation, and if they do not listen to us the state will be justified in building its own lines. The railways should not be in the express business; they are not in the

express business in Europe; their charges in Canada are extortionate; their charges in the United States have been proven to be grossly exorbitant; and the people of the United States have sought relief in a parcel post system which will go into effect in a few days. We are told here that we should wait to see how the American experiment turns out, but it is my belief that we should go ahead for ourselves and start immediate competitions by parcel post with the express companies so as to give immediate relief. Then, if that were done, telegraph charges and express charges would practically disappear from the transportation question, and we would have only two questions to be dealt with by the Railway Commission, namely, what is a fair passenger rate and what is a fair freight rate.

There is another thing that must be cured, and the people are demanding it, and that is the matter of classification, and the matter of commodity charges on freight. I believe there are only ten classes in the tariffs as prepared by the railways, but there are so many variations in regard to commodities and so many divisions, and so many favours granted and so many other requests for favours refused, that the ordinary citizen is mystified. It ought to be stated in the Act that the Railway Commission should be ordered to simplify the classification and the commodity rating. There are so many different freight definitions now made by the railways that the ordinary man cannot possibly know what they mean. One relief to the West would be if that classification were reduced, and especially the list of commodity charges, and the variations in connection therewith. Why should one class of the community, because it is engaged in manufacturing business and produces a certain article, have a favour as against another class. Why should the makers of bricks have their commodity placed in a better position than the producers of cement or lumber. It is only a matter of favour, and there should not be those divisions in the classification, and the railways should not be allowed to make commodity rates under the very wide interpretation permitted to them in connection with railway charges. I hope that this will be one of the things taken up by Parliament at an early date. There is another thing we can do and we are trying to do it, but we are doing it very slowly—one way of regulating the railways, and especially as long as they discriminate and make these unfair charges, is to extend the system of state-owned railways. Probably a crisis has been reached in connection with the National Transcontinental railway, but as to that I am not yet aware of the facts.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): I thought this Government was going to do that—it was in their platform.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Do what?

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): State-owned railways.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I am waiting to see, but there is a question coming up, as I understand it, in connection with the Transcontinental railway (and on that I am waiting information), which may have an important bearing on the whole matter. An opportunity may arise of settling the question and of securing fair treatment through an extension of the principle of a state-owned railway. It is coming much more rapidly than some of us think. We own a railway to-day, and it is coming to be one of the greatest assets of Canada. We must put it in touch with the province of Ontario, we ought to put it in touch with the other provinces, and we ought to put it in touch with the Transcontinental road. We may have a state-owned railway in the West, and this country has got plenty of money now at Ottawa that will enable it to get the state-owned lines. The province of Ontario has begun a policy, a little weak-kneed at the start, but it will develop, and that it is the proposal of Mr. Beck to apply the hydro-electric system of power to a system of local public owned railways, owned partly by municipalities and partly by the province, that will put these roads in competition with the big roads and their excessive charges. We have just as many railway grievances in Ontario as the people have in the West. There is discrimination, unfair treatment, excessive charges, and the only relief will come from action by the whole of the people of Canada, in their organizations, as cities or as provinces or as a Dominion, seeking relief in regard to transportation by state-owned railways, by fighting the railways through public organizations and by public counsel as they are doing in the West to-day. I commend the provinces of the West for sending their own solicitors to fight the battles of the people before the Railway Commission. A number of other things, however, remain to be done. When the people come to us demanding relief, we must not send them back to the Railway Commission, which is not sufficiently instructed as to how it ought to treat these questions. My contention is that we ought to give the Railway Commission further instructions by the insertion of definitions in this Railway Act that would secure fairer treatment, lower rates, and still give the railways an opportunity to make reasonable returns on their investments, and the railways must be made to see, like every other corporation, that with their franchise goes a duty. The

railways in this country have taken the position that they have a franchise to do as they like. They have a franchise, in consideration of doing a duty and giving a service, but the great railway magnates of this country spend most of their time considering questions of finance, such as cutting melons and things of that sort, rather than giving service. We must bring the railways before us in this House, and ask them to justify their conduct in respect of these excessive charges, and make them recognize the fact that they were given a franchise for fair treatment and public service, and if they do not give that fair treatment and public service, that franchise is subject to cancellation and reconsideration.

I want to deal now with another question that has occupied the attention of the people of Canada in a remarkable way during the past summer, and that is the arrogance of the Canadian Pacific railway in regard to stock-watering and cutting enormous melons, which it has distributed amongst its shareholders. This, I think is the worst thing ever done by a public body in this country of ours. I have put a question on the Order Paper, but as it has not been reached yet, I cannot speak exactly. So far as I can gather, however, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company made some application to the Government to increase its stock, at least that was the current rumour. Then they chose to act on their own initiative, and distributed sums of money amongst their shareholders which was practically taken out of the pockets of the Canadian people who pay freight rates. They did it arrogantly. Perhaps they did it in defiance of the Government. I do not know, because the facts have not come out, but that action of the Canadian Pacific railway in issuing stock bearing a high dividend of ten per cent, which they claim the right to charge on it, instead of issuing debenture stock or bonds which could be put out at a much lower rate, is in defiance of the people of Canada, and they have set up the principle that they can do what they like in regard to watering their stock. I have brought it up in this House and spoken almost without any support when I did so. I know on one occasion I could hardly get a seconder. I predicted that this would be continued if Parliament was so indifferent, and they have continued it now for years, and they propose to do so hereafter. I sat in this House when the Canadian Pacific railway had a capital of only $65,000,000, and when they came one day to this House for a small increase in their capital, I made a suggestion that the Government of Canada should take up that comparatively small amount of stock, which was then to be had at par, and in that way practically become a large partner, and soon come into control of that railway. I was laughed at on that occasion as I have often been laughed at in this House, but what I said has come true, and the opportunity has passed. From what it had then, it has gradually gone on in its arrogance until it defies the people, it defies Parliament, and while in the last stock-watering it proceeded by asking for the consent of the Governor in Council, this time it ignored the Governor in Council, and put out a great stock-watering proposition, so far as I can gather, without any authority, or with only a questionable clause in its legislation some years ago.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think my hon. friend is wrong in saying that the Canadian Pacific railway have made that distribution. So far as I can understand, they cannot make that distribution and cut that melon without the actual consent of the Government.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I hope the hon. gentleman is right, and I will be very glad to assist the Government in making that point good. They have sent out circulars that they are going to do it, and the responsibility rests on the Government of the day to see that they do not do it.

Mr. TURRIFF: They can stop it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): It is the most demoralizing thing in Canada. This stock-watering business is an unworthy business; it is against all public policy, and has been stopped wherever it has been attempted.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): How does my hon. friend call it stock-watering.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Anything is stock-watering that raises money expensively to the people who have to pay the rates and dividends on the stock. It is raising money in a way that is unfair to the people. It is not quite stock-watering of a character that I am going to speak about in a short time, but it is a wrongful act, and it is against the solemn compact which was entered into between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Government of Canada in the Canadian Pacific Railway Act, that their tariff of freight charges was to be governed by the cost of that railway, and this has never been investigated, and to-day by means of issuing stock in this way, instead of taking ten per cent on what the road actually cost, they are taking ten per cent on a capital much more than the railway ever cost. They are treating the people unfairly; they are doing something that no community

should allow, and the result is the control of the Canadian Pacific railway to-day is in the hands of foreigners.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean, York) will permit me, he is dealing in general statements regarding this matter. I would like him to distinguish somewhat carefully as between what the Canadian Pacific railway has done in this matter and what is done by any mercantile company under the Companies Act or under an ordinary act of incorporation.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I am coming to that. To-night I am only making general statements. But I intend to go into details, and especially the details with regard to the Canadian Pacific railway. When they sell stock at $175 which is worth from $260 to $280——

Mr. TURRIFF: It is at $266 to-day.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Very well, $266; I say that when they do that they are doing an unfair thing. But they go to the Railway Commission and say freights must be high because they have to pay ten per cent dividends on their stock. They could raise all the money they require on a four per cent debenture, or, on a five per cent debenture. The result would be that we should need to pay only half the rates we pay at the present time. I say that the men who are doing this are foreigners, as the men who are raiding us in cable and telegraph rates are foreigners. And that foreign element that controls the Canadian Pacific railway will charge these enhanced rates at the expense of the Canadian people as long as the House of Commons allows them to do it. I had hopes and anticipations that I should see that great Canadian Pacific railway owned by our own Canadian people; I had hoped that they would eventually buy the stock. But the stock has been so hoisted, it has been so distributed in Europe among these people—do you think we shall ever recover it? There is a new slavery coming in this country; the Canadian people are being put into slavery in the interests of foreign capitalists who take unfair advantage of their position. And we are so pusillanimous in this House that we do not prevent it. What is to be the attitude of the Parliament of Canada—not on the naval question, not even on the question of reciprocity, but on this question of the exploitation of the Canadian Pacific railway? Sir Thomas Shaughnessy — Colonel Shaughnessy of the Hugheseliers—may think that he runs the Canadian Pacific railway, but it is not Sir Thomas Shaughnessy who runs it, nor is it run for the benefit of Canada; it is run by a committee of foreigners who issue instructions in regard to its financial policy——

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What evidence has the hon. gentleman of that?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I see it every day. I see the conduct of the railway. I will give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) a chance to explain the conduct of the railway when I come to the details—and I am coming to them. In the meantime, I commend to the attention of the hon. gentleman the little book I have here, which I found in my post-office box the other day, 'The Canadian Pacific railway and its capitalization.'

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is not the increase of capital authorized by meeting of shareholders?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Of course. Shareholders love to authorize these things. They turn out by proxy. The proxies of the Canadian Pacific railway and the control of them are owned in Holland, and there is a little syndicate in Holland that has the say. I want my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) to read this little book in regard to the capitalization of the Canadian Pacific railway. If he has not a copy, I will try to procure him one.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Who is the author?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): the author is the Winnipeg Free Press, a paper that is taking great interest in railway questions in the West and is doing great service to the people of Canada by dealing in a fair and effective way with the railway problems of this country. If my hon. friend wants more information, I ask him to read this book. But I expect to give him fuller information later on.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): The hon. gentleman is not giving it to-night.

Mr. NESBITT: Before the hon. gentleman sits down, will he please give us the names of the foreign potentates who govern the Canadian Pacific railway? I thought Sir Thomas Shaughnessy governed it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Sir Thomas Shaughnessy is elected by foreign shareholders, and large blocks of the shares are syndicated in Holland and Germany. The details of it I cannot give, but the facts are before us and the stock manipulation is before us, and the working of the Canadian people to pay 10 per cent on the stock that was given to these shareholders for $175 which should have been sold for $250 for the benefit of the undertaking is before us. The things that were given to

the Canadian Pacific railway, including the lands, the hundreds of miles of completed railway, and the exemptions and other things, were given 'for the benefit of the undertaking' and, as, I think, the last clause in the contract says, 'for the maintenance of that railway for ever.' They were to use the capitalization of the company to the best advantage of the undertaking and not to benefit themselves. And I say they could have raised all they want on four per cent debenture stock. They could have used the enormous surplus which they now have in their coffers to construct the works which they are to construct with the money they are to raise by the proposed stock issue. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company to-day has millions of cash in its coffers. It has securities that it could sell at an enormous increase on the prices paid for it. And they could sell their lands, I am told that they have $75,000,000 of real estate in the city of Vancouver alone that they got from the people of Canada. Why then should the company raise money for the benefit of the undertaking by this most expensive method which leaves millions in the hands of shareholders who laugh at the people of Canada and at anybody who protests against this thing. We should have kept the capitalization at the lowest point—at $100,000,000—or even $50,000,000, and should have forced them to raise money by other means than the sale of stock, or, if the sale of stock was allowed it should have been upon the condition that the stock was sold at the highest price obtainable and the proceeds all put into the treasury of the company and not into the pockets of shareholders. I am going to argue this question in this House as long as I am able as I have argued it outside of this House; and I know that the feeling of the people is that an infamous thing was done in that business, and that it must stop; and that this Parliament——

Mr. LEMIEUX: Are not the rates of the Canadian Pacific railway under the control of the Railway Commission?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): No, I have never consented to that doctrine, though many lawyers have asserted it in this House.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): Sir Allen Aylesworth said they were.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I do not care. He is not here, and I am here. I have read the Act to the best of my ability, and I believe that the right to investigate what the actual cost of the railway was is still in this House. I have heard the lawyers in this House argue the contrary, and they have put me down at times in that kind of argument.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understood the Canadian Pacific railway had accepted the control of rates by the Railway Commission.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): But I have not, as a citizen foregone any right that I had for my protection under that Act. They like to say that, and also that they go under the Railway Commission. They like to hang up the question of rates in a long argument that cannot be settled for seventeen years——

Mr. LEMIEUX: But they have accepted the Railway Commission.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I do not care. I say that here is protection for the people in the original Act. That has never been vindicated, but it ought to be vindicated.

Mr. CURRIE: The original Act places control in the Minister of Public Works, not in Parliament. The Minister of Public Works alone has power to review these matters.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): There is a clause there which says that the freight rates shall be governed by the actual cost of the railway. It is there still, it is still efficacious and still in the interests of the people that any rights we have under it should be vindicated.

I wish to discuss another class of stock-watering, real stock-watering—and we are having a great deal of it these days. Gentlemen from the West, and perhaps the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) were interested in cement charges. The cement industry in Canada is controlled by a gentleman who effected a merger of the cement factories. A new class of men have come forward in connection with financial operations. There was a day when a man was a manufacturer and built up his business and bred his son to his business, looked after it, cultivated it, and built it up and made some money. Now a gentleman has come along, engaged in what is called high finance. He is an exploiter of the public, an exploiter of the manufacturer and a most dangerous customer. A gentleman of this class got hold of the cement industry in Canada; in connection with a great financial institution he effected a merger and the result has been unfortunate for the men who did not go into the merger and for the people who had to buy from the merger as the statements of the members from the West go to show, and the action of the Minister of Finance in connection with the cement duties also proves. These captains of finance come

along, they merge the various firms engaged in a trade, they exploit a trade, they merge it and capitalize it at an enormous sum. They have preferred stock and bonds and most of all they have a great big issue of common stock which they take to themselves, they keep some of it for themselves and the rest they sell to the public, putting the proceeds in their own pockets, and the industry is expected to pay a dividend on this watered stock. The cement merger is only a case in point. These high fliers in finance have had one very bad effect, they have demoralized the ordinary investor. The ordinary investor formerly looked for a sure investment at 4 or 5 per cent, but these men have been tempting them with this common stock, saying: 'If you take our preferred stock we will give you a bonus of common stock. The result is that the rate of interest has gone up all the world over, especially in Canada; the investor has been demoralized and will not look at a mortgage proposition or a 4 per cent or 5 per cent bond. The investors in England and in Montreal and Toronto say: Have you not got any free or bonus stock to give us? and as a consequence it is a hard thing to get ordinary capital at ordinary rates of interest. Our banks, I am sorry to say, have encouraged these mergers and they are only beginning. Here is the latest one I have come across. This is a quotation from the Montreal Star—that is a great friend of the mergers, Sir Hugh Graham is a great friend of the mergers. The item reads:

> New Refinery Capitalized at $7,000,000.
>
> Formation plans of the Atlantic Refineries, Limited, the new sugar company in which Mr. D. Lorne McGibbon and other prominent Montreal financiers are interested, are fast nearing completion, and a definite announcement of the details of the big project will be made in a few days.
>
> Mr. McGibbon stated to the Star this morning, on his return to the city from the West, that the new company would be capitalized at $7,000,000, divided into $1,000,000 in bonds, $2,500,000 preferred, and $3,500,000 common stock.
>
> The new refinery, which will be erected in St. John, N.B., will be built at a cost of $2,500,000, and will be one of the finest in existence. The capacity of the plant will be over 2,500 barrels per day, and will be built under the supervision of one of the best known sugar experts of America, who designed the large refineries of the Arbuckle, Warner and Havemeyer Companies.
>
> 'The consumption of sugar in Canada per day,' said Mr. McGibbon, 'is approximately between 7,000 and 8,000 barrels, considerable of which is imported. This is growing rapidly each year, as no sugar refinery has been put up in the Dominion during the past 20 or 25 years, the outlook is most promising for our company.'
>
> Mr. McGibbon stated that he expected the St John plant would be ready for production in about a year and a half. Owing to the location of the refinery, it would be possible to import the raw product from the West Indies, regardless of the seasons.

I have seen many of these propositions of common stock. There is no statement here that while $7,000,000 is to be raised a lot of that is not to be free common stock used to promote the enterprise. The refinery will only cost $2,000,000 and yet there is all this stock. I do not think I am doing Mr. McGibbon an injustice when I say he proposes to take most of that common stock for himself and the promoters of the enterprise and to ask the public to pay dividends on it. I have spoken of the cement industry which has passed into the hands of a merger, and the sugar industry which it is proposed to exploit in the same way, because if Mr. McGibbon can do this in the St. John refinery he will soon find a way to follow Sir Max Aitkin in the sugar industry in Canada. I am a protectionist and always have been a protectionist, and yet if protection is to be used for the justification of stock-watering of this character in the matter of sugar, or in the matter of cement, then I say the day cannot come too soon when we shall have a tariff commission that will investigate these things and say what the actual investment in these industries may be and that the tariff is to be used only to keep the trade in our own country by a reasonable return on the investment. But no tariff can ever be justified to me in order to pay dividends on such stock-watering as took place in connection with cement and as will likely occur in connection with sugar in this country. That is the danger of this example set by the Canadian Pacific railway of exploiting the public in connection with its capitalization. The capitalization of any concern, and especially of our railways and great manufacturing concerns, must be regulated. They have regulated them in the State of New York by effective legislation. What they can do we can do. Parliament must take control of the regulation of the capitalization of all the companies it creates and no company must be allowed to issue capital for less than it would bring in the open market and no company must be allowed, unless a good case is made out, to do any stock-watering or to put the payment of dividends on watered stock on the public who happen to use the product that this merger is created to control. These men of high finance must be taught a lesson. They must be taught that the people of Canada are not to be be exploited by them, and Parliament must teach them that lesson. You cannot teach them out in the country, and you cannot bring the Canadian Pacific railway or the manufac-

turers who are exploiting the public to a sense of that duty to the people of this country by anything but strict regulation of their financial arrangements.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): How do you propose to do that?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): In the same way as it is done in the city of New York. When they go to the Railway Commission there and make out that they want money for some particular enterprise, they have to justify their application. They have to tell the commission how they propose to raise the money; they say to the commission, we will isssue stock to our shareholders at its full market price, or we will issue bonds or debenture stock, and the commission sees that, having regard to the condition of the money market, the security issued is one that bears least on the public who have to pay the dividends. They control it absolutely in the public interest, and it has worked out splendidly.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What are you going to do to the mergers?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Parliament must find a cure and I will try to find a cure, and I hope I shall have my hon. friend's support.

Mr. TURRIFF: Take off the duty, that will cure it.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): That may be. As a protectionist I may say that if these industries in this country can only be maintained by this kind of exploitation, by the kind of stock watering, then cut out those industries and protection so far as I am concerned. But it is not true protection, and protection is not to be held responsible for this new kind of financing, and it will not be held responsible if Parliament does its duty.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou): What is responsible?

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Parliament is responsible and can effect a cure right away. And the provinces must not be a party to the exploitation of the public by this new kind of finance. The building up of those enormous fortunes by men who exploit the public is one of the surprising things in the world, and the concentration of enormous wealth in the hands of few individuals must be regulated. It is going on in the United States, it is a problem over there, it is the interests against the public, it may be coming here, and if it is, then Parliament must find a cure for the condition. Parliament was started for the rectification of grievances of the public. That was the origin of Parliament, and in a way, Parliament has been able to cure the grievances of the public from the earliest times up to the present. But we are allowing those new men in finance, those men of enormous fortunes to concentrate wealth and to get control of us. They tell us what they want us to do. We must tell them what we want them to do, and we must insist that they respect public rights. I am through with that matter for the present, but I hope to bring it up later on.

Now, I come to my last topic, and that also has reference to the question of exploitation. The greatest combine in the United States to-day, so far as being severe on the people is concerned, is the coal combine. I read a brief article in the New York World, which is a very good paper and very carefully edited.

Mr. GRAHAM. Worlds are all good papers.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): But the people of this world, some of them, are uncertain. The substance of it is that this coal monopoly controls not only the production of coal and the railways, but the railway yards for the distribution of coal throughout the United States. Coal in the United States has passed into the hands of this monopoly, and we, Canadians, especially of western Ontario, are dependent on the hard coal monopoly in the United States for our heat and fuel, as are many other portions of the Dominion. Now Canada possesses in all her provinces not coal, but the greatest store of electrical energy, capable of development by means of water-power, of any country in the world, and some day the economic conversion of electrical energy into heat will come. I almost believe that the invention exists, and that the coal monopoly and the electrical monopoly in the United States are in possession of it to-day. They fear that the development of electrical energy into a source of heat is coming and that their monopoly is in danger, and, therefore, they are out now to corral all the great water-powers that are left on the American continent. We are told—and we had experience of it in this Parliament a year or two ago—that they wished to get control of the water-powers that are left on the St. Lawrence river, and especially of the enormous power that may be developed in or about the Sault rapids in the neighbourhood of Cornwall. Another attempt is to be made to get Canada and the United States to pass over to an enormous combination in the United States the right to generate electrical energy on the river St. Lawrence. They look for their great market for that power in the city of New York. They have the transmission problem solved at all events, and they propose to generate that power and transmit it to the United States. Now, I say it is the duty of Canada not to allow

that franchise to pass to any corporation, and least of all to an international corporation. If that water-power is to be developed, it must be developed by the two countries acting in unison, and dividing the product for the benefit of the people and only for the benefit of the people of both countries. Especially if that electrical energy is to be converted into heat, as I believe it will be in an economic way, we want to reserve all that water-power for our heat and for our industries, and to keep it absolutely in the control of the people, for the people. Yet the proposal is coming up again that we should part with that great franchise and that great store of power, and turn it over probably to be floated in connection with bonused stock and things of that kind. I do not want to see any such thing done with a great water-power like that. I want to see the water-powers we have kept for the people of this country. The people of the United States have parted with their coal and they are compelled to pay $8 a ton for anthracite that could be sold for less than $3 a ton, and we will have a similar experience if we let those corporations get control of our water-powers. We have got to keep them for the people.

These are the questions that I have tried to raise in this House, and I say they are the real questions. I specially ask this House to give attention to the railway question, and to this question of capitalization as I have presented it here to-night. I believe the result will be for the benefit of the people of this country. I am not advocating for one moment any system of confiscation or unfair treatment. I want the people who invest their money to get a reasonable return, a good return, on their investment, but I do not wish to see the people of Canada placed in bondage by unfair capitalization or by people who exploit the various manufacturing interests of the country for themselves and not for the people. Parliament must do something with reference to these things; it must amend the Railway Act, it must regulate the capitalization of all kinds of companies, including railway companies, and it must see that even the tariff is not used as a buttress to unfair exploitation of the public in the way of over capitalization or anything of the kind. During the session, in such way as I can, and with such help as I can get, I propose to bring these questions in a practical way before the House. I hope that some things with regard to railways will be covered by a Government Bill and I shall wait a reasonable time to see what is coming in the way of relief. If something is forthcoming I will be very glad to support it. Otherwise, I will have to go my own way and see if I can get some relief. I will be only too glad to join with anybody else in this House to try and get some relief from these great issues that are bearing on the people to-day. Instead of relief they are only given a stone when they are referred to the Railway Commission which has not sufficient in struction in regard to this matter. I have taken up the time of the House perhaps longer than I should have, but I did feel that I had some kind of a duty to perform in calling attention to these matters. I will be only too glad to let someone else occupy the time of the House and take the lead in regard to these questions. I would like to see the leadership in regard to these questions taken by the Government of the day. They must know what these issues are, they know what the people expect, and it is their duty to deal with these questions, and to deal with them in the way that will give relief to the people of Canada.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, the hour is somewhat late and I would be glad to move the adjournment of the debate, but I am told that it is very important that we should get along with this debate, close it and get down to business. I think then that perhaps I had better crave the indulgence of the House for the few remarks that I intend to make upon the subjects that are now before the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Maclean, South York) who just sat down will excuse me if I do not go over all the ground that he has traversed. I noticed, Mr. Speaker, that he did not have very much sympathy for his proposals on his own side of the House. Of course, he might have understood that himself because, attacking the trusts, combines and mergers from the front benches of the Government side, is, to my mind a very hopeless task. My hon. friend, if he wants to get anywhere, had better come across to this side of the House where there is at least a little sympathy with the ideas which he has presented.

In common with other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this side of the House I think that the Government is to be congratulated on the condition of the country. There is no doubt, Sir, that at the present time the country is in a very prosperous condition. Evidence of this is found on every side. We have one of the largest surpluses, we are told, that we ever had in the history of this country. It is a new experience for our hon. friends on the other side of the House to have large surpluses. They did not have them when they managed the affairs of this country a few years ago. Going back to the time when my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) was Minister of Finance to use a homely phrase that they

use in my part of the country, they were always scraping the bottom of the pot. But, now, they have an abundance of money and we are all glad to know that they are able to come before the House with such an encouraging statement as to the state of trade and the state of the country. This Government has been very fortunate in that respect. Other men have laboured and this administration has entered into their labours. The tariff revision of 1897, the adoption of the British preference, the subsequence tariff revision, the changes in the western land laws by which the land was kept for the settler and not for the rich corporation, the administration of the western land and immigration regulations, which wakened up the West that had been asleep for about eighteen years, the splendid management of our finances by the late Minister of Finance, the Hon. W. S. Fielding, in short, fifteen years of good, clean, honest and progressive government have made it possible for us to congratulate ourselves to-day on the prosperous condition of this country.

I regret to say, and I am sorry that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) has left his seat, that my own constituency does not share to the full extent this prosperity. The reason is chiefly the lack of transportation facilities. The products of my constituency are, to a large extent, fish, lumber and farm products. There is a fair local market for the farm products but we have to go abroad to find a market for our fish and lumber. The best market we have for our fish and lumber is in the United States and the people of my constituency were very much encouraged by the proposals prior to the last election looking to reciprocity with the United States. We hoped not only to get relief from the duty, but we also hoped that the trade would be very much increased and that we would be able to have a fast line of steamers plying between the ports of eastern Nova Scotia and Boston which perhaps would do more for us than anything else that could be done. Our other market is in Montreal and other Canadian cities but we experience difficulty in getting there. The difficulty is that we have no proper transportation facilities, that we have no branch of the Intercolonial railway running into my constituency. The late Government undertook to rectify this. They undertook to build a branch railway. They had made some progress, they had made a survey, they had laid off the line, they had taken steps to expropriate the right of way, they had asked Parliament to vote a million dollars to commence the work, they had made a contract with a reliable construction company which had deposited $50,000 as a guarantee that they would carry out the contract and they had bought a branch line, called the Sunnybrae branch, twelve miles long, at a cost of $100,000, which would have made up part of the line running into the county of Guysborough. This was the condition when the present Government took office, but I regret to say that, for political and party purposes, this Government cancelled the contract, struck their pen through the million dollars that had been placed in the estimates and turned the clock back to where it had been before. This has been very discouraging to the people I represent. Hundreds of our young men have had to leave the country and seek employment elsewhere. I do not know what may be the plans of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals for the future, but I take the first opportunity of mentioning this in the House and of asking him to reconsider the decision he came to last year to abandon this important proposal.

Reference has been made to the visit of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) to England. I am sure that every Canadian was pleased to know that the leader of our Government met with such a reception in the old country. The only disappointment I felt in regard to it was that the Unionist press in the old country and the Tory press in this country attempted to use this incident to give the impression to the people that the victory of the Conservative party in the election of last year had some kind of Imperial significance, that, in some way or other, that victory was to strengthen the tie that binds Canada to the old country. Every Canadian knows that the tie does not need any strengthening; it needs strengthening just about as little in Canada as it does in the old country itself. The worst offender in that respect was the Halifax Herald, the organ of the Prime Minister. In one of the headlines, giving an account of the speeches of the Prime Minister in the old country, it was stated that the right hon. gentleman said that Canada was to remain in the Empire as the result of the election. I am inclined to refuse to believe that he ever made such a statement. It is almost incredible that the Prime Minister of Canada should endeavour to convey the impression to the people of the old country that one-half of the people of this Dominion contemplated separation from the Empire on the occasion of the last election. Twice in our history have Canadians demonstrated that they were really ready to do something more than by mere words of mouth to give evidence of their gratitude for the old country. I refer to the South African War and to the adoption of the British Preference. and I am happy to say that both instances took place under a Liberal administration led by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The Soudan War was

one other occasion in the history of Canada when opportunity was given us to join the old country in the defence of the Empire; but the Conservatives were then in control and they refused to spend one dollar to assist England in her difficulties. Therefore, the claim put forward by these gentlemen opposite that they are the one and only loyal party in this country is not a valid claim.

The right hon. the leader of the Government made reference the other day to a letter written by President Taft to Mr Roosevelt which he called the 'adjunct' letter, and the right hon. gentleman got a little hysterical over it, and he seemed to attach to it a very great deal of significance. It occurred to me that the right hon gentleman was somewhat too serious about that. I would. ask you, Mr. Speaker, what significance can be given to a letter from one foreigner to another foreigner with regard to the internal relations of this country, I can quite understand a man like President Taft thinking that the people of Canada were a mean lot of hucksterers who had no national sentiment, who would be influenced in their national sentiment and connections by trade and the sale of goods; I can understand that on the part of President Taft because he does not know the Canadian people, but for a man that was born and brought up in Canada, who knows our history, who knows the attachment of the Canadian people to the old land; for him to utter such a thought places him beyond the pale of forgiveness. All sorts of arguments, many of them sham arguments, have been used in regard to reciprocity. There is one class of anti-reciprocity orators who tell us we must have no truck or no trade with the United States. These gentry seem to think that the sale of a bundle of hay or a barrel of fish or a bundle of shingles would have some effect upon the loyalty of the people who engage in that trade. I hope there are not very many who hold such views, but be they many or few they ought to be confined in an institution for the feeble-minded. There are others who tell us that if we get this great boon—they admit it is a good thing—we will lose it after a while and then we will feel far worse than if we never had it at all. This argument I have heard from the Minister of Finance, and if it be sound, it would prevent the Minister of Finance from ever getting a wife because he might lose her; it would prevent a man from accumulating wealth, because the money might take to itself wings and fly, as it often does. Another argument put forward by the Finance Minister is that a reciprocity treaty would destroy our fiscal independence, but the hon. gentleman neglected to tell us how it could possibly have that result. Does the hon. gentleman not know that it has been the custom of every civilized nation to make trade treaties with other countries; hundreds of those treaties have been made by Great Britain and by the United States and even by Canada, and a few years ago we made a treaty with France. France and Germany entered into trade treaties with each other. How does the Minister of Finance know that it will affect our fiscal independence? He gives us his word for it, and he expects us to swallow it, and of course you cannot argue with a prophet.

My own view is that we are dead right on this question of reciprocity and no argument presented up to the present can dissuade me from that belief. Of course, the big interests are against us, but the big interests will always be against the people, and the big interests can put up an argument for almost anything; if they could make a dividend out of it they would argue against the doctrine of gravitation. The cry against reciprocity raised by gentlemen on the other side of the House is not sincere, and that it is insincere is proven by the very Speech from the Throne itself. If you read this speech carefully, you will find that the Government congratulates the country on the enormous increase in our trade. But, wherein is this increase most marked? Why, the greatest increase of trade in the past year has been between Canada and the United States. It has been pointed out that while the increase in our trade with Great Britain during the past year was about $10,000,000, the increase in our trade with the United States during the same period was over $70,000,000. And so we are told in the Speech from the Throne, if not in so many words yet unmistakably, that this truck and trade with the Yankees which is now over $1,000,000 a day, and which during the past year has increased over the previous year by about $70,000,000, is very gratifying to those anti-reciprocity gentlemen on the Treasury benches.

Another matter which has been referred to in this House is the retirement from the Ministry of the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and although little information has been vouchsafed us as to the cause of his retirement, yet, the Prime Minister did tell us that the hon. gentleman retired acting under a high sense of duty. If that be true, and I believe it is, it is a very creditable thing to the hon. gentleman. In the session of 1910, that hon. gentleman moved the following resolution:

> The House regrets that the speech from the Throne gives no indication whatever of the intention of the Government to consult the people on its naval policy and the general question of the contribution of Canada to Imperial armament.

That is the resolution. You will note he refers not only to the naval policy,

which I understand to be the policy of the late Government, of a Canadian navy, but to any contribution to Imperial armament. The late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), having voted for that resolution, did not feel that it would be right or honest for him to stay in a government that proposed to give a contribution to Imperial armament without an appeal to the people. If he was the only man in this House who had voted for that resolution, there would be nothing more to say about it, but when we examine the record, we find that not only the late Minister of Public Works voted for that resolution, but the Minister of Labour and the Minister of Justice voted for it. My friend who sits in front of me, the Minister of Customs, voted for it; so did the Minister of the Interior and the Prime Minister.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Minister of Trade and Commerce went out.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If it was necessary for the late Minister of Public Works to retire from the Government, what have we to say about the high sense of duty of these other gentlemen who voted that no contributions should be given to Imperial armaments, unless there was an appeal to the people. I believe in a Canadian navy built by Canada, manned by Canadians and under the control of the Canadian Government for the defence of our own coasts, and in time of trouble or war, to come automatically under the control of the Imperial Government. I think that is the policy the Canadian people will adopt, and notwithstanding all the juggling and all the wriggling they are endeavouring to do on the other side of the House, they will be bound to come to that policy. Great Britain does not need our money; she needs our men far more. If we had given a cash contribution at the time of the South African war, it would have been forgotten in two or three years. The fact that we sent the first contingent to South Africa, the fact that we sent the second and the third contingent, the fact that some of these brave fellows lie to-day under the sod of the veldt; that was a sacrifice worth making, and one that will be remembered for many years. You could not do it by the payment of money, and the payment of money, I venture to say, will not be received with very much satisfaction on the other side of the Atlantic. I noticed in the Manchester Guardian the other day a very significant item, which shows that this contribution was not being received with very much enthusiasm in England:

The Manchester Guardian discussing the probability of Canada offering $30,000,000 for naval purposes, hopes, since it involves a principle which many Canadians will certainly dislike, it will prove to be Mr. Borden's own idea and not the result of any suggestion from the home authorities. He ought to make it clear to Canadians that the idea of benevolence is as repugnant to us as it can be to them.

What proof have we that there is any emergency? So far as we can learn on this side of the House, so far as we can gather information from the press, the proof is all the other way. We have for example the statement of Sir Edward Grey made on July 10th of this year and reported in the London Times, when he says:

Our relations with the German Government of the present moment are excellent. We are perfectly frank with each other about all questions of mutual interest, and I believe that when questions come up, whether they be, for instance, in connection with our respective interests in South Africa, or whether they be in connection eventually with the Bagdad railway, both governments are convinced that their mutual interests can be perfectly reconciled.

I will now quote from Mr. Asquith:

Our relations with the great German Empire are, I am glad to say, at this moment—and I feel sure are likely to remain—relations of amity and good will.

Then a word from Lord Crewe, the leader in the House of Lords:

There is another thing. If you come forward with a great splash of a programme, you help to bring about the particular evil which you wish to avoid, because the people to whom you announce that you are building against them are positively spurred on to the acceleration and possibly to the enlargement of their programme. To that extent you tend to defeat your own object.

Then, again, Lord Crewe says:

Taking March 31st of this year, we find that we have 16 battleships and battle cruisers of the Dreadnought type, as against 15 possessed by all the other powers in European waters. Next year we shall have 24 ships of this type as against 21 possessed by all the other naval powers in Europe. These battleships represent a distinct margin over the two-power standard.

Not only over the two-power standard but over every other nation in Europe. Here is another extract from a speech by Mr. Asquith delivered about the 23rd of July, this year, which must be about the time the Prime Minister and his colleagues were consulting with the Government.

This year Germany has laid down two new ships; we are laying down four. Next year, we are told, Germany is going to lay down one extra ship; we are going to lay down two extra ships. Is that nothing? This year Germany has laid down two small cruisers; we are laying down eight, not quite so large, but much faster. We are accelerating the construction of these eight vessels. It is true that this year Germany

is accelerating the construction of 12 destroyers; we have accelerated the construction of 20 destroyers. In the course of the next 18 months it is expected that the German fleet will be reinforced by 21 destroyers. We shall be reinforced by 43 destroyers in the same period.

That does not look very much like an emergency. But I am not going to discuss this question of the navy to-night, as an opportunity will be given later when the papers are brought down, and I can assure my right hon. friend who leads the Government that if he is able to show that there is a real emergency in Great Britain, he will have the support of at least one man on this side of the House in anything he proposes, which is at all reasonable.

I listened to-night to a long discussion in regard to the cut in the cement duty. One phase of it surprises everybody, which is that the Minister of Finance, who came to the Government for the purpose of keeping the Empire together and preventing railway traffic north and south, should have ever though of doing such a thing as that. I wish to refer to it in order to show the attitude not only of the Liberals, but of the Conservatives themselves in regard to that important question. Of course the whole point is that the Government is blamed for having made this cut in the cement duty for political purposes. If that were true, it would be a very serious accusation to make against this or any other government. I want to point out that the accusation did not come from the Liberals any more than from the Conservatives. I wish to read an extract from the weekly letter of J. C. McIntosh & Co., of Halifax. Mr. McIntosh is a man well known in our province, and I have not the slightest doubt that he is a strong supporter of the leader of this Government. The McIntosh firm each week issues a letter reviewing the state of trade and the prices of stocks. And this is an extract from one of these letters :

The Canada Cement Company has maintained that the reason why the western market could not be supplied was that the railways could not furnish enough cars. This company did not seem to be as much affected by the change as were independent companies operating throughout Ontario. The latter maintained that the action of the Government would destroy their business in the western market, and claimed that the action had been taken with a view of helping the Government in Saskatchewan, where elections are now pending.

That is what Mr. McIntosh sent out to his subscribers and patrons all over the country. It shows the attitude of friends of this Government and what they expect of this Government. If that transaction had been attributed to the former Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), I can imagine there would be an uproar throughout the country and a hundred protests would come in demanding what proof there was that Mr. Fielding would do a disreputable thing like that. But here we have leading Conservatives all through the country who seem to take it for granted that this Government—this Government that belongs to the trusts, combines and mergers—would go so far as to do a thing like that for the purpose of winning an election in Saskatchewan. That is the opinion that their own friends have of their political morality, and that is the reason I refer to the matter. Of course they have reasons for what they believe. They remember, perhaps, the telegram that went to Prince Edward Island when the local elections there were on and that won the elections for the Tory party. We have also the incident that happened in Richelieu a short time ago. I do not see my hon. friend from Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) in the House, though he was here to-night. Later on, I want to refer to that incident, and perhaps he may then be in his seat.

I wish also to say a word about this proposal to do something in regard to the great industry of agriculture. There are no two opinions about this expenditure. Everybody on this side was in favour of it last year, and I have no doubt they are in favour of it this year. The only criticism I have to make of this proposal to spend money in education and experiment in agriculture is that the proposal of last year was so ridiculously small that one could hardly take it seriously. I have not the census at hand, but I have seen it estimated that more than half the people of this country depend on agriculture for a livelihood. Let us assume that we have four millions of people depending upon this industry. And the Government voted half a million dollars for the purpose of promoting the great industry of agriculture. If you look at the estimates you will see that they propose a larger amount for one wharf in the constituency of the Prime Minister. Half a million dollars for the benefit of an industry which supports four millions of people. This means about 12½ cents a head, or less than the cost of a pound of bacon. Then these hon. gentlemen think it worth while, in the Governor General's speech, to compliment themselves upon having done this. I would like to say to the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) that if he wants to be taken seriously in this matter he will need to improve on that and propose more effective steps than those proposed last year.

The Prime Minister takes credit for carrying out his promise in regard to highways, 'the grantng of substantial assist-

ance' as he says. But I submit that he has not done so. I submit that the Bill he introduced last year was not a Highway Bill at all, but was a Bill to provide a fund for the Conservative party at the expense of the country. That is a serious statement, but the proof is that the Government refused to accept the reasonable proposal of the Senate to divide the money among the provinces in proportion to population and to have it spent on the roads. Why, the whole amount could have been spent by the Minister of Public Works in the Macdonald election, or in Richelieu in the election there. That was the reason why we on this side were opposed to that method. I trust that if the Bill is introduced again the Senate will treat it in the same way, if the Government do not show the fairness to amend it and make it a Bill for the building of public roads rather than for the helping of the Conservative party at the time of an election. We have positive proof that that was what they intended to do. My hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Reid, Grenville) is here, and everybody remembers that the ink was hardly dry on that Road Bill after its introduction when he rushed up to South Renfrew and began to peddle out the road money to the electors. So gross were the statements he made on that occasion that a Conservative paper in the constituency atacked him for doing it. I trust that if that Bill is introduced this year it will be so amended as to secure the proper distribution of the money to the provinces and its expenditure upon the roads.

The Prime Minister said a good deal about having fulfilled his promises made while in opposition. And my hon. friend from Prince Albert (Mr. McKay) went so far back as to say that they were going to go back and fulfil the promises that Sir Charles Tupper had made many years ago. I am inclined to think they will have their hands full if they undertake to fulfil the promises made by the Prime Minister in the past. Those promises are so numerous that I do not expect to see half of them carried out before the millennium. I have here the document known as the Halifax platform. I think the House will admit that it is authentic, for it has a full page picture of the leader of the Government on the cover with his signature. It came to a constituent of mine under the frank of the present Minister of the Interior. So I can say to the House that it came from the proper source. I think it is worth while to place on 'Hansard' the Halifax platform, so that future generations may know what the Prime Miniser did promise the people when in opposition, and they will be able to see whether he is carrying out the promises or not:

The Liberal-Conservative platform as laid down by R. L. Borden, M.P., Opposition leader, at Halifax, August 20, 1907:

1. Public Finance. Honest appropriation and expenditure of public moneys in the public interest.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

2. Appointment by Merit.—Appointment by public officials upon consideration of capacity and personal character and not party service alone.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

I do not know about the 'hear, hear' for that.

3. Honest Elections.—More effective provision to punish bribery and fraud at elections, to ensure thorough publicity as to expenditures by political organizations, to prevent the accumulation of campaign funds for corrupt purposes and to prohibit contributions thereto by corporations, contractors and promoters, to expedite the hearing of election petitions and to prevent conclusive arrangements for the withdrawal or compromise thereto, to provide for a thorough investigation of corrupt practices and if necessary to appoint an independent prosecuting officer charged with that duty, to simplify the procedure therefor and to enforce the laws so amended.

4. A thorough and complete reformation of the laws relating to the Civil Service so that future appointments shall be made by an independent commission acting upon the report of examiners after competitive examination.

We do not hear any shouting on the other side of the House for that clause. Why?

5. Reform of the Senate.—Such reform in the mode of selecting members of the Senate as will make that Chamber a more useful and representative legislative body.

6. Immigration.—A more careful selection of the sources from which immigration shall be sought, a more rigid inspection of immigrants and the abolition of the bonus system except under very special circumstances and for the purpose of obtaining particularly desirable classes of settlers

7. Public Lands and Franchises for the People.—The management and development of the public domain (in which are to be included great national franchises) for the public benefit and under such conditions that a reasonable proportion of the increment of value arising therefrom shall inure to the people.

8. Non-partisan Management of Government Railways.—The operation and management of our government railways by an independent commission free from partisan control or influence.

9. National Ports, Transportation and Cold Storage.—The development and improvement of our national waterways, the equipment of national ports, the improvements of transportation facilities and consequent reduction of freight rates between the place of production and the market, whether at home or abroad and the establishment of a thorough system of cold storage.

10. A Public Utilities Commission.—The reorganization of the present Railway Commission as a public utilities commission with wider powers and more extended jurisdiction so as to establish thorough and effective control over all corporations owning or operating public utilities or invested with franchises of a national character.

11. Public Telegraphs and Telephones.—The establishment after due investigation of a system of national telegraphs and telephones under conditions which shall be just to capital already invested in those enterprises.

12. Improved Postal Facilities.—The improvement of existing postal facilities, especially in newly developed portions of the country, and the inauguration after proper inquiry as to cost, of a system of free rural mail delibery.

13. Tariff Policy.—A fiscal policy which will promote the production within Canada of all useful articles and commodities that can be advantageously produced or manufactured from or by means of our natural resources, having due regard to the interests of the consumer as well as to the just claims of our wage-earning population.

14. Imperial preference.—The promotion by negotiation, legislation and other constitutional means of a system of mutual preferential trade within the Empire.

15. Justice to the New Provinces.—The restoration of the public lands to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan upon fair terms.

16. Provincial rights.—The unimpaired maintenance of all powers of self-government which have been conferred upon the provinces of Canada under the constitution.

There, Sir, we have 16 very important reforms that were proposed in 1907 by the Prime Minister, and I was surprised to find, in reading over the Speech from the Throne, that not one of the 16 has been mentioned during the present session. This is likely to be the working session of this Parliament, and you would expect that some one of these numerous reforms, promised so many years ago, about which the Prime Minister has had so much time to make up his mind, would appear on the programme for the present session; but we look in vain for a single one of them.

One paragraph says that we are to have appointments by merit in the Civil Service. Will any one claim that this Government has endeavoured to live up to that principle? Appointments by merit? Why, Sir, this principle has been violated in every county of Canada. I have no time to go into a full discussion of this Civil Service question, but we have never had such an experience as during the fourteen months that this Government has been in power as regards the Civil Service. Instead of reforming the Civil Service during the fourteen months they have debauched and bedevilled it beyond all reason. I have collected here a few instances that have come under my own observation and I wish to give them to the House. The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely), has told us some things that were done in Western Canada. I want to point out a few things that were done in other places. My list is as follows:

1. This Government appointed a gentleman described by the Roman Catholic Bishop of Newfoundland as 'the greatest scoundrel who ever passed the Narrows,' as chairman of a commission to investigate the whole civil service of the country, as in the case of A. B. Morine.

2. They dismissed an officer of the Customs Department because he said privately to a friend that he could not support any man who had been found guilty of bribery in connection with an election contest, as in the case of Lyman C. Smith, of Oshawa, Ont.

3 They dismissed another officer of the Customs Department because he protested against certain anti-British sentiments made use of on the public platform by certain Nationalist orators in the province of Quebec, as in the case of E. O. Baldwin, of Coaticook, Quebec.

4. They dismissed a lighthouse keeper who had served the Department of Marine and Fisheries faithfully for thirty-two years and deprived him of a life pension to which he was justly entitled, because he proposed three cheers for Sir Wilfrid Laurier, as in the case of W. L. Munro, of White Head.

5. They started a prosecution against a postmaster for offensive partizanship who had been dead for four years and, when they discovered that he was beyond their reach, wreaked their vengeance on his poor old widow, as in the case of John H. McPherson, of Tracadie Road.

6. They dismissed an inspector of the Intercolonial railway by telegram and without trial and replaced him by a man who is said by the present Postmaster General to have been guilty of grave irregularities connected with the post office funds, as in the case of John Fraser, of Stellarton.

7. They dismissed a respectable man from the public service in Descousse, N.S., and replaced him with a criminal who was at the time under an accusation of forgery, and has since been tried and convicted of that crime, as in the case of Andrew Landry, of Descousse.

8. They conducted a Star Chamber investigation in a garret. Denied the accused the right to cross-examine witnesses, or to be represented by counsel, examined witnesses in the absence of the accused, as in the case of John W. Davis, Guysborough.

9. They disorganized the life-saving service on the Atlantic coast by recklessly dismissing the trained life boat crews without investigation and replacing them by men who have had no experience in the life-saving service, as in the cases of the life boat crews of Canso and White Head.

Those are a few of the things that have come under my notice in regard to the way they have dealt with the Civil Service. That is what my right hon. friend would call Civil Service reform. I have no doubt there are hundreds of such cases that will be brought before the attention of the House this session.

Another plank in the platform of my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was honest elections. The promise is honest elections and the performance is the scandals we have retailed here for the last week in regard to the constituencies of Macdonald and Richelieu. Is it honest to issue a blank warrant? Is it honest to have innocent men arrested under sham warrants? Is it honest to confine them in jails distant from the places where the supposed crimes were committed? Is it honest to keep them there until after the election and then to discharge them without making or proving any charge against them? These are the only proofs we have yet that the Prime Minister desires to carry out his promise in regard to honest elections. The election in Richelieu has created a good deal of discussion in this House. I regret that my hon. friend the member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) is not present as I would have liked to ask him one or two questions in regard to that election.

Mr. TURRIFF: Why is he not here?

Mr. SINCLAIR: We have a report of a speech made by that hon. gentleman in that constituency a few days before the poll, a report not in what my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works would call the reptile press, the term which he applied to the whole Liberal press of this country, but in his own paper, a reptile called La Patrie. He ought to be able to recognize the spots on that reptile. This is what he is reported to have said:

He said that he was coming in the name of the Government, at the request of the Hon. Mr. Rogers, to beg the electors of Richelieu to send to Parliament a member in sympathy with the present administration.

I would not come here, said he, until I had the promise of the Government that you would have the marine railway, of which I spoke to you at the banquet offered to Mr. Hazen. It has been promised to you, and I now come to ask you to elect my friend Mr. Morgan, so that Sorel and the county of Richelieu may progress with the assistance of the Government.

I caused promises to be made to me, not electoral promises, but real promises, and I have the pleasure of telling you that if Mr. Morgan is elected your member on Thursday, you will have the marine railway of which you stand in such need, to procure to your city the progress to which it is entitled.

The point I wish to make, is that we may have been mistaken when we assumed that it was the Minister of Public Works who made the promise to that hon. gentleman. The latter does not say it was the Minister of Public Works. He says that the hon. Minister of Public Works begged him to go to the electors of Richelieu and to ask them to elect a member in sympathy with the Government. But when he comes to the promise, the real thing, he says he got the promise, not from the Minister of Public Works, but from the Government. It is up to the Prime Minister to say whether or not there was such a promise given, and the Prime Minister has not yet dealt with that question. I want now to call his attention to it, and to point out that his supporter from the county of Charlevoix made the statement that he got that promise from the Government, which, I presume, means not the Minister of Public Works but the Prime Minister. It is possible that some people in the county of Richelieu think that the Postmaster General is the Government, or that Mr. Armand Lavergne is the Government, but we will hold the Prime Minister of this country responsible for the promise until he explains the matter and settles it with his supporter from Charlevoix.

Now the amendment before the House is in the following terms :

We beg to represent to your Royal Highness that in the elections of Macdonald and Richelieu there were practices calculated to terrorize and corrupt the electorate, which were connived at by your ministers and which deserve the censure of the House.

I submit that there is a good deal of proof, substantial proof, before the House at the present time, that such was the case, that these irregularities in Richelieu and Macdonald were connived at by the Government. We have the statement, the word of honour of a responsible member of this House, given at a public meeting to the electors of Richelieu that he had the authority of the Government for making the promise he made, and we have a large amount of proof of irregularities in the constituency of Macdonald. How are these things dealt with by the Prime Minister? What did he say? His only answer was to fling some mouldy futilities across the House about an old contest in North Huron. What did the Minister of Finance say? We expected the Minister of Finance to take some high ground on the question of these irregularities. He is supposed to be the salt of the Cabinet. He was taken in, we were told to give the Cabinet respectability, and we would suppose that a man occupying that high position would have had something to say about this question, that he would have told us that if the Minister of Public Works had really been guilty of having engineered those dreadful things that were done in the constituency of Macdonald, he ought to withdraw from the Government, and that as Minister of Finance he would not sit round the table with a man who had done such things. He ought to compel him either to clear up his character in regard to those difficulties in Macdonald, or to retire altogether.

But what does he do? With a graceful wave of his hand he dismisses the whole question, and says,—'cheer up, the worst is yet to come'. Well, Sir, it is bad enough already, but I have no doubt that if this Government remains in power for a few years longer it will be worse. It is a question that the people will have to take in hand for themselves. The Minister of Public Works is the chief conspirator in this case, and what does he say? Has he made any defence? Why, he accepts responsibility for all those irregularities. He says those men were treated right, that he would do it again, that if he had the doing of it he would punish them much more than they were punished. That is practically what he said. He did not say he was sorry that such disgraceful things happened in his province, he did not say he would try to have them rectified. In fact there was only one man, or two, supporting the Government, if I remember rightly, who had anything to say against these abuses. My hon. friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham), said it was a bad thing that happened, and the last speaker (W. F. MacLean) rather condemned it. But outside of these two, I have not heard a word of condemnation either from the front benches or from the back benches about those abominations that were practised in Macdonald. The evidence against the government of Manitoba is overwhelming. There is no doubt at all that the Justice Department of the province of Manitoba entered into a conspiracy to prevent a fair election in the constituency of Macdonald. The evidence against the Government here is, of course to some extent circumstantial, but it is also to my mind conclusive. It is not denied that the Minister of Public Works was in the constituency, that he was on the spot directing that campaign. It is not denied that, before some of those arrests were made, the Minister of Public Works said that an arrest had been made, and that there were more to follow. My hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) pertinently asked how did he know that arrests were to follow unless he was in the secret, or unless there was some plan of that kind to arrest the Liberal workers in the constituency. I am very unwillingly forced to the conclusion that any fair-minded jury would decide that those disreputable doings in the constituency of Macdonald were connived at by this Government, and I intend to vote for the amendment.

Mr. C. A. MUNSON (Northumberland West): Mr. Speaker, like all the other young members of this House, I crave its indulgence. Elected by the people of West Northumberland, I am here to represent their interests, and in my own feeble way I am going to try and answer a few of the arguments advanced by a number of the gentlemen who have spoken during this debate. A great deal has been said about the election in Macdonald. I take that up first because it was the last thing spoken of. I fail to see that there has been produced any evidence authentic enough for any person to take any notice of. In the first place, there are some affidavits made by both sides setting forth certain particulars regarding actions in contravention of the Elections Act.

We are debating to-night the amendment which, I believe, should be the only thing before the House, but I understand that a considerable amount of latitude is allowed to members on such an occasion as this. At any rate, I find that members have wandered all the way from melon-cutting in the Canadian Pacific railway company to corrupt acts, so-called in the Macdonald and Richelieu elections. A great deal has been said here about the corrupt acts of the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). It was alleged by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sinclair) that the hon. Minister of Public Works was in Macdonald, that he took part in the elections, that there were corrupt acts, and that therefore the minister is liable. There were corrupt acts in the West Northumberland, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was there and the right hon. gentleman was doing his best to elect the candidate who advocated his cause. I am not one to say that the right hon. gentleman was guilty of a corrupt act because he came into West Northumberland, but I would have as good a right to say that he had committed gross irregularities as these hon. gentlemen have to say that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works was guilty of corrupt acts in Macdonald.

This amendment presents itself to me in a very peculiar way. I may not be experienced enough to read it as it should be read, but I do know that it amounts to a vote of want of confidence in the present Government. The demand by the leader of the Opposition to amend the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne by introducing the words which he proposes is not in keeping, I think, with the reputation that the right hon. gentleman has always borne. I was not in the House at the time the amendment was made but I was with a number of gentlemen, including Liberals, when it was read and we all smiled, one gentleman remarking: Is that all?—a remark which pretty nearly conveys the gist of the amendment.

A great deal has been said by hon. members and especially by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) about the

manner in which my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works conducted himself. When the Minister of Public Works stated that he would again send detectives if another election took place the look of horror on the face of this hon. gentleman was something awful. He must be afraid of detectives. Why should he be afraid of having detectives go into any constituency? They are the representatives of the law, the guardians of the peace, and why should they not be allowed to go into any constituency? Is it not the duty of the Government to see that everything is run properly? As far as the arresting of these young men is concerned, everyone knows who has read these affidavits that there was cause for making the arrests. Whether there was cause enough to convict I do not know as the men were not tried, but there is this to be said that, during these election contests, men come in from outside under false names and other men come up and swear that these outsiders have committed corrupt acts in asking them to vote for their candidate and offering them money and whiskey. That has been sworn to. What is there in it? There is nothing to make all this howl about. There is not a constituency in the whole Dominion where we have not had irregularities more or less but the very fact that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are making such a howl about these irregularities so called in Macdonald shows that they have not much else to talk about.

It amused me somewhat to hear the discussion regarding the policy of the Laurier Government during the fifteen years in which hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. How they gloated over the grand surpluses which were piled up owing to the fact that the Laurier policy was still in force ! What is that Laurier policy ? Why, it is the old National Policy inaugurated by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1878. Practically the same percentage of duty is imposed on goods coming into this country. Sir John Macdonald, when he inaugurated that policy, predicted just exactly what would happen. Manufacturing establishments were brought into being, trade and commerce went on with a rush, railways were built and the Laurier Government came in just at the time when a small depression existed and took advantage of everything that Sir John Macdonald had done. The remarks which we hear in this House about the policy of the Laurier Government are almost enough to make Sir John Macdonald turn over in his grave, and Alexander Mackenzie, too. When the late Government tinkered with the Macdonald tariff, what did it amount to ? They adjusted a few items here and there as necessitated by the times, but they hung on like grim death to the old National Policy and we have it to-day in its original shape almost just as Sir John Macdonald gave it to us.

Now, I am going to say a little more about this amendment. The right hon. leader of the Opposition says in effect that the ministers connived at the irregularities in Macdonald. He does not say whether they all connived, but he says 'the Ministers.' I am sure he cannot mean the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). The Minister of Trade and Commerce, I believe, was in England, and therefore he could not have meant him. He could not have meant the other ministers who were not in Macdonald. They could not have connived very well at long range. The right hon. gentleman kept himself within the lines of Torres Vedras. He did not come out distinctly and say : I am going to lay an information against these ministers, I am going to bring them before the Privileges and Elections Committee, and I am going to forfeit my seat if I do not prove my case, as he would have to do under the rules of Parliament. He was not like the member of this House who, a year or so ago, made distinct charges and proved them to the satisfaction of every person. No, he kept within the lines of Torres Vedras. I used to think the lines of Torres Vedras were lines surrounding Lisbon within which the Duke of Wellington kept his forces, but I find from listening to the right hon. gentleman that within the lines of Torres Vedras, means any place where there is a mud puddle into which you can crawl and pick up a handful of mud and spatter it all over any person who happens to be in the vicinity. During this debate hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have talked for hours, and it occurs to me that there has been altogether too much time wasted and the business of the country too much neglected. I intend only to speak for a few minutes and I wish to be modest about it because I am a new member and I know that the older members do not take very kindly to a man who tries to talk himself to death. I think members of the Opposition in the House might find better use for their time than in trying to bespatter the fair fame of this Government, indecently, as they have been endeavouring to do during the past week. I thank the House for the attention given to me.

Mr. I. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, like the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Munson), I do not propose detaining the House very long. The debate on the Address has lasted already several days and very little remains to be said on either side. However, as the Speech from the Throne states the government's intention of

submitting to the House in the course of the session a bill for the revision of the Banking Act, I shall take this opportunity of expressing my views on that important subject to which I have given a good deal of study for some years back, though I may not strictly in doing so confine myself within the limits set down by the section of the Speech from the Throne referred to. I hope that the fact that I am addressing this House in French will not provoke criticism on the part of a certain journalist who apparently thinks that the right to speak French does not necessarily imply taking advantage of that right; as I am quite sure that since making those unkindly references to the hon. member for Vaudreuil, in an Ottawa newspaper, he has had occasion to think the matter over and take a more sensible view of the question.

It is of primary importance that our Banking Act be revised, at least in part. An announcement of the Government's intentions in this regard is awaited with anxiety and I may add that such a revision will not prove satisfactory, unless some pretty radical changes are introduced. In regard to shareholders, for instance, the proposed new legislation should be such as to preclude all possibility of fraud through fictitious shareholders or substitutes. Every shareholder should be bonâ fide, and to ensure that result, it might be provided in the law that no shareholder shall be recognized as such until the board of directors have duly agreed to it, save in the case of an estate. Of course, under such conditions, all could not become shareholders in our banks, but to my mind it is only proper that all should not be allowed to have a free hand with the savings of the people. Were such limitations enforced, we would not so frequently have to deplore the insolvency of shareholders, carrying with it the most baneful results to depositors.

Then, shareholders should be kept in closer touch with the bank's business. I suggested last year that the president or general manager should be under the obligation of submitting to the shareholders at the annual meeting for the election of the board of directors, a statement of all transactions exceeding a certain amount, including overdrafts allowed to clients, considerations which have induced such action, securities held by the bank. And why should not parties concerned be informed of such doings, in the same way that partners in a private concern. Where is the business man who lends money without having any security as to the solvency of the borrower?

It may be objected that the shareholder is in a position to secure information from the bank reports. Well, now, is there a single hon. gentleman in this House who would be in a position to judge of the financial status of a bank, or of the efficiency of its management from reading through these reports? In how many instances has it not been found that bank officials had for years been making false reports, the falsity of which was brought to light only through the failure of such institutions? Why? Because reports of that kind give no clue whatever to the actual condition of the bank's business.

Again it may be stated that millionaires have ready means of obtaining whatever information they may need. But that is no assurance that they will do so, whereas were my suggestion followed, they could not help paying attention to such matters. That is the only means of ensuring a judicious selection of directors, whereas to-day the shareholder votes blindly, and relies wholly on the confidence he happens to repose in Mr. So or So.

But, of course, even that would not suffice. I say to the Government that the revision of the Banking Act is one of the most important and most difficult questions we have to deal with. Banks are chartered by the Government with a view to safeguarding public interest, and in the same way that it controls their organization, it should make sure that they are properly managed, supervise their transactions; and I may add that the people expect measures to be taken that will ensure a closer government supervision. It is quite plain that such supervision is necessary and as a matter of fact the Government has made an effort, though unsuccessfully, to enforce inspection. Such reports as are required are meaningless, utterly insufficient, since failures follow one another without any one suspecting the day before what is going to happen. Which signifies that the means, the only means provided by the law, to keep us posted on the situation of banks, is inoperative.

With, on the one hand, the acknowledged need for an effective government supervision of banking transactions, and, on the other, the failure of the present system of supervision, it is imperative that we should find some other means of attaining that object, and I would pin my faith to the enforcing of a system of inspection by the Department of Finance. I also believe that the public feeling in favour of the establishment of a system of inspection is quite pronounced, and that some move of that kind on the part of the Government is expected. I submit to the House that a departure in that direction would have the effect of inspiring a widespread feeling of security who would make for the stability of our banks as well as for the prosperity of our commerce and our industries.

A fact which I much regret to state, but which should not be withheld, is that the people lack faith in our financial institu-

tions, and the Post Office Department must have had evidence of it in the increased deposits in their savings banks. That condition of affairs will have to be done away with, even should we be forced in consequence to establish a State bank, of which these savings banks are possibly the forerunners. For the future prosperity of the Dominion, it is necessary that the old saw 'As good as the bank' should bear its full meaning.

Such a system of inspection, it may be observed, is not an untried experiment. It has been introduced in several countries and has been giving for many years the most satisfactory results. So I say to the Government that a revision pure and simple of our banking law cannot be satisfactory to the people. Substantial, far reaching changes are needed, and I believe the duty devolves on me, considering the interest I have in the past taken in this question, to offer at this early stage of the session these humble suggestions.

I shall now pass on, Mr. Speaker, to another part of the Speech from the Throne. It is therein stated that Canada is enjoying unexceptional prosperity. We are all agreed as to the existence of such prosperity, though we disagree as to the causes which have brought it about. There is another point concerning which we should all agree, and it is that such prosperity is not due to this Government; for, as a matter of fact, what have they done to favour it? Have they revised the tariff? Have they increased or reduced customs duties? Have they built or started anything? Of course, I do not wish to taunt them too sharply for having done nothing, as they have not been in power very long; but I object to listening to encomiums concerning them, or to their getting credit for happenings which to everybody's knowledge can not be attributed to them.

So then I say that the present prosperity is not due to this Government. The hon. gentleman from Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Rainville) goes right back to the fountain head, to Cartier and Macdonald and to the establishment of the great National Policy, to find the actual cause. Alas, facts are against him and there is not a single member in this House, without excepting the Prime Minister himself, but who knows that the failure of the National Policy led the country to ruin. There is not a single member but who remembers that baneful period of our history during which our people left their homes to seek in a foreign country their daily bread which they could no longer find here in the Dominion. In such a condition of affairs there lurked a danger of annexation much more to be feared than influences emanating from a mere trade agreement. Finally, in 1896, the people, disgusted with the carelessness and inefficiency of the

Conservative government tired of the National Policy introduced for the satisfaction of a few privileged persons, called on the Liberal party to regenerate and save the country. That task the Liberal party has accomplished. To that party is due in a great measure the extraordinary prosperity which we enjoy at present.

The National Policy could not by itself bring about such a change. Something else was needed, and the main factors of our prosperity were the British preference, the immigration policy, the building of our canals and the improvement of our great waterways, the building of the Transcontinental railway, the establishment of a perfect system of cold storage compartments on board steamships, the reduction of customs duties on about 150 articles of first necessity.

And it is since then, and owing to the good management of the Liberal government in conjunction with a bountiful Providence, that we enjoy that marvellous prosperity which we never tire of lauding. Under Liberal rule, Canada has become a nation known to the world, attracting general attention, and resting on a solid foundation; this Government has as yet done nothing whatsoever to modify our economic status whereas, at the time we reached power, the country was in a state of crisis, of financial depression, verging on poverty. So we on this side of the House have every reason to rejoice at this reference to the prosperity of the country.

As regards that part of the Speech from the Throne which deals with the fair and requisite help to be given for the naval defence of the Empire, like every other hon. gentlemen in this House, I find here nothing sufficiently precise and clear to enable me to discuss the Government's position. But what surprises me is to see a member of this House who abides before hand by any proposal emanating from the Government, especially when for a number of months we are in a semi-official way given to understand by ministerial organs and through the resignation of the former Minister of Public Works, that the Government's policy will consist in donating to Great Britain some thirty million dollars right away ant when we remember that the gentleman referred to was previous to September 21st, 1911, the champion of the statu quo and plebiscite policy, and was one of that group which denounced in the most violent terms not only the proposal for a Canadian navy, but also to use their own words: 'the still more baneful policy' of the present Prime Minister.

So as to make things plainer, I shall quote from a few of the reports of the numerous Nationalist meetings, at which the hon. member from Chambly and Verchères was one of the most forcible, if not one of the most sincere speakers, and I shall use

for that purpose Le Devoir, the organized organ of that group.

The following is what we read in Le Devoir, of February 21st, 1910.

Report of a meeting held at Longueuil, on February 20th, 1910.

Summary of a speech delivered by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères, at the time a mere spokesman of the Nationalist party:

Would it not be preferable, queries Mr. Rainville, to spend our money in opening up new colonization roads, in building railways, in building the Georgian Bay canal, in equipping our ports at Montreal, Sorel, Quebec, St. John and other points?

What vexed him was just this:

At a given moment, the King would cable to the Government and twelve hours later, the ships, our ships, would take to the sea.

And to think that Laurier wanted

A navy at the disposal of the British admiralty, which would utilise it whenever it saw fit to do so.

Of course, we owed nothing to Great Britain.

Considering that our rights had always been ignored by the mother country.

Meeting held at Montreal on March 23rd, 1910. This again is from Le Devoir, being a report of the speech delivered by the present representative for Chambly and Vercheres.

He inveighs against the shameful stand taken by journalists who, at the bidding of English noblemen unwilling to maintain British supremacy out of their own pockets, want the colonists to supply the cash and pay the cost of maintenance of the British navy.

Meeting held at Chambly, on August 28th, 1910. Again from Le Devoir being the report of a speech by the present representative of Chambly and Verchères.

Mr. Jos. Rainville follows Mr. Ducharme. He enquires whether his hearers know why the Ottawa Government have imposed on us the Navy Bill, and why Mr. Borden has joined hands with Mr. Laurier on this question. The leader of the Opposition at Ottawa is the mascot of Sir Wilfrid. Whenever there is some mean thing to do, Laurier manages to get Borden to give him a hand.

Imperialism is an English importation, an invention of Chamberlain's, who has instilled it in the minds of the members of the Upper House, all great landlords, by getting them to understand that the result of such a policy would be to relieve the British tax-payer and secure a part of their enormous budget through contributions from the colonies.

What has become to-day of that unflinching Nationalist who now sits in this House as the representative of Chambly and Vercheres? Of his old-time Nationalist ways he has retained only his method of quoting extracts. Indeed, in an effort to clear himself to-day, he cuts out this wee sentence from an editorial of Le Devoir, dated October 12th, 1912, which reads as follows: 'Never have the Nationalists contended that Canada should do nothing for the safety of the Empire.' I will now give the remainder of paragraph, and the House no doubt will infer from it that the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères must realize that he is in a pretty bad plight, since he mutilates the editorial to which he refers.

Herewith I give the wording of the paragraph referred to from Le Devoir, of October 12, 1912:

Never have the Nationalists contended that Canada should do nothing for the safety of the Empire. What we have always stated was that the best and most satisfactory way of fulfilling that duty, while at the same time refraining from any infringement on the principle of self-government, would be by thoroughly providing for the defense of the territory and coasts of Canada, and not by launching out a reckless policy of naval defence for which Canada has no use whatever.

The change of position effected by the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres is equivalent to a complete right about face. One of the strong grounds taken by the Nationalists, prior to September 21st, 1911, was that the great majority of the people were in favour of the statu quo and opposed to any form of contribution. When we would state that in Quebec only was there to be found a small group of abstentionists, our opponents would answer (the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres among others): 'See the Grain growers, the Grangers'; then they would quote the views of Mr. So and So of Toronto, of Mr. So and So of Winnipeg, of such a one from Halifax, or Vancouver, etc. To-day the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères acknowledges that we were right, when he says:

There are differences of opinion as to the manner in which such contribution should be effected, but from one end of the country to the other people are unanimous in their desire to see the supremacy of Great Britain maintained in the interest of the whole British Empire.

Then the Balkan war has worked a wonderful change in the mind of the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres; it has set topsy turvy all his former ideas on that important subject of the Empire's safety, and in it he finds the vindication of the Government's whole attitude, future, uncertain and undefined though it be. He is no doubt forgetful of the fact that our ministers' visit to Great Britain preceded the declaration of war.

I do not doubt that the newly-formed views of the hon. member will be

received with great satisfaction and much relief by his constituents in Chambly and Vercheres. So I will let him settle the matter with them and devote some time to a much more interesting figure in this House, I mean the hon. minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel).

For some time I have been worrying over the sad plight in which he would find himself if verily the Government decided to make a grant of thirty millions, considering that he made such a fight, in 1910, to stave off a grant not of 30 millions, but of twenty-five millions, that he showed off as an in and out abstentionist, and that he was noted for his constant appeals to the people of Quebec in favour of the 'statu quo' and the plebiscite. And the reason why I took so great an interest in that hon. minister was my remembrance of a visit which he paid to the county of St. John (whose representative I have the honour to be), on the 1st of December, 1910, and of a speech he made there on that date.

No doubt, he will be grateful to me for recalling in his presence the sweet things he said to my constituents for the purpose of inducing them to vote against me. Hon. gentlemen will also like to have them put on record in 'Hansard.' According to the report in Le Devoir, the hon. minister thus delivered himself at the time:

I will define the three positions taken in the House by Messrs. Laurier, Borden and Monk. Mr. Laurier has made up his mind to have a navy which will be Imperial in time of war and Canadian in time of peace. Mr. Borden, instead of a navy, wished us to make at once a grant of 25 millions to Great Britain. Mr. Monk asked that, previous to any action being taken by the House in this connection, the people be consulted (Applause).

The least that can be expected from a public man is that he should advocate when in power the same principles that he advocated when in opposition. The Government supporters of to-day are not those of fourteen years ago, are not those of ten years ago, are not even those of two years ago. That is why we urge you to oust them from power. If ever our party is put in power, I for one, I promise you to remain faithful to the principles I am advocating to-day. And should the contrary happen, well then, let those who will have carried us to power turn us out.

After reading such a statement and seeing that the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue is still a member of the Borden government, I am led to believe, in spite of contrary indications, that the Government's policy does not provide for a money grant; and what confirms me in that view, is the recent acceptance of a portfolio in that Government by the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Coderre), who, he also, in 1910, paid a visit to my constituents in the beautiful parish of St. George d'Henryville.

What are the principles, the views of the hon. minister on the important question of a grant towards the maintenance of Great Britain's naval supremacy? We have them summed up in the following excerpt from his speech at the Longue-Pointe meeting, on August 2, 1910:

Speakers overrun the constituencies of the provinces of Quebec blaming not only the Government who have put through the Navy Bill, but also the Conservative Opposition which supported a still more obnoxious proposal.

We rally around the principles propounded by Mr. Monk, by refusing to contribute either men or money to the wars of the Empire, before the people have decided what to do. And we believe that such a stand is patriotic, and not that of the Government or of the Opposition. (Applause).

Mr. MARTIN (Sts. Marie): Translation.) Is it really the member for Hochelaga who speaks thus?

Mr. DEMERS: (Translation.) I will go on with the quotation; it is all the time Mr. Coderre who is speaking:

In 1776 and in 1812, our forefathers repulsed the invaders; we would be ready to do the same, but we refuse to fight for motives which we know nothing about, or rather concerning which we are too well posted, as in the case of the South African war, prompted by the business interests of speculators. And we are satisfied that if the electorate were consulted, the majority of the voters would defeat the Government bill and the Borden proposal as well.

I would have enjoyed recalling to the hon. member for Dorchester the visit which he also made to my constituency and some of the speeches which he then delivered, wherein he referred to rags of the red or blue tinge. But I will leave that for some other time.

May I be permitted while I am on my feet to say one word about the amendment moved by the hon. leader of the Opposition. From all that we have heard in connection with the Macdonald and Richelieu elections, it appears that a system of intimidation and terror prevailed there, and that an attempt was made to interfere in very possible way with the free exercise of the most secred right. It was expedient, with a view to vindicating Canada's good name, that a solemn protest should be entered, and I shall be glad to cast my vote in favour of the amendment.

Mr. FORGET moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 12, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 3, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 13, to incorporate the General Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Knowles.

Bill No. 14, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 15, respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 16, respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 17, to incorporate the Northern Empire Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Knowles.

Bill No. 18, respecting the Ontario-Michigan Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill No. 19, respecting the Ottawa Terminals Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 20, respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. L'Espérance.

THE PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN moved:

That Messrs. Boyce, Clarke (Essex), Chisholm (Inverness), and Sharpe (Lisgar), be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the restaurant, as far as the interests of the Commons are concerned, and to act as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the restaurant, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours therewith.

Motion agreed to.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the subject of the printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on printing, viz.: Messrs. Beattie, Bickerdike, Bowman, Brabazon, Brouillard, Cardin, Chabot, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Currie, Douglas, Elliott, Graham, Lavallée, L'Espérance, Martin (Montreal, St. Mary's), Middlebro, Murphy, Nantel, Nicholson, Roche, Stevens, Verville, White (Victoria, Alta.), and Wilson, (Wentworth), will act as members, on the part of this House, on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform their honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Béland, Blondin, Borden, Boyer, Broder, Clark (Bruce), Crothers, Doherty, Emmerson, Foster (North Toronto), Laurier Sir Wilfrid), Lemieux, Lewis, Meighen, Pardee,, Pelletier and Pugsley, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a Joint Committee on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Pelletier.

Report of the Secretary of State for year ended March 31, 1912; the Civil Service List of Canada, 1912.—Mr. Coderre.

LABOUR TROUBLE AT ALGOMA STEEL WORKS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. VERVILLE: I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) if he has any information or any representations with regard to the lockout that now exists at the Algoma Steel Works at Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. CROTHERS: I have had no communication on the subject, either from the employers or the workmen.

DEBATE ON THE ADDRESS.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Rainville for an Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General, in reply to his Speech at the opening of the Session, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET (Charlevoix): Mr. Speaker, so much has been said by hon. members on the other side of the House upon the amendment of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) regarding the Richelieu election that I think I should be allowed a few words, as I happened to be there. Hon. gentlemen on the other side who have spoken upon the subject do not know very much about it, but have simply taken their cue from what the leader of the Opposition has said. In his speech, referring to the Richelieu election, the right hon. gentleman said:

I again charge the Minister of Public Works, and I arraign him before Parliament, with having tried to bribe the electors of Richelieu. I call as witness a member of this House, the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget)——

Well, I have responded to the summons.

—and I say, on the word of the hon. member for Charlevoix, that he was sent by the Minister of Public Works to Richelieu to try

and bribe the electors. I shall not use my own words; I have the words of Sir Rodolphe Forget published in La Patrie, which is the paper friendly to the Government and especially friendly to the hon. member for Charlevoix. The hon. member for Charlevoix came to the town of Sorel, the shire town of the county of Richelieu and held a meeting, and this is his language as reported in his own paper, La Patrie.

I beg to deny that I am the owner of La Patrie. I have not and never had a single five cents worth of interest in that publication. If my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition does not want to believe me, he can ask his bosom friend, Senator Dandurand, who has been a director of La Patrie, and, if he does, he will find that what I state now is the truth. The right hon. gentleman has accused me of having been the proxy of the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers). I want to declare here that the Minister of Public Works had nothing whatever to do, directly or indirectly, with the election in Richelieu. I was not his proxy, but I went there at the request of my friend, Mr. Morgan, to whom I owe a debt of gratitude for what he had done for me in the election of 1911 in Montmorency county. When I got down to Richelieu I found nearly every hon. member of this House from the province of Quebec, as well as the Liberal staffs from St. Hyacinthe, Nicolet, Quebec, and Three Rivers. I may also say that, so far as I can remember, I found there, on the Tuesday, the present hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Cardin) and the hon. members for Beauce (Mr. Béland), St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier), Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier), Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune), Bagot (Mr. Marcile) and Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau); in fact, the hon. member for Three Rivers, on the eve of the election arrived at the head of a party 210 strong, all wearing red ribbons, with a portrait of the leader of the Opposition, which is against the law. As you know, this was in contravention of section 260 of the Dominion Elections Act. These gentlemen did not hold proxies, but they held a general power of attorney to sell, buy and deliver. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been speaking about intimidation, but let us see what occurred. I arrived there on Monday late at night; and I am sorry I was not there on Sunday, because the result of the election would have been otherwise.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Why?

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Because, had I been there on Sunday, I would have spoken to the people in the country districts after mass, as the Liberal members did, and I am sure I could have persuaded them by my arguments on political questions. I understand that by intimidation it is meant that you try to prevent a man from voting, but I do not understand that intimidation means that you can force a man to vote for one party or the other, because when he is behind the door in the secrecy of the polling booth, marking his ballot, he can vote just as he pleases. Let me point out here that the vote in the by-election in Richelieu in October last was the largest vote ever cast in that county. In September, 1911, the vote cast was 4,012 and in October, 1912, the vote was 4,060. Let me point out also that, with the exception of Sorel itself and St. Joseph de Sorel, where this Government has kept a number of Liberal workingmen in their employment, we had a majority everywhere. The hon. member for Richelieu was elected by a majority of 241, and Sorel and St. Joseph de Sorel gave him a majority of 302. Talk about intimidation; was it intimidation for me to say to 4,000 people at a public meeting in that county: Gentlemen, I want you to vote; I want you to vote for Mr. Cardin or for Mr. Morgan; your vote is secret; when you have done your day's work, you have earned your money, go and vote as you wish to vote.' But I went further than that. As president of the Richelieu company, which has its headquarters in Sorel, I stated there publicly, in addressing the people: 'If any foreman should interfere with any man with regard to his vote, let me know, and he will be discharged immediately.' Most of the foremen are good Liberals, and they worked very hard against me.

Now, I come to the famous question of the marine railway. That marine railway has been promised since 1906 by every Liberal that visited Sorel under the Laurier regime. It was promised by the late Mr. Tarte, who I believe had a plan prepared; it was promised by the late Mr. Prefontaine, who had the rollers made; it was promised by Mr. Bruneau, now Judge Bruneau; it was promised by Mr. Beauchemin; it was promised by Mr. Lanctot, the ex-member for that county. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen opposite that when it was promised this time, it was not promised by the present Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) but it was promised by the ex-Minister of Public Works, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). That promise was made at a non-political banquet given by the workingmen of Sorel, who were present to the number of about 800. Furthermore, the promise was made before the writs were issued, at least three weeks before, and it came about in this way. The president of the Board of Trade of Sorel presided at the dinner, at which were present many of the members of the board of trade of that city, and the president of the board of trade who is a very good Liberal, got up deliberately and said that he took

advantage of the presence of the two ministers who had the most to do with Sorel—the hon. the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) and the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk)—to ask them if at least they would promise the marine railway, which was absolutely necessary—and the hon. member for Richelieu cannot deny that it is absolutely necessary. So the Liberal president of the board of trade asked for a promise. I was sitting next to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and he turned to me and said: 'What will it cost, and is it necessary?' I replied: 'It will cost about $200,000 or $225,000, and it is an absolutely necessary work.' At that moment the hon. member (Mr. Monk) rose and promised that he would endeavour to have this marine railway built, which we all know was not only in the interest of the people of Sorel, but was for the good of the country generally. Now, the night that I spoke at Sorel, during the election, I heard that the hon. member had resigned the portfolio of Public Works, and it was rumoured that the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Rogers) would get it. Some of those present came to me and said: 'Now that Mr. Monk has resigned, I suppose that is the end of our marine railway,' but I told them that I did not believe that was the case. What I said at Sorel was: 'I have just heard that Mr. Monk has resigned his portfolio, but you may be sure that whether his successor is Mr. Rogers or anybody else, he will carry out the promise made by his predecessor. Knowing Mr. Rogers as I do know him, and knowing that he is so friendly to the province of Quebec——'

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Well, it is very easy to understand that, because the hon. gentleman (Mr. Rogers) was born in the province of Quebec. I said 'I believe that Mr. Rogers will certainly carry out the promise made by his predecessor, but it will be more sure if you elect——'

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Yes, I said: 'If you elect my friend, Mr. Morgan, the request for the marine railway will be backed up by all the Conservative deputation from the province of Quebec, and we will go to the Minister of Public Works, and we will ask him for it, backed up by your own board of trade.' The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley), who was not there, and who I am sure knows nothing about the matter at all, said in his speech in this House the other night:

I think we would all recognize that it is absolutely indefensible for a public man to make representations of the character of those that the hon. member for Charlevoix made unless he had authority from the Minister of Public Works to make them. He is reported to have made these representations. There are one or more members in this House who heard him make them.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was present.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: I ask the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) if he can now make the statement that he was present on that Monday night.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was present at Sorel when the hon. gentleman (Sir Rodolphe Forget) spoke on the eve of the election. We had a meeting at the Town Hall, and the hon. gentleman was speaking, and I heard him there make the promise referred to in the speech of the hon. the leader of the Opposition. There are four or five other members of this House who heard the speech.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) was not there on the Monday, and he was not there on the Tuesday.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was there on the eve of the election.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: On Wednesday evening the hon. member was there, but I only arrived at a quarter past twelve that night by special train, and he was there speaking in the market hall, and I left the place before he finished his speech. On the Wednesday evening I made only a short speech, simply stating that the farmers were in our favour. I ask the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) now, if he can make the statement that he was present on the Monday when I spoke about the marine railway, and that is the only day I ever spoke about it.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot): I was present on the night in question in Sorel when the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) spoke about the marine railway, and I heard him say what is reported in La Patrie.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Then it must have been you who made that report in La Patrie. As far as the dismissals in Sorel are concerned, I may say that I had nothing to do with them. I do know that we said to the authorities of the Government shipyard at Sorel to let everybody come and vote, and so much was that done that most of the work in lake St. Peter was stopped that day for want of men. I repeat that if it had not been that 85 per cent of the men in the shipyards in Sorel are Liberals, the result would have been much different. In conclusion, I want to say that I never went down to Sorel with a

proxy for the Minister of Public Works, because I have never been used as a proxy, and I am never going to be.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Before discussing the points which have just been raised by my hon. friend the member for Charlevoix and Montmorency (Sir Rodolphe Forget), I should like to review for a few moments what is contained in the Speech from the Throne. It is stated in the biography of the Marquis of Salisbury, written some years ago, that he was an expert in clearness, that no man writing in the English language could be so clear as he, whenever he had to hold a pen. It was said that he could write a Speech from the Throne as easily as he could write an article for the Fortnightly Review. I have read the Speech from the Throne, and if that has been penned by the right hon. the Prime Minister, I am bound to say that he is unlike the late leader of the great Conservative party in England, in that, far from being an expert in clearness, he is a past master in vagueness. It reminds me of the quilt every one of us once saw in our grandmother's house in days gone by. Looking at its broad surface, one could see the intricate weaving; but, while there were very few gold threads in it, there was plenty of fustian. The Speech from the Throne is very heavily freighted with the spoils of the Liberal party for the gold threads it contains. The hon. gentleman seems to have plucked for his scalp many of the feathers belonging to the Liberal party, and to have crowned his forehead with many of the laurels which rightly appertain to that party.

Amongst the petty larcenies—and I am glad to say it is only a petty larceny of which my hon. friend the Postmaster General is guilty—I notice one paragraph referring to cable rates. The speech says:

> My Government has succeeded in securing certain reductions in cable rates, and will continue its efforts to obtain still further reductions.

This is a petty larceny at the expense of the preceding Postmaster General. The work for the reduction of cable rates between Great Britain and Canada is not a work of to-day or yesterday. It started under the direction of my predecessor, Sir William Mulock, it was continued by my humble self, and the first fruits reaped by my hon. friend were reaped just a few weeks after he had taken office last year in the month of October. I do not, however, begrudge my hon. friend the further reduction of this year, far from it, and I hope in the coming years he will obtain more than a cable rate reduction, but a state-owned cable between Great Britain and Canada. It is the desideratum of the Dominions over the seas; is the wish of all those who are sincere believers in cheap telegraphic communication between the various parts of the Empire.

I come now to the real feathers and laurels. The general prosperity of Canada, the settlement of the West, the increase in revenue, the expansion of trade; all of this rightly belongs to the Liberal Government which has administered so successfully the affairs of this country for fifteen years. Lest we forget, I should like to state in a very few words what the Liberal party accomplished during the fifteen years of its regime. First, it adopted a tariff which materially reduced the rate of taxation and promoted domestic and foreign trade. It granted the imports from Great Britain a preferential treatment, which is sane imperialism in deeds, not by words of mouth. It secured the annulment of the Belgian and German treaties which stood in the way of trade between us and Great Britain. It fostered and stimulated the export trade of Canada. It pursued a vigorous policy along the line of development of transportation facilities. It established penny postage within the Empire. It extended the Intercolonial railway to Montreal. The Grand Trunk Pacific was started under the Government which preceded this one, and I only hope that the Grand Trunk Pacific will not be degraded as it is rumoured. It established the Labour Department. It provided against the sweating system in the performance of government contracts. and last but not least, even according to one of the staunchest opponents of Liberalism in the province of Ontario, namely, the Toronto News, the leader of the Liberal party was the pioneer of Canadian naval defence. That policy may be thwarted at the present time, but its ultimate triumph is only delayed. Sir, we look back to our record with pride and satisfaction. It can compare advantageously with that of preceding governments and also with that of the present Government. The turn of the tide in Canada came with the adoption in 1897, of the wise fiscal policy of that great Canadian, the Hon. Mr. Fielding. Even so stout a Conservative as my good friend whom I am pleased to see in his place, the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), will admit that the turning of the tide in Canada came on the introduction of the British preference which had been heralded and promised for many years before 1897, but which it remained for the Liberal Government to give Great Britain. That British preference is the test of Liberal imperialism, it is the standard of Liberal loyalty to the Mother Country. The turning of the tide came also—and this was pointed out yesterday in the very able speech de-

livered by my hon. friend from St. John and Iberville (Mr. Demers)—with the adoption of a vigorous immigration policy begun by the former Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Sifton) and energetically continued by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver).

Let us compare the fifteen years of Conservative regime with the fifteen years of Liberal regime and see if we cannot look back on our record with some pride. Our trade increased from 1881 to 1896 by only $41,700,000; our trade from 1896 to 1911 increased by $525,000,000. The population of Canada, in fifteen years of the Censervative regime increase by 562,000; under the Liberal regime, the population increased from 1896 to 1911 by 2,254,000. The homesteads taken up in the West in 1896 numbered 1,300; the homesteads taken up in 1912 numbered 39,000. if I mistake not.

About this immigration, I read in a certain newspaper some very severe strictures upon the class of immigrants that come into Canada from Great Britain. If I did not respect the House of Commons as I do I would read the article which has been published by the chief ally of the coalition government, Mr. Bourassa, in which he represents the British immigrant as the meanest and the poorest kind of immigrant that is being sent to our shores. I will not cite his own words—I respect too much the House of Commons and have too great consideration for the ears of hon. member to repeat what he says in Le Devoir newspaper. I only wish to call this matter to the attention of my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) who, I presume, has a word to say in the direction of Le Devoir. My hon. friend does not deny that, I suppose? Does he deny it? I would like to know if my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) denies having something to say in the direction of Le Devoir newspaper. The reason I insist for an answer is that my hon. friend, not three weeks ago, stated over his own signature, that he was a shareholder of Le Devoir. And I know, as a matter of fact, that his colleague the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) is also a large shareholder of that paper.

Mr. PELLETIER: A shareholder is not a director.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, Sir, when you put your money into an enterprise, you have that enterprise at heart. I know that my hon. friend will not draw many dividends from Le Devoir. He has drawn all the dividends he is likely to get from that source—the sweets of office are his dividends.

We are told that we have a buoyant revenue. It is true, and my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White, Leeds), the saint of the Cabinet, the personification of honesty in the Cabinet, seems happy and proud of that buoyant revenue. He reminds me of young Vincent Astor. I read in the newspapers yesterday that young Astor was in receipt of a vast income, the interest on a capital ranging from $70,000,000 to $80,000,000. Suppose that young Astor were to pass along Broadway or Wall street with a smile on his face telling people that he is the happy recipient of that income, the proud possessor of that fortune, and were to take to himself the merit of the acquisition of that fortune, I suppose he would be laughed at by older folks. For everyone knows that he owes it to the bounty of old John Jacob Astor. Might I suggest to my hon. friend, the Astor junior of the Cabinet, that he owes his buoyant revenue, his magnificent income to the hard-working man whose name is synonymous with prosperity, Hon. William Stevens Fielding. My hon. friend is proud of that fortune; he smiles and is happy. So are we. It is our common heritage. But according to his own judgment, at least, according to what he said before the last general election, is he not now using and spending tainted money? Where does that money come from? If he consults the blue books he will find that out of the $50,000,000 or so surplus of this year, $49,177,584.32 comes from the United States. Sir, it is a shock to my loyalty to think that the son of Toronto—Toronto the good, the Mecca of protectionism, the mother of loyalty, where the slogan 'No truck or trade with the Yankees,' was heard during the last elections—I say it is a shock to my loyalty that my hon. friend receives that tainted money and spends it in public works in Macdonald and Richelieu. But my hon. friend, who is a great student, remembers that there is an old English adage, 'Too much of a good thing is good for nothing.' Has not he noticed of late that this great prosperity of the Dominion coincides with an excessively high cost of living? My hon. friend has disclaimed his affiliations with the mergers, trusts and combines, and if that be true I hope that before long there will be a divorce between him and the hon. member who spoke a moment ago. My hon. friend, who thus disclaimed his affiliations with these interests, comes from Toronto—as I stated a moment ago, the Mecca of protectionism, where a gentleman whose name I now forget stated a few years ago that he would like to see our tariffs as high as Haman's gallows. In Toronto my hon. friend hears only one word—protection, and high protection at that. I have just quoted an old English adage, and might I now re-

mind my hon. friend of an old French saying: 'qui n'entend qu'une cloche n'entend qu'un son'—he who hears but one bell hears but one chime. Let him put his ear to the ground and listen to the tale of woe heard in that stronghold of protectionism—Toronto!

I do not suppose my hon. friend reads the Labour Gazette, although it is now edited by a very experienced statesman, my hon. friend the Minister of Labour; but if he would read this publication he would find there some very definite statistics. In case he does not read it, however, let me quote from a speech delivered yesterday by one of the foremost financiers of the Dominion, Mr. Meredith, vice-president of the Bank of Montreal, as reported in the Montreal Star of yesterday. Speaking of the high cost of living, he says:

The increased cost of living, and the reasons therefore form a subject much discussed the world over, and commissions of inquiry are now engaged in seeking the cause. I mention the subject because to its effect on the bank's net earnings, owing to the necessity of our having to increase our fixed charges from time to time as a result of bringing up the salaries of the staff to a point which may be considered a fair and reasonable one for the services rendered. The cause for the enhanced value of all commodities is difficult to determine. There are no doubt a number of reasons for it; among them, the largely increased output of gold, resulting, to a great extent, from the more scientific treatment of ore bodies.

And he goes on to give other reasons. But, Sir, an investigation, has taken place in the city of Toronto at the request of the Toronto Board of Trade. That report which I have in my hands, and which is made by a very able economist—a man I am told of world-wide repute—states that during the eleven years subsequent to 1900 the increase in the price of meat in Canada was 43 per cent; of fish, 37 per cent; of dairy products, 27 per cent; and of the other foodstuffs, 25 per cent.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): What about the United States?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have not the figures relating to the United States.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I would suggest that you look them up.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will look at them. They may be higher there, for there is more protection in the United States, but in that country there has been elected a David who will shortly give some of his views to the Goliath which has kept the American consumers crushed down for the last twenty years.

My hon. friend spoke the other day of the Canadian Courier—a publication which is read in every respectable home of Ontario. I am an Ontario man myself, and I relish the reading of the Canadian Courier. My hon. friend said, 'Oh, it is an obscure paper'. But it is owned by some of my hon. friend's greatest admirers; I am told that it is published under the guidance of Messrs. McKenzie and Mann. Possibly my hon. friend's reference to that paper as being an obscure one is due to the fact that it is a fair paper for both parties. However, perhaps he knows something about Saturday Night, which is published in Toronto. I do not think this is an obscure paper; on the contrary I find it a very illuminative periodical. Commenting on the report prepared by Professor McKenzie, the Toronto Saturday Night says:

That we here in Canada should be paying more for Canadian produce of one sort and another, than is the Englishman for the self same foods, 'is grotesque on the face of it, but nevertheless this is apparently the fact, according to the figures recently published in the London Economist, a journal of authority in the British capital. The very fact that we send our produce over some three thousand miles of water, not to speak of the expenses incurred in putting it aboard ship and taking it out again, and then sell it through a London shop for less money than we pay for the same things in the province in which they are manufactured or raised seems almost unbelievable.

Almost unbelievable—yet it is the baid truth. As one of the causes of the high cost of living, Mr. Meredith mentions the large output of gold, but Professor McKenzie gives one other cause, which we must bring to light,—for the toiling masses of this country will not stand any such tariff or any such prosperity when they pay more for their foodstuffs on this side of the water than our English friends. Let me quote what Professor McKenzie says:

One cause operating in Canada as a whole which permits the prices of foodstuffs to be higher in Canadian cities than in London is the tax levied on imports of food from abroad and paid, of course, by the Canadian consumer. This tax was intended to protect the Canadian farmer in times of Canadian scarcity and to be inoperative in times of Canadian plenty, but the development of the packing and canning industries, coupled with the growth of cold-storage facilities, has made it possible to-day for a group of men to entirely control the prices at which our farmers must sell certain products—nearly all the possible buyers being in the group—and also to maintain the prices at which the consumer must buy the same products up to the level of the foreign price, plus freight, plus duty. We all know how high are the prices of domestic fruits and vegetables, while imported tropical fruits, upon which there is no duty, are said to be as cheap in Toronto as in any other city outside of the tropics. It was never intended that a tax imposed to protect the farmers should be used by dealers

to corner domestic produce. If Argentine beef, New Zealand mutton, and Australian butter, for example, had free access to Canada, no one could doubt that the prices of these commodities would at once drop to about the London level, and it is pretty certain that the Canadian producer would, on the average, get at least as much as he is getting now.

That this tax on the importation of food has resulted in raising the price of food to all who live within the taxed area is now clearly seen by the industrial classes of Germany and of Austria, and is apparently becoming obvious even in the United States. In these countries manufacturers and municipal councils are joining forces with the artisans in demanding the removal of the tax on foodstuffs.

Sir, I claim that the trade agreement negotiated two years ago by the Hon. Mr. Fielding and that other stalwart Canadian, Mr. Paterson, was the best means of abolishing all high prices of foodstuffs consumed in Canada. My hon. friend in his reference to reciprocity was, I would not say sneering, but rather contemptuous. He seemed to forget that 616,948 free men, Canadians, British subjects, supported that pact at the elections of 1911. In his attempt to discredit the Fielding-Knox agreement, my hon. friend even delved into history. He reminded the House of what George Brown had said in 1866 when he refused to join the movement in favour of a new reciprocity treaty with the United States at that time. He said that George Brown protested because he would not care to see any Canadian statesman dangling at Washington. My hon. friend reminds me of the historian who wrote the history of France and forgot to mention the name of Bonaparte. He speaks of the George Brown of 1866; surely my hon. friend ought to know that in 1874 the same George Brown went to Washington, the bearer of a mandate from the Canadian people, to obtain a reciprocity treaty from the United States. When my hon. friend frowns down the idea of negotiating a trade arrangement with the United States, he is very severe on the old chieftain, Sir John A. Macdonald. Has he forgotten that Sir John A. Macdonald was himself a supporter of reciprocity with the United States? Has he forgotten that the National Policy itself was only the precursor of a reciprocity agreement with the United States? The other day some one on the other side of the House interrupted my friend from Carleton, N. B. (Mr. Carvell) when he was making the argument I was making a moment ago, that if the reciprocity agreement of 1911 had been adopted, foodstuffs would have been cheaper for the Canadian consumer. Some one asked, 'Who pays the duty?' I wish to tell my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, and his disciples behind him, that the answer to that query was given by no less an authority than Sir John A. Macdonald himself. Here is what Sir John A. Macdonald said, as reported in 'Hansard' for 1878, page 861: He puts a very concrete case, and the answer is very simple:

I put a case in the Eastern Townships of a man upon the imaginary line which was between this country and the United States. Suppose a man has 100 acres on the Canadian side of the line and 100 acres of land on the American side of the line. Suppose he grows 1,000 bushels of barley on each of his farms. He takes his 1,000 American bushels to the American market and gets one dollar a bushel for it. He takes his 1,000 bushels of Canadian barley to the American market and gets but 85 cents per bushel, because he has to pay 15 per cent. duty for taking it across that imaginary line. How can it, in this case, be said that consumer pays the duty? It comes out of the pockets of the Canadian farmers.

There is the answer given by the old chieftain. But besides the words quoted above, we have the deeds of Sir John A. Macdonald; we have the permanent offer contained in the National Policy of 1879, and if my hon. friend the Minister of Finance would only take the pains to read section 6, chapter 15, of the Act, 42 Victoria, he will find the enumeration of all the articles practically the same as contained in one of the schedules of the reciprocity agreement negotiated two years ago by the Canadian ministers. A reciprocity agreement should not be in the eyes and in the mind of hon. gentlemen opposite, a disloyal act on the part of the Liberal party when in 1911 we were only continuing the policy adopted by the great chieftain of the Conservative party, Sir John A. Macdonald, in 1878. But there are two kinds of justice in this country, one for the Tories and one for the Liberals. Tories and Toryism all over the Empire, are the embodiment of loyalty. Whigism or Liberalism, be it in Great Britain, or be it in Canada, is the very embodiment of disloyalty, especially when the hon. gentlemen are not too secure in office. Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Leonard Tilley, and Sir Charles Tupper were great imperialists. They could negotiate a reciprocity treaty with the United States, but Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, and the Hon. Mr. Paterson, being Liberals and sane imperialists, are so disloyal to the Crown when they happen to negotiate a similar trade agreement with the United States.

The right hon. the Prime Minister referred to the leader of the Opposition as a scrap-book orator, and he himself concluded his speech by reading a series of extracts. He taunted the hon. leader of the Opposition about his campaign last fall in the province of Ontario, and he stated that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Lau-

rier) had nailed the reciprocity flag to his mast. I wish that the hon. gentleman could have quoted correctly the language used by the hon. leader of the Opposition. The leader of the Opposition spoke on that vexed question at a banquet which was tendered to him by the Montreal Reformers on the 27th of May last at the Windsor Hotel. He used the following language, and it states exactly the position of the Liberal party in regard to the fiscal policy:

There was before us last year, and there is before us this year this same problem of larger markets. The agreement which we proposed last year would have largely solved that problem, but it was rejected by the Canadian people. I am a constitutionalist, and therefore I have to accept the verdict. However, that problem is still here, just as it was last year. Not only is it still here, but it is more acute than it was last year.

The problem of larger markets is an important problem in the East, but it is more important in the West. Larger markets for the provinces east of Lake Superior are an advantage apparent to everybody, but in the provinces west of Lake Superior—in the prairie provinces, larger markets are an indispensable necessity. How shall I prove it? Let me appeal to your judgment and your experience. We have been pouring population into the western provinces. Every year thousands, and hundreds of thousands of acres of virgin soil are brought under cultivation. Last year the wheat crop fit for human food was about 130,000,000 bushels. This year, if Providence blesses us at all, our wheat crop will be at least 200,000,000 bushels. Where will the crop go?

We know where the crop is going because hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House went this year, as they went last year, hat in hand, begging from the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States, the privilege of sending our wheat in American cars and American bottoms through American ports. Does the problem still exist? I have not here the words—the weighty words—spoken last year before the Canadian Club in Montreal by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Bennett); but if I remember well, that hon. gentleman prophesied that if relief were not given to the western growers there would be secession by the West from the East. This language was used by one of the supporters of my right hon. friend opposite, a gentleman who aspires, and rightly so, to become a member of the Imperial House of Commons.

I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance must read very assiduously the articles which are published monthly in that gospel of the manufacturers, Industrial Canada. If he wants to know whether the problem still exists in the West, as was stated by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition at the Windsor Hotel banquet and during his campaign last fall in the province of Ontario, he has only to read the report made to the Manufacturers' Association at Toronto by Mr. Frank Beer, in the month of May last. It is published in the August number of Industrial Canada. Mr. Frank Beer was the president of the Toronto branch of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and he stated:

The one event of outstanding importance since our last annual meeting was the federal election which resulted in the downfall of the Government upon the issue of reciprocity. It would be useless to attempt to disguise the fact that Alberta and Saskatchewan are keenly disappointed over the failure to obtain access to the larger markest of the Uuited States, and so long as that feeling of disappointment prevails it cannot be said that reciprocity is dead. Nor can we afford to close our eyes to the fact that the provinces mentioned feel aggrieved with us in the East for the part we played in thwarting their desire. No amout of specious argument or flag waving will allay that feeling or satisfy the West that it has not been robbed.

That is the language, not of a disgruntled or disloyal Grit, but it is the language of the president of the Toronto branch of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. He states that the westerners feel that they have been robbed of their market in the United States.

I now come to the amendment moved by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. There were disclosures after the elections in Macdonald and Richelieu which, I thought, might perhaps affect the apparent tranquility and serenity of my right hon. friend the leader of the Government. When these disclosures were made in this House by the affidavits read by the hon. member for Edmonton, I thought that his eyes would dart reproof. I thought that the right hon. gentleman would remember the Halifax platform, that he would remember the denunciations which he hurled from this side of the House when he was himself leader of the Opposition, about the electoral corruption that the Liberal party, in his judgment, was guilty of in those days. No, Mr. Speaker, he used the old tu quoque argument. But, I must tell the right hon. gentleman that more is expected of him. His own high reputation, his very position as Prime Minister of the premier colony of the Empire, compel him to frown down such electoral methods. Why, Sir, what is the origin of the word 'franchise?' It means freedom—freedom for the elector to elect a representative and if that freedom is denied to the elector and if the Prime Minister of Canada would simply say: 'Well, you did the same thing,' I reply that such an argument is beneath the dignity of the Prime Minister and that it is not in accordance with the policy which he preached on this side of the House.

I see my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) in his seat. He has been on the bench for fifteen years. He has administered justice in the province of Quebec and he is now occupying the highest post in connection with the administration of justice in Canada. He is himself the worthy son of a worthy sire who was a judge for many years in Montreal. How does he regard the methods of Judge McMicken in Winnipeg? What has he to say about the actions of Judge McMicken? Mr. Speaker, if I cannot appeal to my hon. friend as Minister of Justice, or to his better instincts as a judge in the old days, might I suggest to him to read the memorable words of one of his own countrymen, probably the most eloquent of modern orators? Let me refresh his memory. Let him read the words of his eminent fellow-countryman, Sheridan, who, on the celebrated trial of Warren Hastings, in defining what British justice is, used this language:

> It is not the portentous phantom of despair it is not like any fabled monster, formed in the eclipse of reason and found in some unhallowed grave of superstitious darkness and political dismay! No my Lord!
>
> In the happy reverse of all these, I turn from this disgusting carricature to the real image Justice I have now before me august and pure; the abstract idea of all that would be perfect in the spirit and the aspiring of men!—where the mind rises, where the heart expands; where the countenance is over placid and benign; where his favourite attitude is to stoop to the unfortunate—to hear their cry and to help them,—to rescue and relieve, to succor and to save:—majestic from its mercy; venerable from its utility—uplifted without pride—firm without obduracy—beneficent in each preference—lovely though in her frown.
>
> On that justice I rely; deliberate and sure —abstracted from all party purpose and political speculations!

That is the image of British justice as defined by that great Irish orator, and my wish is that the Minister of Justice, who is a staunch Irishman, although he belongs to the Tory party, would live up to the spirit of justice as defined by his great compatriot. Sir, we are advertising Canada in the old country, we are asking immigrants to settle our vast domain west of Lake Superior, and when they come here they expect that in this British country they will find the image of British justice set up for veneration. Have they found in the jails of Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie the image of British justice? The Minister of Justice may smile, the Minister of Justice may ignore the amendment which has been placed before the House, and while the people of this country may forget and forgive many things, yet, when it comes to an attack on the liberty of the British subject, the people of Canada, French, English, Irish and Scotch, will never forget and never forgive.

I have listened to the harangue delivered by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rudolphe Forget) and I may say I am not surprised at all at the manner in which he spoke of his dealings, his plannings, and his schemings, in the Richelieu election. The hon. member for Charlevoix said that he was no proxy to the Minister of Public Works or to any other minister. It is a very strange thing that when the Liberal party fights in an election, as the Liberal party fought in the county of Richelieu, none of the ministers who represent the Quebec wing in the Cabinet appeared on the platform. Mr. Monk did not appear in the election, the Postmaster General did not appear in election, the Minister of Inland Revenue did not appear in that election, but they sent the noble knight, the member for Charlevoix and Montmorency, who usually never takes part in politics—he is too busy at other things just now. But, in Richelieu he was there the representative of the Quebec wing in the Government. I will repeat word for word what was reported in La Patrie, a newspaper which is inspired by the hon. member for Charlevoix and Montmorency which takes his special defence just now in many things, which is the organ of the Quebec wing of the Borden Government in the district of Montreal. La Patrie stated that on the eve of the election in Richelieu, and at one other meeting before that, the hon. gentleman had appeared on the platform and had used in substance the following words: 'Gentlemen, you have an election at present in this constituency; the Government candidate is Mr. Morgan, my bosom friend; the Opposition candidate Mr. Cardin. I have spent the evening last night with Mr. Rogers the Minister of Public Works, and I am authorized to inform you gentlemen, that if you will vote for Mr. Morgan, and elect him, you will get that marine railway and I take the pledge, that if this amount is not put in the estimates during the next session Mr. Morgan will resign as your member.' My hon. friend has the audacity to say that this is not a threat, that this is not intimidation. Is conscience a blank with the hon. gentleman? I say it is the worst perversion of the election law. I am not surprised, Sir, at the language of the hon. gentleman; I am not surprised at his taking part in an election contest just now—he needs the Government just now. We have never before seen the hon. member for Charlevoix taking part in an election; we hardly saw him in this House during two Parliaments; he was not in politics, he was in

business. But there are people who say that there is a very obvious reason why the hon. gentleman should try to prove his influence in the county of Richelieu, and in the province of Quebec generally, so as to get as much as possible the favour of the Government. The hon. gentleman (Sir Rodolphe Forget) is in straits at the present time.

Mr. CARVELL: What kind?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh, it will come out during this session and the members who cheered a moment ago will then understand why the hon. gentleman is ready to eat humble pie and to swallow what he said during the Richelieu election in order to enjoy the good graces of the Minister of Public Works. A very respectable paper, an independent Liberal paper, the Montreal Witness——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend deny that? Is not the Montreal Witness one of the most respectable papers published in Canada? I know of no more respectable paper. I am a Roman Catholic; it is a stern and unbending Protestant organ, but I know of no paper of such honesty of purpose as the Montreal Witness. It stated the other day the following, and thus you will understand how my hon. friend is ready to acquiesce with and to stand as bondsman for the hon. the Minister of Public Works:

> The statement is made on very good authority that the bond interest on the Quebec railway, light, heat and power bonds, due December 1st, will be paid, and that all arrangements in this connection have been completed.
>
> There has been doubt regarding the company's ability to pay its bond interest, but it is understood that Sir Rodolphe Forget has arranged the necessary financing to pay the interest.
>
> Such a stand was adopted because it was felt that by the time the next bond interest was due, arrangements would have been completed regarding the assistance the Government is going to lend the Quebec and Saguenay line.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: I deny that absolutely in toto; the Quebec railway will pay its own interest.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I declare from my seat in this House that the Quebec and Saguenay railway is a bankrupt concern at present.

Sir RODOLPHE FORGET: Do not call it the Quebec and Saguenay; call it the Quebec railway.

Mr. LEMIEUX: There is pending in the courts of Quebec an action amounting to $800,000 against the Quebec and Saguenay railway. It is well known; my hon. friend knows it, so do the Prime Minister and the Postmaster General, and no man knows it better than the Minister of Public Works, that the hon. member for Charlevoix is dangling around the minister's offices to get a guarantee of bonds in order to relieve the unfortunate French investors who were caught in that enterprise.

Mr. CARVELL: The engineers have not been paid.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh, do not have any fear, the hon. member for Charlevoix will engineer that probably if we have another by-election. I would warn the right hon. the Prime Minister, in whose honesty I believe, to be careful—yes, to be doubly careful. We know what influences are at work at present to obtain from this Government a guarantee of bonds for the Quebec and Saguenay railway. I warn the right hon. gentleman that not only from Canada, but from Paris, from France, investors are watching events just now.

The hon. the Minister of Finance, seems to be aggrieved because forsooth, a reference was made to the cut in the cement duty. As Liberals we do not object to the reduction, in fact, we favour the reduction of the cement duty. I, for one, would be ready to wipe out the duty altogether. The hon. gentleman, however, must know that we are rather suspicious of a cement cut announced by my good friend, the Minister of Public Works, in that smooth language of his, at a banquet held in Regina, a few hours after the Order in Council has been passed, and just on the eve of the Saskatchewan elections. We object to that. It is disgracing Canadian politics to insinuate, to whisper to the electors that if they do the right thing they will get tariff reductions. Nobody accuses the Minister of Finance, in whose sterling honesty we all believe, of being a party to such a crime, but as long as men have the brazen effrontery to parade before the Parliament of Canada their corruption, I tell the hon. Minister of Finance that the people will not stand for such tariff tinkering.

But, Sir, in addition to the cement cut for the West, there was another cut engineered by my hon. friend, the Postmaster General, just on the eve of the Quebec elections, following the same methods. It was not a cut in cement; it was a cut on the Quebec rock. Here is a paper which my hon. friend owns and inspires, and when I want to know something of Cabinet secrets I read L'Evenement. The Quebec elections took place, as my hon. friend will remember, on the 15th of May. Surely he has not forgotten that date. On the 6th of May, L'Evenement reported a speech delivered by my hon. friend at Jeune Lorette. That is where my hon.

friend's leader, Mr. Armand Lavergne, delivered a speech the other day. My hon. friend said, just before the election, in order to get the votes of Quebec :

> We shall make a cut. We shall tunnel Cape Diamond, in order to reach the heart of Quebec.

For a practical man like the Postmaster General, a heart is much needed. He did not find the heart of Quebec, and nobody talks now of a cut in the rock of Quebec, or of a tunnel under Cape Diamond. Will my hon. friends, the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, be surprised if we are suspicious as to the honesty of purpose of the Government, when, just on the eve of the Saskatchewan elections it reduced the cement duty, and when the tunnelling of Cape Diamond is announced just nine days before the elections there. This is corruption, and once more I say to my hon. friend the Prime Minister, that he will have to live up to the principles he preached while in opposition, and a searching investigation will have to be made as regards Richelieu and Macdonald, or else he will lose the respect of the independent electors in this country.

Just a word about the naval policy. I have nothing to add to what has been so forcibly said by the speakers on this side of the House, and notably by the leader of the Opposition. I do not know what the policy of the Government will be. We are told, however, that an emergency contribution will be asked from this Parliament. If there is an emergency, I for one will do my duty towards the Mother Country and the Empire. But, what is ' an emergency ?' Webster is my friend, Mr. Speaker, and I look to Webster when I am embarrassed with an English expression. I look to Webster to find out what an emergency is, and here is what my old friend says :

> Emergency; a sudden or unexpected appearance; an unforeseen occurrence; a sudden occasion; a pressing necessity; an exigency.

If my hon. friend is able to establish before this House and the country that there is an unforeseen occurrence, a sudden occasion, a pressing necessity, an exigency, I for one, as a Canadian and as a British subject, am ready to do my duty toward the Mother Country. And not only shall I do my duty, but the Liberal party will do its duty. Let me remind the ' Jingo ' press that there is no monopoly of loyalty in this country or within the Empire, and nobody will be stampeded by any cry of 'Emergency,' if it does not really exist. We are free British subjects; we have free parliamentary institutions; and before voting the millions of this Dominion, we shall want to know why.

My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who spoke so eloquently the other day—in fact so eloquently that surely he should occupy one of the front benches in this House—asked himself—as though he did not know it at all—if it were true that some people had stated in the province of Quebec that Canada owed nothing to England. I can assure my hon. friend that, as a matter of fact, this very disloyal, this very unpatriotic statement was made. And made by whom? Made by his leaders, by the gentlemen who represent the Nationalist wing in the present Government. And I may add, the Liberals in the province of Quebec suffered defeat in twenty or twenty-one counties because they thought it more patriotic to educate the masses to their duties towards the British Crown than to have recourse to demagogic appeals in the province of Quebec. In that campaign of education I am sorry to say the right hon. gentleman who leads the Government was found wanting. He, as leader of the great Conservative party—the party so ably described by my hon. friend the 'nouveau riche of Chambly Verchères,' as the party of Macdonald and Cartier—came to Quebec during the last general election. He knew the vicious campaign carried on by his neighbour the present Postmaster General. He knew the language used by the former Minister of Public Works. He knew the literature sent all over Canada, wherever a French settlement existed in Ontario, in Manitoba or the Western provinces. He probably knew also that my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), a stout imperialist, a jingo of the jingoes, had paid the postage of Le Devoir at the Montreal post office to spread that literature among the French speaking electors of Canada. And the right hon. gentleman did not care to stop that nationalist education given to the French Canadian electorate of this country. The Nationalist wing of the Cabinet, had but one slogan in that campaign amongst the French electors. It was: No navy! no contribution! we owe nothing to England! The present Minister said: ' There is a deep laid plot, gentlemen of the French race, there is a dark conspiracy amongst Laurier, Borden and Lord Grey, to benefit England at Canada's expense.' And the shouters and the shriekers were the men who are now in the coalition Government, the allies of the right hon. gentleman himself.

Mr. LAMARCHE: If my hon. friend will allow me to ask him a question—

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend was one of the worst in the county of Nicolet.

Mr. LAMARCHE: I would ask this: When he says that in the province of Quebec some of the so-called Nationalists

said that we owed nothing to England, were they using their own words or were they repeating certain words spoken by the late Sir Richard Cartwright, a member of the Liberal party?

Mr. LEMIEUX: If there are fools who believe that the gallant old knight of Oxford could utter so disloyal a sentiment, I pity them. The hon. gentleman is there using half a phrase—which makes half a lie, which is worse than a lie. He is using half of a sentence which I have just read in the 'Reminiscences' of Sir Richard Cartwright, as they insidiously used half a sentence from the speech made by the hon. Mr. Fielding in the naval debate. The hon. gentleman, I say, was one of the worst, but far less guilty in my judgment than the Postmaster General, who had been a Minister of the Crown in the province of Quebec, and as such had taken the oath of office and sworn loyalty to His Majesty. He argued, and they argued, in the province of Quebec that according to Mr. Fielding: 'Laurier's navy will be Canadian in time of peace, but Imperial in time of war.' And they added: 'Poor mothers, in the dead of night your children will be snatched away from your homes and carried afar to the seas of China and Japan,—indeed, to all the seven seas where Britain dominates; and your children will be killed for a flag which is not their own and for a cause which they ignore.'

Sir, we will have a naval debate, and we will know how many of the gentlemen who jetisonned their principles for office how many will have the courage to repeat what they said during that campaign in the province of Quebec.

I have a few clippings in my possession; I need not use them. The time has come to stamp out the disloyalty cry in this country. The words spoken in Parliament are heard all over Canada. The language used by the Postaster General, the former Minister of Public Works, the Minister of Inland Revenue, the new Secretary of State, and all those other gentlemen who were elected as members of the Nationalist party in Quebec, could not be repeated before such an assembly of free men as is gathered here to-day. Let me tell my eloquent friend from Kingston, that we, the 'disloyal', we the old Rouge party in the province of Quebec, fought the demagogues. Mr. Speaker, you have long been a member of this House, and you know that this was manifested on many occasions—not by blatant jingoism, not by words of mouth, but by deeds. Canadian Liberal imperialism manifested itself in this country when our ancestors of the Reform party fought for responsible government; when George Brown and Alexanderr Mackenzie advocated confederation; when the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, for the first time in the history of Canada, gave Great Britain a trade preference; when Liberalism took over the garrisons of Esquimalt and Halifax; when we gladly gave our co-operation to the fighting forces of Great Britain in South Africa; when the right hon. gentleman, attending the conferences of the Empire in London, obtained, through his wise statesmanship, an equal status for all the colonies, and, finally, when, in spite of the wild appeals made to passions and prejudices, he gave Great Britain a Canadian navy—a navy to be built in Canada, to be manned by Canadian sailors, to fly the Canadian flag, and to be ready to respond to the call whenever the Empire would be in danger. I will not quote from the remarks of the right hon. gentleman, for I find that a speech delivered by the Minister of Trade and Commerce is still more pointed, and brings out in a more concrete way the principles of the Laurier navy—the tin-pot navy, as my hon. friends are wont to say. When the resolution of March, 1909, was introduced in the House, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce delivered what I consider to be one of the masterpieces of Canadian eloquence. He said ('Hansard,' 1909, vol. 2, page 3406):

> The interest that we take in a contribution spent by another is not the interest that I desire for Canada. I want to see something grafted on the soil of Canada's nationhood which takes root and grows and develops until it incites the spirit of defence in this country, leads to a participation in the defence, leads to that quick interest in it, its glories, its duties, and its accomplished work, which is, after all, the one great thing that compensates a people for great expenditures either on land or on sea in the way of defence, and of the maintenance of the rights of the country. . . The first Canadian-owned vessel, built and equipped in Britain, and sent out to defend our coasts, would become the nucleus and the training ground of Canadian stokers, Canadian sailors, and Canadian officers, and bye and bye perhaps of a Canadian admiral on the Canadian coast. How much time would be spent in completing that circle none of us can say, but if we begin the tracing of it and follow it fairly and faithfully the time must come when we get a complete circle and have an Imperial adjunct to the British navy for the defence of Canada and the defence of the Empire in which Canada has some of her body, her bones, her blood, and her mental power, her national pride.

This is the best argument that was ever offered for the policy of a Canadian navy.

Mr. Speaker, let me say one word to my hon. friend the member for Kingston, and let that word be repeated in the press of this country; let it be heard throughout

Canada, and, if it be not too presumptuous of me to say so, throughout the British Empire. The French-Canadians are willing nay, are anxious, that Great Britain should have and maintain her naval supremacy. It is essential to Canada, and perhaps more so to Quebec, for reasons that I will give later on. Great Britain's difficulties are not Quebec's opportunities; on the contrary, Great Britain's difficulties would be Quebec's difficulties; Britain's trials would be Quebec's trials. That is the reason why the members of the French-Canadian Liberal party, knowing what liberties they enjoy under the British flag, are willing to give men and money in order to maintain, unimpaired, Great Britain's naval supremacy on the seven seas.

Mr. NICKLE: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he suggests that I cast even a shadow of suspicion, in respect to their loyalty, upon the French-Canadian people, or if I expressed in any way the belief that there would be the slightest hesitancy on their part to do their duty to Canada and the Empire?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hasten to accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman——

Mr. NICKLE: I am making no explanation; I am asking a question.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I accept, without any discussion, the words of my hon. friend; but he mentioned something in his speech which in my judgment required an explanation from me. He mentioned that he had heard some one suggest that we owed nothing for England. I did not say that my hon. friend had charged this side of the House with that unpatriotic sentiment. I am explaining to the hon. gentleman that he made use of such words in the campaign of 1911.

Mr. NICKLE: I rise to a question of privilege. If the hon. gentleman intends to quote me, he must quote me correctly. I am reported in 'Hansard' as saying:

> Another point is raised. They tell me that if the policy of the right hon. leader of the Government prevails we shall divide Canada into two parts, that we shall have Quebec on the one hand and the English speaking provinces on the other. I cannot believe these foretellers of such dire forebodings.
>
> My mind goes back in history to the time when, in 1775, the revolting American colonies used every wile to win the French-Canadians from their allegiance to the British Crown; my memory goes back through history to the war of 1812, when French-Canadian blood watered the lower provinces for the maintenance of British supremacy; history tells us how, in 1840, the French-Canadian people, more numerous then than the people of Upper Canada, threw in their lot with us for a united parliament.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. NICKLE: I am on my feet on a question of privilege. I submit that if I am to be quoted it is my right to be quoted as I spoke.

Mr. CARVELL: Read the other part.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Might I suggest the sentence he used, 'We owe nothing to England.' That will explain what I have just stated. I have accepted the explanation of my hon. friend.

Mr. NICKLE: I have no recollection of ever using the words, 'We owe nothing to England.' If the hon. gentleman can find it in my speech, I would be very glad if he would point it out. Now that I am on my feet, if my point is well taken, I desire to continue my quotation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order, Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it is a question of privilege, I must tell hon. members that I see no question of privilege.

Mr. NICKLE: Then I rise to a point of order. If I am to be quoted, I must be quoted as I spoke.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have accepted the explanation of the hon. gentleman. If I am mistaken—

Mr. NICKLE: Will you please give your ruling, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER: I see no point of order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. the Minister of Finance, was very gloomy as to the future of the Liberal party. He said that we had many more sorrows to face, that we must stay five, ten, fifteen, or perhaps twenty years, in opposition. Might I suggest to my hon. friend that he might read one of Mirabeau's speeches, in which he said that the Capitol was not far from the Tarpeian Rock. We have seen parties, quite as strong as the Conservative party, remain in office just long enough to show the people how inconsistent they were. But since my hon. friend is making predictions, let me remind him that in our judgment we have a good cause and a great leader. We have a good cause just as the Liberals in England had in the 70's after their defeat, and we have a Canadian Gladstone at our head. Last fall after a meeting at Woodstock, where five overflow meetings had to be held in order to let the hon. leader of the Opposition speak to the masses of the people who had congregated, the Mail and Empire suggested to its readers that if so many thousand people had gathered at Woodstock, it was, forsooth, because the people of Ontario, being very generous, wanted to see the old man for the last time. This

was said of Gladstone when he started the famous and classical campaign of Midlothian, and we know what the result was in 1880; he disrupted and disbanded the Tory party in England, as the Tory party in Canada will be disrupted and disbanded at the next general election. Let me recall to my hon. friend the words of Gladstone during that campaign; they are of application to the present circumstances:

We can not reckon on the wealth of the country, nor upon the rank of the country, nor upon the influence which rank and wealth usually bring. In the main, these powers are against us, for wherever there is a close corporation, wherever there is a spirit of organized monopoly, whenever there is a narrow and sectional interest apart from that of the country, and desiring to be set up against the interest of the public, there, gentlemen, we, the Liberal party have no friendship and no tolerance to expect. Above all these, and behind all these, there is something greater than these—there is the nation itself.

Before resuming my seat, I would like to answer my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle). I read in 'Hansard,' at page 26, the following words which he used in his speech:

If I understand correctly the spirit and intention of the Canadian people, they are determined that their nationalism will never rest on the will and favour of any foreign power. The critics again say that we owe no duty to England because she has not been fair in diplomacy.

He says that of the Nationalists in the province of Quebec.

Mr. NICKLE: Mr. Speaker, I rise——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. NICKLE: I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman has directed a question to me, and I believe it is my privilege to reply. I said, 'the critics say,' I did not say 'the Nationalists say.'

Some hon. MEMBERS: Who are they?

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is exactly what was being said in the province of Quebec by my hon. friends the Postmaster General, the Minister of Inland Revenue, the Secretary of State, the member for Dorchester, the member for Chambly-Verchéres, and by all the Nationalists.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. RAINVILLE: I rise to a point of order. If the hon. member will point out to me, even in a newspaper, that I ever said that we owed nothing to England, I am going to resign.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Other hon. MEMBERS: You are afraid.

Mr. MARTIN (Montreal, St. Mary's): Give us what he did say.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Fortunately I have witht me the gospel of nationalism Le Nationaliste reproducing word for word, several speeches delivered by the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères.

An hon. MEMBER: Let him resign.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We have not had many resignations, Mr. Speaker. I am afraid that this House will be depleted, and that the majority of this coalition Government will dwindle down to very little if they all resign when we have read their speeches. Le Nationaliste, the organ of the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères, the organ of the hon. Postmaster General, the gospel of the rebels in the province of Quebec, reports the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères, as saying:

Would it not be better to use our money to open new railways, to work for colonization, to open the Georgian Bay canal, to equip the harbours of Montreal, Sorel, Quebec, St. John and elsewhere, before deciding this great problem? The Government must submit it to the people.

On the 21st of August, the hon. gentleman said:

Why has Mr. Borden allied himself with Sir Wilfrid Laurier on that question as on many others? The leader of the Opposition at Ottawa—the right hon Mr. Borden, the leader of the Government to-day, is the mascot of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Each time that the Prime Minister (referring to Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—has a 'mauvais coup'—a bad trick—to play, he uses Mr. Borden, and Mr. Borden goes willingly to his assistance.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Who said that?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres, the hon. gentleman who is anxious to resign, the hon. gentleman who said that we owe nothing to England. We remember the song, 'Britons never shall be slaves.' Listen to this, on the 11th of September, 1911, just ten days before polling day. The hon. member for Chambly and Verchères was speaking at Boucherville with that rebel, Armand Lavergne, the gentleman who is trying to raise civil war in Canada, according to the Postmaster General:

I have told **myself**——

He was speaking to himself, soliloquising.

—that I would not enter the House of Commons like a slave. I have too much heart for that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. LEMIEUX: On the 21st February, 1910, he used the following language:

During the past century the race for armaments has gone on until it has reached the epidemic stage in Europe. The people are being ruined to feed soldiers and to main-

tain vessels. If the United States wanted Canada thy would only have to take it and I believe—I suspect—that England would allow the United States to take Canada without saying anything. Invariably——

I call the attention of the hon. member for Kingston, to this:

Invariably the United States have obtained what they have asked for, and our rights have always been sacrificed by the Mother Country.

My hon. friend was right in stating that somebody had said that we owed nothing to England. Of course, that somebody was the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres. I said a moment ago that the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche) was the worst, but the first prize is due to the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres. Of course, the grand laurels, the gold medal must be bestowed upon the hon. Postmaster General. Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: We have many more such statements, but I shall not read them to the House.

Mr. RAINVILLE: I have already said, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. gentleman was in Richelieu.

Mr. RAINVILLE——that I never used such language as that which has been attributed to me.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. gentleman is quite happy, I am sure.

Mr. RAINVILLE——and I ask the hon. gentleman to take it back.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If I have to take it back I will have to tear the Nationaliste, the hon. gentleman's gospel into shreds.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Take it back.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Never.

Mr. RAINVILLE: I ask that the hon. member take those words back; they are unfair to me.

Mr. PELLETIER: I think, Mr. Speaker, the best course to adopt under the circumstances of such a speech as the one we have just heard——

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was an emergency.

Mr. PELLETIER: After the accusations which the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has made against some of his colleagues in this House——

Mr. LEMIEUX: No; recollections, you mean.

Mr. PELLETIER: Will the hon. gentleman just wait a few minutes? I understand he is labouring under some irritation, and no one can be surprised at that, under the circumstances, but I think he should be——

Mr. LEMIEUX: Smiling.

Mr. PELLETIER: Well, he is smiling apparently; but he is always sore and bitter. If he will try to follow what I am going to say for a few minutes, I think he will have reason to tender apologies to the members of this House against whom he has made accusations. We have heard the hon. member for Rouville say he could prove to my hon. friend from Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Rainville) that he had used the words that were attributed to him.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let the hon. gentleman wait for a few minutes. He was not interrupted; he was listened to in the most civil and courteous manner, and I tell him that he has got to be courteous and civil to hon. members on this side of the House. He is the only one since this debate began who has chosen to make personal accusations against his fellow members, and if he chooses to adopt such a position in this House, and to indulge in vituperation, he must expect that he is going to get an answer but in a more dignified manner.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, what is the point of order?

Mr. PELLETIER: I will ask the hon. gentleman to keep silent and wait until I have finished what I have to say.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do not be long.

Mr. PELLETIER: He is bound by the rules of the House, just as every other member is, but he is so sore and bitter that he cannot bow to the rules, and so, Mr. Speaker, we will have to ask you to remind him of his duty.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The cement duty.

Mr. SPEAKER: The rules forbid any hon. member to interrupt a member addressing the House.

Mr. PELLETIER: The hon. member for Rouville stated that the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères had used the words, 'We owe nothing to England.'

Mr. LEMIEUX: He said worse than that.

Mr. PELLETIER: I trust the hon. member will understand his position, and follow the ruling which the Speaker has just given.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He said worse than that.

Mr. PELLETIER: When the hon. member made the accusation, a denial was made by the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères, and the hon. member for Rouville was obliged by the rules of this House and by the rules of honour to accept the statement made by the hon. member. The hon. member for Rouville has chosen to ignore the rules of the House and the rules of honour, and so the people of the country will know what kind of a debate we have in this House when the hon. member is on his feet, and will be able to compare his conduct with that of other hon. members in that respect. The hon. member for Rouville undertook to prove his assertion, and in order to prove it, he read to this House words which did not give a tittle of evidence for his assertion. The hon. member should be manly enough to withdraw the accusation he has made against the hon. member for Chambly-Verchères. However, he has told us that he would not do it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I never said that.

Mr. PELLETIER: Well, perhaps the hon. gentleman did not say it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I said worse than that.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER: What is the matter with these hon. gentlemen opposite? I am anxious to pay them as many compliments as they deserve, but we are now witnessing a very remarkable thing. A member sitting on the front benches on the other side of the House accuses another hon. member, and undertakes to prove his accusation, but cannot do so, and then refuses to follow his plain duty and withdraw the accusation, and his friends in this House pound their desks. It is just as well that the House and the country should know that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are guilty of such conduct.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this debate has been a prolonged one, but it has been of use in the sense that after several ineffectual attempts had been made to ascertain what was the political programme of the Liberal party, we at last succeeded in understanding it somewhat. The Minister of Finance tried to learn from hon. gentlemen opposite what was their policy on reciprocity, but these gentlemen, while the Minister of Finance spoke, had not made up their minds whether they were or were not still in favour of reciprocity, and so they could not answer. A few days later the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) tried the same experiment, and again hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House could not give an answer. Finally, they anticipated that the question would be put once more, and they evidently met in the meantime to consider it, and to come to a conclusion. Then when the hon. member for Kings and Albert (Mr. Fowler) put the question direct to them, he at last succeeded in having hon. gentlemen opposite declare that they were one and all in favour of reciprocity, although the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) had declared last session that reciprocity was dead and buried.

Mr. GUTHRIE: May I rise to a point of order? I did say last session that in my opinion reciprocity was dead, and I think at that time I spoke correctly, but no one has ever questioned where I stood on the principle. I have never changed my opinion; I did not change it then. What I meant at the time, and I think I so stated, was that it was not an immediate issue before the people, and that the immediate issue was then the question of the navy. There never has been any doubt where I stood on reciprocity; I am for it now as much as I ever was.

Mr. PELLETIER: I stated that the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) had said——

Mr. LEMIEUX: Take it back.

Mr. PELLETIER: There is nothing to take back. I stated that the hon. member for South Wellington declared during last session that reciprocity was dead, and the hon. member now stands up and admits that he said so, and there is nothing to take back.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not ask my hon. friend to take anything back; I merely made an explanation of what I said, and I think it is a reasonable explanation.

Mr. PELLETIER: Then I am right as to what the hon. member said?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Certainly, I said that.

Mr. PELLETIER: If we agree, then, there is nothing to take back.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Nothing. I do not want you to take back anything. I only wanted to explain.

Mr. PELLETIER: The hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) wants me to take back my statement, because he wants someone to be in the same bad fix as he is in himself; but, as the hon. member (Mr. Guthrie) himself admits, I have nothing to take pack.

As to the amendment which is now before the House, it seems to me that it is a matter for a judicial inquiry, and that the statements made here can be nothing else than ex parte statements upon which this House cannot pass judgment. There is, however, an amusing feature in connection with this amendment. We are

told that the Richelieu election was a corrupt election, and a great fuss is made about it, and the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and the hon. members who sit behind him have used some harsh terms in connection with it; but these hon. gentlemen have forgotten to tell the House that the by election in Richelieu was caused by the very fact that their own supporter, who was returned at the general election, had to admit before the court that his election was brought about by corruption, and he had to resign his seat because his election was secured by corrupt means. They condemn what they claim to have been corrupt practices by our side in the last election. But what took place in the general election, so grave and so bad, that the hon. member had to resign his seat before any evidence was put in, is as white, as pure and as immaculate as it can be. My hon. friends do not suppose for one moment that they are going to get the country to believe all that. We are told that a marine railway was promised in Sorel, but the idea that it is bad for a member of the House of Commons to go to a constituency and promise a great public work, has come to the minds of my hon. friends only quite recently. During the last fifteen years of the Liberal regime in the province of Quebec—I do not know about the other provinces—there has not been one election, general election or by-election, which the party in power has not tried to carry by promising some important public work. That is a matter of public notoriety. I will take just one case in point. There are members on the other side of the House, who feel very much scandalized at this sort of thing, but who have gone to their constituents declaring that unless they voted for the Laurier candidate, they would not get a certain railway, but if they did vote for that candilate, they would get that railway. Now, is that bad or good? Let the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) answer that question for one. At one time a man was disqualified by the courts in the province of Quebec for having made a promise of a great public improvement. This was the first jurisprudence we had in our Quebec courts. That jurisprudence has been since set aside, and it has been declared by the courts that if a man went into a constituency and promised, not to this, that or the other elector, but promised in a general way, the building of a great public enterprise, this was not a corrupt practice which would disqualify any man running in any election in any county in the Dominion of Canada. Now, where is the crime? The hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) has fully explained that long before there was any question of an election; the then Minister of Public Works, Mr. Monk, went about Sorel, and if he told the people of Sorel that he was in favour of building the marine railway, surely there was no crime in repeating what was said by him before the election, as my hon. friends on the other side of the House would like to represent before the country. It is a tempest in a teapot, because my honourable friends on the other side of the House have found nothing more to say against the policy of the present Government.

In this great debate on the Address, the Liberal party should have been in a position to come before the country and before the House of Commons, and put in your hands, Mr. Speaker, an amendment declaring what their policy is on this, that and other great questions, but we have only soreness and bitterness, because they have been badly beaten in Macdonald, and because their majority has been reduced by five hundred votes in Richelieu. That is the sole reason for this amendment. What great principles of policy our friends have, we do not know yet. They have found during the last few days that they are still in favour of reciprocity. We have no desire to take it away from them. If they choose to have a corpse in their political programme, let them have it and enjoy it; but they will see whither it will lead them. I have no doubt it is with the greatest hesitation that some of our friends on the other side of the House have been obliged to accept what probably the majority of the Liberal caucus has decided on, because there are men on that side of the House who would like to get rid of reciprocity.

An hon. MEMBER: Not one.

Mr. PELLETIER: Our friends on the Liberal side have always placed great hopes in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. One of them they claim has unfurled the flag of reciprocity, even in a provincial election, and, owing to that, the majority of the Liberal caucus have decided, probably to the great displeasure of many of them, that reciprocity should be kept. We know where we are, and we know where our friends are. Reciprocity has been a dead issue for a long time. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has tried to resuscitate it in Macdonald. He has had his answer there; and in every county in this Dominion, when the question is known, as it is becoming better known day after day, the members of the Liberal party who have tried to prevent this reciprocity plank from remaining in their platform, will be in a position to tell the member for Edmonton that he was the cause of the great mistake which has put

our friends in the position they are in now.

I have been told by the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who has peculiar ways of his own in interpreting public actions and public speeches, that I am responsible for what a newspaper in Montreal says, because, forsooth, I happen to be, or have been, one of the shareholders of that paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I did not say 'have been;' I said 'to be.'

Mr. PELLETIER: The hon. gentleman pointed his hand at me and said: 'You, Sir, are responsible for that.' This is the first time in my life that I have heard any man, who does not want to appeal to prejudice, and who wants to respect what should be respected, tell a shareholder in a company: 'Sir, you are not a director in that company, you are only a humble shareholder; but you are to be held responsible for all that paper publishes, even if its views do not agree with your own.' I shall not make a speech in order to try to destroy that argument; it is self destructive. I think that the member for Rouville has found out since the last election that a great many people do not admire his ways of discussing matters before this House; and the only thing I will say on this point is that sometimes it is beneath the dignity of a member of this House to go as low as he does. I am very sorry indeed that the hon. member for Rouville thinks that I have tried to be as big a man as he has been himself, or as he thinks he is now, by doing something in the way of reduction in cable rates, and he says: 'You are borrowing our feathers.' I can tell the hon. member that I am not going to do that, either to-day, to-morrow or at any other time. But the member for Rouville is a great laudator temporis acti. Whatever good has been accomplished has not been accomplished by this Government, but we will have to thank him for it. For anything good in the past or anything good in the future, every member of this House will have to pass before the member for Rouville, and say: 'I have not done that; it is good, but you, the great man who sits for Rouville are the cause of all the good that is done in this country.'

It is because of the hon. gentleman's influence that, last summer, we succeeded in getting further reductions in the cable rates. He ceased to be a member of the Government in October last, and we got a reduction in August of this year. And the hon. member for Rouville says: I did it; I am the big man; I am the sole inspirer of this policy; my powerful influence remains even after I have left the department, and, though I am absent, it is my influence that brings about all these big things. Surely, a man who is as big as that has the right to accuse anyone and not prove his case and yet not take back his accusation. A man so great is not to be treated as a common man. As this Government goes on and accomplishes more and more for the people of Canada, we shall, no doubt, feel constrained to come to the House and ask for money to erect a statue to the hon. member for Rouville in commemoration of what we have done. Oh, we will treat him fairly. There is not even a Laurier any more, but the great man from Rouville is the only one who is doing all these fine things. And he takes no little trouble to tell the country all about it. I wonder if it is because he thinks the country will find it hard to believe. I am not going into vituperation about this; but it is well that we should try to size up the hon. gentleman, to prevent him, if that be within the bounds of possibility, having quite so much pride. He is not a bad fellow, as everyone would know, if he were not quite so proud of himself. We will give him a chance to grow penitent and try to reduce himself to the size of the ordinary man.

The great, glorious, infallible member for Rouville has told us a number of things quite disagreable for the member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget), and, turning to his friends, he has made the prophesy of what will happen if this Government intends to do certain things in relation to a company that he speaks of as a bankrupt company. He went pretty near to accusing the hon. member for Charlevoix of not being an upright and honest man.

Mr. LEMIEUX : Were you not a director of that company yourself ?

Mr. PELLETIER : Sit down.

Mr. LEMIEUX : The hon. member was a director of the company.

Mr. PELLETIER : I was a director of the company, associated with Senator Casgrain, M. Dubord and other respectable Liberals in the city of Quebec.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do not get excited.

Mr. PELLETIER: Not excited, but just in earnest, to prove to the House the depth to which the hon. gentleman sometimes goes. The hon. gentleman is evidently very sore and bitter, because of the position in which he finds himself, and because of that seeks to wreak his vengeance on others. To-day his attack is directed against the hon. member for Charlevoix.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let the hon. member be silent. If he is not his own master, if he cannot control himself how would it do to send for a glass of cold water or ginger ale in order to cool him down, so that he

would be ready to follow the rules of debate in this House?

Mr. LEMIEUX: But you were a director.

Mr. PELLETIER: He is at it again. He is very sore, and shows his feeling against the hon. member for Charlevoix, a man who has done so much to weaken the influence of the Liberal party in the province of Quebec. He seeks vengeance upon all those who have helped to prevent him from continuing to be a member of the Government of this country. I have had my turn as the object upon whom the hon. gentleman sought to wreak his vengeance. The former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) has had his turn, so has the hon. member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Rainville), and now it is the turn of the hon. member for Charlevoix. So the hon. member speaks of the Quebec and Saguenay Railway Company as a bankrupt company, and mixes it up with the Quebec Railway, Light, Heat and Power Company. As to the Quebec and Saguenay Railway Company, I never was a director of it, nor have I been connected with it in any shape or form. I want the House to know that. But when the hon. member tries to cast aspersions upon a representative of the people like the hon. member for Charlevoix, I can tell him, and tell this House, that his attack is directed against a Canadian of whom the province of Quebec is proud. Nothing that falls from the lips of the hon. member for Rouville will diminish the reputation which the hon. member for Charlevoix enjoys in the province of Quebec. The hon. gentleman's words have been spoken in this House for one purpose, and for one purpose only, and that is to raise suspicions and doubts as to the completion of the Quebec and Saguenay railway. He has said that the hon. member for Charlevoix is giving explanations in this House because, that hon. gentleman—to use the word of the hon. member for Rouville—has been 'dangling' outside the doors of the ministers' offices to obtain favours for the Quebec and Saguenay railway. I tell him that is not the fact; the statement he has made is a calumny against a public man of his own province. I am not going to ask him to withdraw it, for the more he says, the less he withdraws, the more unjust he is, the more unjust he persists in being. We have nothing to expect from him. But the country will judge his utterances as they ought to be judged, and the result will not be to the profit or glory of the hon. member for Rouville. He will be deceived if he thinks by threatening in this House and by speaking as he does of the Quebec and Saguenay railway to affect the course of events. If the Government thinks (and inquiries will be made, I suppose, into the matter) that, this railway, having been begun, if it is in the public interest—mark my words, if it is in the public interest—that it should be finished, the fact that the hon. member for Rouville is sore and has sought vengeance against a member of this House, will not prevent this Government from doing its duty. But the hon. member has said that all this has taken place. I tell this House now that there is nothing definite before the Government at the present moment, and no decision has been arrived at in this respect.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER: The hon. member says 'Hear, hear.' But what I have said —and it has been noted, I hope—is that it is not the threats of the hon. member for Rouville that will influence us. If this railway ought to be finished in the public interest, we will judge this question on its merits and not on the threats made by the hon. member for Rouville.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He has given up the case, thrown up the sponge!

Mr. PELLETIER: Because I say that the question will be judged on its merits, and in the public interest my hon. friend says that we have given up the case. That is his way of understanding the public interest and defending the public treasury; it is not mine.

Just before the hon. member for Rouville thought fit to bring these accusations against hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, we were told that these hon. gentlemen had lost twenty counties in the province of Quebec on account of certain appeals. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to have got into a kind of confusion, a state of mind easily understood by one who knows the circumstances. In the province of Quebec—I do not speak of any other province, but only whereof I know—in the province of Quebec every time the Conservative party has tried to do its duty to this country, even going back to the time of the Militia Bill, the Liberals of that province have gone from hustings to hustings, and have told the people that they ought to oppose any kind of defense, military or naval—that that has been their settled policy for years. What was their attitude in 1896, when in the province of Quebec, as well as in other portions of the Dominion, some big questions were at issue, and should have been discussed? Hon. gentlemen opposite from the province of Quebec went from one meeting to another telling the people that Sir Charles Tupper ought to be defeated because he perpetrated a big crime in buying guns for this coun-

try. We have heard that from every platform and every husting in the province of Quebec, and the Liberals of that province were becoming used to such appeals. Fancy their surprise when these same men came back to them and told them: 'We are now going to have a tin pot navy!' They stood aghast, and said: 'These are not the same men who preached to us for years that we should never interfere in the military or naval defence of the country.' It is no wonder that some gentlemen in the province of Quebec were tempted to give them a dose of their own medicine, and recall to their bad memories these appeals of the past. That this took place certainly does not surprise me, and hon. gentlemen opposite got what they deserved.

I shall not deal with this question at any further length. I rose only on account of certain unfounded accusations made by the hon. member for Rouville. When we are told in the province of Quebec that we are not doing our duty in regard to this question, we simply say that when it is brought before the country, the people will judge us then by our attitude in the matter.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

Mr. SPEAKER: According to the rule which governs business on Tuesday evenings, the first hour is usually reserved for private Bills, but as there are no private Bills on the Order Paper ready for consideration, the debate on the proposed motion and amendment regarding the address in reply to the speech from the Throne will continue.

Mr. P. J. A. CARDIN (Richelieu): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, throughout the debate on the Address, the facts in connection with the by-election in Richelieu have been commented upon at sufficient length to warrant my giving some explanation to the House in regard to the practices resorted to by hon. gentlemen who sit on your right. However, before entering into an examination of this question, I may be allowed to say a few words in answer to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), who has paid me the compliment of a few personal references in the course of his speech this afternoon.

In the first place, if I understood him right the hon. minister finds fault with the Opposition for not having more definitely pointed out what policy they propose to follow during this session in reference to the various issues under discussion. Hon. gentlemen, it seems to me, cannot but find rather extraordinary such utterances in the mouth of a Minister of the Crown. It does not rest with the Opposition to define their position and make known the policy they intend to follow. But it is incumbent on the Government to make known their plans for the future; and just glancing over the Speech from the Throne, one would be tempted to think that hon. members on the other side of the House are not very much better posted than we are ourselves in this connection. Nobody is acquainted with the actual policy of the Government.

Is it then to be wondered at if we in the Opposition ranks have not yet set down in black and white the principles which are to guide us in the course of the debate to be taken up next week with reference to the navy? A matter for greater surprise is surely to find the ministers still unable to give out their views on that question, though four of them have gone over to Great Britain to discuss the matter with the British Admiralty. They have as yet left us completely in the dark concerning the details of their plan, and I consider more than strange that they should undertake to criticise us for not having made known our own platform.

Let the Government come out in the open, and they will soon find out that the Opposition are ready for them and will launch out a policy in full agreement with the one they advocated prior to September, 1911. From what we can see, the policy to be submitted by this Government will be the very counterpart of that advocated at that time by the present French-speaking ministers.

Towards the close of his address this afternoon, the Postmaster General referred to my resignation following on the petition filed against my return as representative of the electoral district of Richelieu. As every one knows, the Act now in force is exceedingly severe; even slight irregularities, committed by agents, may warrant the judge in declaring the election void. And I may add that if all elections carried on in this country, and particularly in 1911, in which our present ministers took a hand, had been controverted, in every case the petition would have been sustained.

Moreover, nothing unusual happened in the course of my 1911 election. I find an admission of the truth of that statement in the stand taken by the ministers themselves at the time. It should not be forgotten that the filing of a petition against my return was the deed of a single individual, whom the Government, the leaders of the Conservative party themselves, blamed for doing so. They even made an effort to induce him to let the matter drop. Now, if so many irregularities had been committed, if so many corrupt practices had been resorted to, it

seems to me that the hon. Postmaster General, who is such a puritan to-day, should have in person taken the matter in hand.

I now come to what occurred in the county of Richelieu during the recent by-election. In the first place, I wish to draw the attention of the House to the fact that the questions which took up the greater part of the time were purely personal and money questions, and that the great principles for which we fought so ardently in 1911 were left in the background. It could not have been otherwise, considering that at the very outset the leaders of the Conservative party in Montreal had stated that the Conservative candidate had a fair chance of getting in, and would get in, as the county of Richelieu was a patronage constituency. And that policy, as laid down by the leaders of the Conservative party at Montreal, was not departed from, that is to say patronage and money matters were the only matters debated, as I will show presently.

It seems to me rather extraordinary and even strange that the ministers should state to-day that they did not take any particular interest in the election. If we were to believe them, the Conservative candidate was left to fight the battle single-handed. We were warranted in finding odd the conduct of the French-speaking ministers of the province of Quebec, who at the first by-election to take place in their province did not have the courage to make known their policy before the electors of the county of Richelieu and state what they had accomplished since their coming into power. But did they really take as little interest as they would have us believe to-day? Now, let us enquire into the matter. I shall show that the exact opposite is the truth. As soon as the election return was voided, the Richelieu Conservatives had a banquet in honour of the former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), and in the speeches which were then delivered reference was made mainly to patronage, to the interest the county had in electing a supporter of the Government. Later on, there was a great banquet given in honour of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), who was received at Sorel with brass-band and torchlight. The banquet had been organized by the gentleman who was spoken of as the candidate of the Conservative party, and who, as a matter of fact, was chosen as such in that by-election.

I may be allowed to quote the speech delivered by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as reported in the columns of a paper to which exception will surely not be taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side, and still less by the Conservative party's candidate at the recent by-election I mean Le Sorelois, owned by the Morgan family. The following is that newspaper's report of the Minister's speech:

I am aware of the importance the Sorel shipyards have in my department. My policy in the Marine department will be to give to your shipyards still greater attention than they have enjoyed heretofore. We have 600 men employed at Sorel. We shall have work for all these men during the winter, and the number of hands will be increased, as I propose applying to Parliament for further grants to carry on the work on a larger scale than heretofore.

We are anxious that your yards should be put to extensive use, and if the Sorel people are willing to work, they will have ample opportunity for so doing. With that in view, we have already increased the rate of salaries, and we shall continue granting increases until the men are paid a fair wage.

In view of all that, you should have a good representative for the County of Richelieu. I hope that you will give to the Canadian Parliament a representative in touch with the policy of my leader, the Right Hon. Mr. Borden.

One can already foretell the promises which were to be made a little later on with greater definiteness.

Now, I will quote from a speech of the hon. member for Charlevoix (Mr. Forget), a speech delivered at that same banquet, and which I find reported in the same paper Le Sorelois:

Sir Rodolphe Forget, with Gaelic liveliness, made a racy speech.

The Minister of Public Works made some interesting statements. We are going to get the Montreal dry-dock within a few days, and the Quebec dry-dock cannot be delayed very long. The Minister of Public Works is the best Minister the Province of Quebec has just now.

I hope the hon. Minister (Mr. Pelletier) will pardon me for quoting those words. It is likely that when the hon. member for Charlevoix spoke in that way he had no idea that the hon. Postmaster General would later on bestow on him such generous praise as we heard to-day. Then he goes on to say:

And since the Hon. Mr. Monk and his colleague are so well disposed, the Sorel workingmen should ask him a favour this very night. The Government should provide at Sorel a marine railway, an improvement which would be very beneficial to your city.

As Chairman of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, I believe that would be a pledge of future progress, and I can assure the Government that we will help to carry that measure through, and if needed, we will pay the interest on the cost of the undertaking.

I shall now quote a document which has also its importance, a letter from the Minister of Marine to the Minister of Public Works dated October 16, 1912:

Ottawa, October, 16, 1912.

To the Hon. F. D. Monk, Minister of Public Works, Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Monk,—In answer to your letter of this date, I wish to inform you that tenders have been asked for the purchase of the quantity of steel required for the building of five lighters and two tug boats at Sorel. The date for the opening of such tenders is fixed on the 18th of the current month, and as soon as the contract has been awarded, the work will be undertaken right away.

In the notice to tenderers it is specified that the steel should be delivered at the earliest possible date, and every tenderer is required to state at what date he will be able to make delivery at Sorel.

The intention of the department is to proceed with the work as rapidly and within the shortest time possible.

Yours very truly,

J. D. HAZEN.

As may be seen, that letter was written in the heat of the electoral compaign, on the 16th of October, nomination taking place on the day following. That letter was published in the paper Le Sorelois, the organ of the Conservative candidate on October 18th.

Mr. Speaker, other circumstances seem to point to the fact that the Government did take an interest in the election. The Department of Public Works was especially interested in it, and the proof of it is that on the day following nomination day a dredge was located in the river Richelieu, close to the village of St. Roch, with the object of excavating. Telegrams were read by the Conservative candidate showing that he had the support of the Minister of Public Works, that the latter was in sympathy with him and hoped he would succeed, and even offered to take a hand in the election, if necessary.

Another fact which to my mind shows the interest which the Government took in that election is the sending of their representative, the hon. member for Charlevoix, who was received at Sorel by the Conservative party with brass band and torchlight procession.

Still another fact, quite characteristic and which should be noted, in this: Previous to the coming to Sorel of the hon. member for Charlevoix, with the assurance that the Government took an interest in the election, the Conservative party there was torn up by factions. But following immediately on that gentleman's arrival, peace was restored, and Conservatives immediately rallied and worked hand in hand to have their candidate returned. Even members of this House who had stated at the outset that they would not lend a hand in the election in favour of candidate Morgan, changed their minds after the arrival of the member for Charlevoix and followed him in the fray.

The feature of the Conservative campaign in that election was an attempt to buy the electors wholesale, accompanied by threats against government employees.

I do not propose quoting once more the editorial which appeare in La Patrie. Hon. gentlemen in this House are already posted as to its contents. It will suffice to read an extract from L'Eveil, a Conservative paper published at Sorel. In his issue of October 24 last, that is polling day, I find an editorial under the heading 'Sir Rodolphe Forget and the victory in Richelieu'. It reads in part as follows:

For a period of some fifteen years, at every election, we were gold-bricked with promises of a Marine Railway, the carrying out of which invaluable undertaking was, as soon as polling day was over, postponed to some future date.

As on previous occasions that famous question was taken up again; but this time, Sir Rodolphe Forget promised on his own word of honour and on behalf of the Government, that a vote of $200,000 would be placed in the estimates for the next Session of Parliament towards the building of that Marine railway, failing which Mr. Morgan would resign his seat.

He also spoke of the possible re-opening of the railway between St. Guillaume and Sorel, considering that Mr. Morgan must get what he has made up his mind to obtain; like the man who is in danger of drowning and to whom a plank is thrown, he lets go only when he has reached a safe place.

These are not empty words spoken by some irresponsible person, it is the solemn pledge of a responsible man, backed up by the signatures of Dominion Government ministers, and on the carrying out of which the fate of the member for Richelieu will depend.

Allow me, Sir, to quote another extract, as I am anxious to make known the real nature of the contest in Richelieu, and to satisfy the House as to the truth of my contention. I give herewith the wording of a manifesto issued at Sorel on October 17, 1912, and spread throughout the town and county. Under the heading 'Important works in sight' the following is stated among other things:

Mr. Morgan, following on several interviews with the Dominion authorities, has succeeded in obtaining the building of 2 steel tugs and 5 lighters.

Notices of tenders have been sent out for the supply of 10,260 tons of steel, which is twice as much as has ever been ordered at one time since the yards are being operated. The building of such crafts in the Sorel shipyards would give work to a thousand sturdy workmen.

Shall we by our votes intimate to the Government that we would prefer such works to be carried on at Point Levis or somewhere else? Surely not.

Electors of Sorel and St. Joseph, would you be acting wisely in intimating to the govern-

ment, through your votes: Take away your shipyards, we have no need for them, put them in some other place, equipment and all.

Herewith I give a few more extracts from that manifesto. Under the heading 'Marine railway', the following appears:

Another important question which has been for some time attracting public attention, is the building of a Marine railway. That question of late has entered into a new phase, and the carrying out of that much desired undertaking, which would be for Sorel a source of considerable revenue, seems now assured. As an assurance we have the statement of the Hon. Mr. Monk, Minister of Public Works, and that of Sir Rodolphe Forget, who, as Chairman of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, has promised, if necessary, to pay the interest on the cost of that undertaking.

Electors of Richelieu, are you going to state through your votes that you are opposed to the carrying out of such a profitable undertaking for your city?

However, they were not satisfied with holding up inducements to Richelieu voters, so that they would be sure to vote for the Government candidate, the probability of some misfortune happening them should they vote against the Government was also suggested to them, as we shall see by the following extract, under the title:

The County of Richelieu should be kept whole.

As is generally known, following on every decennial cencus, a redistribution Bill is voted by the House of Commons.

Montreal, the commercial metropolis of that province, and whose population has increased abnormally, claims, and rightly so, an increase in representation. As the number of representatives to which the province of Quebec is entitled cannot vary from 65, the only means of giving satisfaction to Montreal's legitimate claims would be by making one county out of several adjoining constituencies, which thereby would lose their identity.

Would it not be a pity were the beautiful county of Richelieu, which has played such a noble part in the political history of the country, to cease to appear as a separate constituency on the electoral map of the province?

That is not an imaginary danger, it is an actual possibility which we are pointing out to the electors of this county.

And the manifesto wound up with two short sentences which by themselves warrant my speaking as I have done; they are as follows:

A vote against Mr. Morgan is a vote against the Sorel shipyards.

A vote for Mr. Morgan will ensure the permanency and development of the shipyards, and the prosperity of Sorel and the county of Richelieu.

But that is not all. On polling day and the day previous, a short but very interesting circular was distributed among the electors of the city of Sorel. It is worth reading:

Sir Rodolphe Forget, Minister of Public Works.

Several M.P.'s now in Sorel confirm the above piece of news which appeared in La Patrie of last evening. The Prime Minister has offered the portfolio of Public Works to Sir Rodolphe Forget. The latter will make known his decision by Saturday. Sorel and the whole county of Richelieu should join hands with the M.P.'s towards inducing Sir Rodolphe to accept. Should he accept that portfolio, it would mean this, that the Sorel shipyards would return to public works, as Sir Rodolphe Forget stated.

Forget, Minister of Public Works! Sorel and Progress! Long live Forget! Vote for Morgan!

In passing I may be allowed to remark, Mr. Speaker, that if the facts given out in this circular are as stated, the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) owes me some consideration for having helped, though unawares, to rid him of a dangerous competitor.

Further, telegrams from ministers or head officers of departments hinting at dismissals were read and re-read at meetings. In due time I shall show that canvassers of the Conservative candidate have warned Government employees not to vote, under penalty of losing their positions. Besides, Liberal workmen were refused the right of attending Liberal meetings, while Conservative workingmen were employed to draw the carriage of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Such is the treatment which was meted out to Sorel workmen. I am right in stating here, as I have done elsewhere, that the small wage-earner was the object of very shabby treatment.

Other facts which have come to my knowledge plainly show the true character of that contest. It seems that the hon. member for Charlevoix was not content with distributing favours in the city of Sorel, but that he travelled through the country parishes. His heart filled with pity at the sight of the parishioners of St. Louis who were busy re-building their church, he promised them a bell if the Conservative candidate, Mr. Morgan, were returned. After thus taking care of the church interests, as Conservatives are wont to do at every election, the member for Charlevoix took into consideration the material interests of the people. He promised to provide a telephone line for St. Louis.

I listened with some interest to the explanation tendered by the hon. member for Charlevoix, this afternoon. He started by saying that La Patrie was not his organ, that he not not a single cent invested in the company publishing that paper. That may be so, but it is not the less true that La Patrie has always well treated the

hon. gentleman and even defended him when necessay. Obviously La Patrie had no reason to put in his mouth words which he had not spoken. Therefore I say that the hon. member cannot consistently suspect the truth of the reports appearing in La Patrie. The editors of that paper are his friends, his allies, and it cannot be gainsaid that their reports were in accordance with the facts.

The hon. member for Charlevoix subsequently stated that the hon. Mr. Rogers had nothing to do with the election in Richelieu. Then, why did he use his name? Undoubtedly it was to give more weight to the promises which he made to the electors.

The hon. member for Charlevoix was not the only one to come to the rescue of the party in the Richelieu election. The harmonious dingling of the St. Louis bell instilled a combative ardor into the member for Dorchester (Mr. Sevigny), generosity into the heart of the member for Montmagny (Mr. Lespérance), unerring logic into the mind of the member for Yamaska, (Mr. Mondu), feverish activity into the member for Berthier (Mr. Barette), and looseness of political principles into the member for Chambly and Verchères (Mr. Rainville).

The hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Coderre) was also seen in the skirmishing line. He was present at the first meeting held at St. Ours at the opening of the campaign. But the most efficient worker was possibly the member for Berthier. According to the expression used by some persons in Richelieu, and I think the expression is proper, he 'heard confessions' in the Government offices at St. Joseph de Sorel on polling day. He caused the workingmen to file past him, and preached to them the doctrine of personal interest, in other words endeavoured to satisfy them that it was in their interest to cast their vote in favour of the Government candidate. He may have succeeded in gaining over a certain number, but not the majority. And if he cared to do so, he might tell of the hot words he got from some of them, who then and there stated that even at the risk of losing their positions, they would vote in accordance with the dicates of their conscience.

So they all came with the exception of the leaders of the Government. Conservative members swarmed in to defend the ministerial policy and advocate the doctrine of personal and local interest.

Mr. LAMARCHE: (Translation.) Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that all the Conservative members of the province of Quebec took a hand in that election?

Mr. CARDIN: (Translation.) I have just given the list of those who were there.

Mr. SEVIGNY: (Translation.) Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say a word? I, for one, went to Richelieu, and I hope to be there again some day. Would the hon. gentleman state the names of the Liberal members who were there to lend him a hand?

Mr. CARDIN: (Translation.) I do not think that would be of much interest in connection with this debate. Moreover, if the hon. gentleman had been in his seat this afternoon, he would have heard the hon. the Postmaster General give out the full list. I may add that the Liberal members made their appearance at the outset; they did not wait until the big guns had come out, as did the member for Dorchester.

So I say they all flocked in, those who think they loom large in the ranks of their party, and they were accompanied by all the candle bearers around the golden calf of Government promises and favours. They were all there to preach abandonment of principles in exchange for a policy of personal and local interest.

Now, what answer do we receive from the Government and their supporters when we recall what occurred in that Richelieu election? In the first place, we heard the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) give a formal denial to the statement of the hon. member for Charlevoix, as reported in La Patrie. Then we hear them, as they have been constantly doing since the advent to power of the Conservative party, making use of the 'Tu quoque' argument.

Indeed, every time the Opposition took exception to the policy followed by the Government, hon. gentlemen on the other side have invariably answered: Why should you hide your faces at the thought of such deeds, when you did exactly the same thing when you were in power? That is not answering to the charges brought forward by the Opposition. The House and the country have the right to expect other explanations than those heretofore obtained from the ministers and their followers. Moreover, in virtue of the old maxim, two blacks do not make one white, admitting that the Liberal party should have been responsible for some wrong-doing in the past, that is no justification for the Conservatives following in their footsteps. Such an answer on the part of the ministers amounts to an admission of guilt, since they put on a level their own deeds and the so-called wrong-doing of their opponents.

Lastly the Conservative party have not been put in power to continue the so-called wickedness of the Liberal party. When, in 1911, they appealed to the people, they did not state that they wished to be put in power in order to do just what the Liberal party had been doing; they stated, on the contrary, through the mouths of their supporters that they wished to be put in charge of the business of the country with a view to improving on the methods of their predecessors.

The hon. member for Charlevoix told us this afternoon that during the election he had met at Sorel quite a number of Liberal members, even former ministers, and among others the hon. representative of Three-Rivers (Mr. Bureau), at the head of about two hundred Liberal stalwarts, bearing on their breasts a badge with the picture of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. True, a great number of Liberals did pass through the streets of Sorel, with badges bearing the portrait of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. But the picture of the member for Charlevoix was also distributed throughout the county, with this difference, that instead of appearing on the breasts of their owners, it was in their pockets. For that picture of the member for Charlevoix was engraven on the numerous bills of the International Bank of Canada, which were in many hands on the market place at Sorel, the following Saturday.

Now, the member for Charlevoix has thought fit to quote that section of the Electoral Act which forbids the wearing of any badge between nomination and polling day. I may draw his attention to the fact that many other clauses of the Electoral Act are of interest under the circumstances and had a more important bearing on the result of the Richelieu election. I hope he will take time to look into those provisions of the law when the counter-petition which I propose filing in answer to the protest just served on me, is investigated by the courts.

The member for Charlevoix and the Minister of Public Works have rejoiced over the reduction of the Liberal majority in my constituency. True, the Liberal majority has been cut down, and that is due to the corrupt practices I have referred to. It is no wonder that such a reduction should have taken place when Government supporters in that election were resorting to such means. No wonder they succeeded in scaring some of the workingmen by showing them poverty at their very doors through the loss of their employment. They were given the alternative of either voting for the Conservative candidate, in spite of their opinions, or of losing their jobs. We have reason to be surprised at hearing hon. ministers chuckle over the cutting down of the Liberal majority under such circumstances, and after having recourse to such dishonest practices, not to say more.

Then, they were not content with making threats, they carried out those threats. A few days after the election, 90 or 95 men in the employ of the Government shipyards were dismissed. And you may be sure, Mr. Speaker, that there were no Conservatives in the lot. They were all picked out with care. They were all suspected by those who look after patronage matters in Richelieu and by those who regularly sit in secret committee to bring about dismissals, of having voted for the Liberal candidate.

The Conservative Government have been in power for a year only, and in order to secure the return of their candidates in by-elections they must take such means as those which have been applied in the Macdonald and Richelieu elections, and which the Liberal party have denounced since the start of this debate. How will it be Mr. Speaker, when these hon. gentlemen have been in power for several years?

Such are the facts which I was anxious to bring to the attention of this House. However, I should add, Mr. Speaker, that I have not given out everything. I have kept some facts in reserve, which I intend using at the proper time, more particularly when that counter-petition in answer to the two protests served on me yesterday is taken up. A good many of the members who have been doing work in my county will be called upon to discuss with me before the court some clauses of the Electoral Act. I invite especially the hon. member for Charlevoix to take up that line of study, considering how well posted he appears to be concerning the election law.

As I have just stated, Mr. Speaker, a further protest has been lodged against my return in Richelieu. The extraordinary feature about it is that two petitions have been filed. It seems as if the Conservative party could not agree as to the choice of a single petitioner. If I am rightly informed, one of those protests was lodged at the request of the Conservative organization itself, an organization which did not take any interest in, and even blamed the filing of, the last election protest in Richelieu filed at the instigation of Mr. Morgan. That election protest apparently does not suit the candidate who suffered defeat in the by-election, since he has thought fit himself to file a second protest.

Is it not strange to see the Conservative party who have been running the campaign we have heard about in Macdonald, and the campaign I have just referred to in Richelieu, hasten to take the lead in filing a petition against my return? It certainly is strange. But when the time comes I shall make known in detail the misdeeds of those worthies who had recourse to every means in their power to capture the constituency in Richelieu. And if any one comes out hurt from the fray, it will not be the member for Richelieu, but those who attempted to carry the county by means of threats and promises.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I believe I am perfectly justified in giving my support to the amendment moved by the leader of the Opposition. Indeed, I think the right

hon. Prime Minister will be the last to blame me, since in his platform speech at Halifax, he promised reforms towards ensuring greater honesty at elections.

I shall vote in support of the amendment.

Mr. G. C. WILSON (Wentworth): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the indulgence of the hon. members on this my first attempt to address the House of Commons. I may say that my name appears on 'Hansard,' but it has no right to be there. I have never envied the reputation of having one's name on 'Hansard,' because, coming from the province of Ontario, having sat in the legislature of that province for three years, and having sat here for a year, I believe that 'Hansard' is a detriment to the carrying on of the business of the country. The member who formerly represented Wentworth in this House regrets very much that his name appeared on 'Hansard,' for it was because of the statement that he made in this House on the question of reciprocity, and his right-about-face on that question, that he was left at home, and I was sent to represent the farmers and fruit growers of the county of Wentworth.

I have not been impressed with some of the speeches of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. I certainly do not think that they have set a very good example to new members. The statements of the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell), seem to me to consist of accusations that cannot be proven. They have dealt assassin-like stabs at men of reputation on this side of the House, and for what reason? Simply in order to bolster up their own shattered reputation. I do not think that the action of the hon. member for Rouville this afternoon was a manly one. To me, as a new member of this House, it did not seem consistent, and I hope that when I have been in public life as long as he has been, and occupy as prominent a position as he does, I shall have a greater sense of honor and political consistency than he showed. In my province it would ill become that hon. gentleman to make such statements as he made, for there his name has been associated with the fact that at one time he was ready to espouse the cause of annexation. It is known all over the province of Ontario that at one time he locked arms with Erastus Wiman and some other gentlemen who were anxious to have Canada annexed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was not born then.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): Well, your ideas have been copied from Erastus Wiman and men of his type. The member for Rouville referred to the Prime Minister as a past master in the art of vagueness. The Prime Minister's statements may be vague to my hon. friend, but they are not to members on this side of the House, and I prefer to follow a statesman of the calibre of the leader of the Government rather than the discredited opportunist that the ex-Postmaster General must follow at the present time.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): The hon. member for Rouville says that the Conservatives are using feathers plucked from the Liberal party. Did not he hear the leader of the Opposition say, 'Bet your money on the old cock?' I am proud to be able to say that I robbed his hen roost of one of the Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde breed that tried to face both ways, otherwise known as Mr. Sealey, and I do not think that the Liberal party lost very much. I know that the country was well rid of a man who tried to face both ways. What did the papers say about him at that time?

> He longs to Bless, but is constrained to Curse.
>
> The moral of the scornful snigger which his performance has aroused here seems to be: If you intend to bolt, bolt; make a clean job of it, and have done with it. The Liberals may dislike Mr. Sifton, Mr. German, Mr. Lloyd Harris, but they don't despise them. If you resolve to stand by your party, swallow the dose outright, and keep your face straight; do it and don't make a fuss. There are plenty of Liberals who are taking that line. But public exhibitions of anguished indecision, or apologetic deference to both sides, such as Mr. Sealey's merely aroused derision. Mr. Facing-Both-Ways and Mr. By-Ends have never been counted among Bunyan's more popular characters.

I was surprised to hear the member for Rouville make statements about efforts to win ridings.

Mr. GERMAN: By bribery and corruption.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): I will ask the member for Welland (Mr. German) in a few minutes as to his stand on reciprocity. We have seen some gentlemen held up to criticism because of statements they made in their efforts to win ridings. Here is a little card that my opponent sent out at the last election. The dates of his meetings were printed on the one side, and his promises on the other, no doubt to save expense. Here is what he said:

> Vote for Sealey and a new Welland canal via Wentworth.

I went through the whole of that old county, and there was not a hamlet where it was not going to touch, and was referred to as the cork-screw canal. The Newmarket canal was not in it. Then he had on the card:

Vote for Sealey and $5 horse power in Wentworth and vicinity.

The reason for this promise was that Mr. Sealey and his party had opposed the hydro-electric scheme. I may not be known as a 'Hansard' Wilson, but I am dubbed 'Hydro' Wilson in that part of the country. Mr. Sealey wanted to get some of the credit and he tried to call himself 'Hydro' Sealey and get into the hydro band wagon. Then he said, 'Vote for Sealey and three markets instead of two.' I will come to that later on. 'Vote for Sealey and better prices for both the producer and the consumer!' My Liberal friends may take whichever horn of the dilemma they like. They tried both in my county, but they did not succeed. Then: 'Vote for Sealey and a more extended free mail delivery.' I would like to tell the hon. the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) that I wish he had not started rural mail delivery in my county on political lines. The curse of my county to-day is the way in which the rural mail delivery was laid out. The county of Wentworth was the first to have the rural mail delivery, and it was said of Mr. Sealey that he had to send to the United States to get the boxes. Mr. Sealey had to make good the promise that the county should have rural mail delivery. I believe that the hon. member for Rouville came up to Wentworth at the inception of the rural mail delivery. The first route was from Hamilton to Ancaster.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend state that the boxes were made in the United States?

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): I was given to understand that some of the boxes were made in the United States.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The boxes were and are made in Toronto.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): They are made there now, but were they then?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The first ones came from the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): The hon. member for Rouville will find that more than the boxes came from the United States. We were told to vote for Sealey and double the orders for our factories. Well, I will have something to say about the orders for our factories a little later on. Then we were told that Laurier is the pioneer of Canadian naval defence. That is what the hon. member for Rouville says. He may have been but at present he, clearly, in my opinion, is the obstructionist of naval defence and we will soon learn exactly where he stands. The hon. gentlemen are trying to crawl behind the emergency cry. As a Canadian and a British subject emergency or no emergency, I am prepared to do my share towards the defence of the British Empire. Then the hon. member for Rouville says that the trade agreement of Messrs Fielding and Paterson was the best means of abolishing the high prices of food stuffs. That sounds well, but my hon. friend knows that while we were going to make potatoes, cabbages and all such necessities free, he was going to get the Hon. William Paterson to be magnanimous enough to reduce the duty on biscuits from 35 to 32½ per cent. Yet my hon. friend says that this agreement, if it had been put into force, would have reduced the price of food stuffs, and that it would have meant reduced taxation. When my hon. friend speaks of the high cost of living let me ask why he and his friends did not do something with the high cost of living. What stand did they take on that question? Let me read some of the statements made by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. When he was speaking at the Liberal convention in 1893, he said:

I call upon you one and all to pronounce at once and give your emphatic support to the proposition that we shall never rest until we have wiped from our system that fraud and robbery (protection) under which Canadians suffer. Our policy should be the policy of free trade such as they have in England. The circumstances of the country cannot admit at the present of that policy in its entirety; but from this day henceforward it should be the goal to which we aspire. From this moment we have a distinct issue with the party in power; their idea is protection, our idea is free trade.

Then, speaking at Winnipeg in 1906, the right hon. gentleman said:

We stand for freedom. I denounce the policy of protection as bondage—yea bondage; I refer to bondage in the same manner in which the American slavery was bondage. In the same manner people of Canada, the inhabitants of the city of Winipeg especially, are toiling for a master who takes. . . away a large percentage of your earnings for which you sweat and toil.

The right hon. gentleman was not always in favour of reciprocity. He said on another occasion:

Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself, would have given many things to obtain the American market, but, thank Heaven, those days are past and over.

Again he said:

There was a time when we were wanting reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside and negatived. We have said good-bye to that trade and we now put all our hopes upon the British trade.

He said further:

But I have found in the short experience during which it has been my privilege and my fortune to be placed at the head of affairs, by the will of the Canadian people, that the best and most effective way to maintain friendship with our American neighbours is to be absolutely independent of them.

No truck or trade with them under any circumstances! Now, I want to come to the right hon. gentleman's friend, Mr. Sealey, because he certainly elected me on the statements he made in this House. I want to tell the right hon. gentleman that I have been sent here as a sort of valentine to him. A deputation from the Vegetable Growers' Association waited upon the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, the then Prime Minister, and some of his colleagues in this Chamber on February 10, 1911. And this is what the right hon. gentleman said in reply to them:

I have only this to say. Of course, we are bound to listen to you, but after listening to you, my last word to you must be that it is impossible, absolutely impossible, that any law which is passed, that any agreement which is adopted, that any tariff which is made, can be equally agreeable to all parts of the community, but that all must be prepared to make some concession to the common good.

Then Mr. Fielding said:

It is much too late. I thank you very much but I cannot speak to you.

Further, the right hon. leader of the Opposition said:

The difference is rather, as has been pointed out to us, the climatic differences of our country. The difficulty is that we are on the northern extremity of the zone,—but there are also advantages in those climatic difficulties. I do not know how it works, but it is acknowledged at the present time that the Canadian apple has no competitor in the world. It is undoubted, I believe also, that the peach which is grown on the northern shore of lake Erie is superior to any product on this continent.

The right hon. gentleman did not want to give us protection on fruit and vegetables, but still I remember that Mr. Sealey had on several occasions made statements and I want to endorse Mr. Sealey on this because I think he took the proper stand when he stated that Canada required protection on fruit and vegetables. Mr. Sealey, in 1908, spoke to the vegetable growers in the county of Wentworth and I was present upon the occasion. He said.

The vegetable and fruit growers are interested in too small an area, and it occurs to me that the general agricultural interests of the Dominion should be combined from east to west and in that way we would copy to some extent the manufacturer in the matter of high protective tariff.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth).

He said further, speaking to the vegetable growers in Burlington:

Now, while our district and foreign markets are very good——

I hope that the House and particularly those Liberals from the West who are howling reciprocity will listen to what Mr. Sealey said:

Now, while our district and foreign markets are very good, everybody agrees that our home and nearby markets are by far the best and most profitable and therefore the most precious to be preserved.

Then why give up this profitable home market to the United States? That is what the people wanted to know on the 21st September, and the answer is that I am here instead of Mr. W. O. Sealey. Then again, he says:

We must play fair with the farmers.

Listen to this, you representatives from the West——

We must play fair with the farmers and give them equal consideration and in fact fair play with the manufacturers as well, but the manufacturers are quite capable of looking after themselves and that it was to protect agricultural products all along the line up to their level that we believed was in the best interests of Canada to-day and in that way try to preserve our home markets for our home producer.

Then we come to an important part of Mr. Sealey's speech. It seems that those who have been giving all the credit to Mr. Fielding and Mr. Paterson and Sir Wilfrid Laurier for this reciprocity treaty are altogether mistaken, because we have it on the authority of W. O. Sealey that he had a great deal to do with it. I have a pamphlet here which indicates as much, and on which is again printed that smiling face of Mr. Sealey. This is how Mr. Sealey introduces his pamphlet:

President Taft Recognized Mr. Sealey.

In his recent message to the United States Congress, President Taft referred to Mr. Sealey's speech as printed herein, and urged careful consideration of the matter, and the necessity of avoiding a tariff war with Canada which the terms of the Payne-Aldrich Bill might precipitate.

Great Credit due Mr. Sealey.

The solution of the tariff difficulty between the United States and Canada may in a large measure, be attributed to the effect on the American authorities of the illuminating and vigorous address of Mr. Sealey, to which the President referred.

So that you see Mr. Sealey is responsible in a large measure for this reciprocity pact; and let me further add that he is buried among the dead with Mr. Paterson and Mr. Fielding.

Here is another extract from Mr. Sealey's speech delivered at Boston on International

Trade and Commerce, which should prove interesting to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) were he present in the House to-night, and which hon. members from the West can ponder over:—

In referring to the United States tariff on wheat of 25 cents per bushel and to Canada's transportation facilities, he says: 'But what does it do for Canada. What does it mean to the British farmers, and the United States farmers who are looking for new homes? It says in substance that the Canadian Northwest soil being just as fertile and productive as the United States West and the labour and cost of producing a bushel of wheat in Canada no more than in the United States, therefore in selecting a new home they will prefer the country that is seemingly giving them the best annual results. And what is all this doing for Canada? It is drifting all the choicest immigration of the European countries to the Canadian Northwest. Pleasanter still it is drifting thousands and thousands of choice United States farmers to our Canadian West. This year's records show an influx of 275,000 of the choicest new farmers, by far the largest proportion coming from any one country being from the United States.

Now we come to the fruit and vegetable growers, a deputation from whom was turned down by the Liberal administration, and I shall refer to a speech delivered in the House of Commons by Mr. Sealey on Friday, April 21, 1911, wherein he stated:—

Now, the Canadian tariff on peaches is one cent per pound, while the United States tariff on them is only one-half cent per pound. The Canadian tariff on strawberries is two cents per quart, while the United States tariff on them is only one cent per quart. Our tariff on much of the fruit is twice as high as theirs; and if, under these conditions, they have been able to invade our markets to the extent of $3,000,000 a year and we have only been able to invade their market to the extent of half a million, or one-sixth that amount, during the same time, with only half as much duty against us as we have against them, the result under free trade in these articles would seem to be apparent to everyone. They would swamp us in our own market while we could be unable to meet them in their own market.

That is just exactly what the people of Canada said to the Liberal party on the 21st of September, namely, that the Americans would swamp us in our own markets. Now, when Mr. Sealey went before the electors of Wentworth on that memorable 21st of September, he had a great many accomplishments that I did not possess; he also had a great many fads; and, he sent out a circular as a Christmas card all over the riding, containing a lithographed copy of his card of invitation to the coronation ceremony at Westminster Abbey church and setting forth that by command of the King, the Duke of Norfolk, Earl Marshall of England, invited W. O. Sealey, Esq., M.P., to be present. And on the back of the card was printed: 'With best wishes to you for a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year from Mr. and Mrs. Sealey.' I was certainly not born with a silver spoon in my mouth, and I was up against it, because I had to contest the riding against a man whom the King had invited to come and visit him; and I had never been in the presence of royalty at all. I want to tell you how it all turned out. When Parliament was suddenly dissolved, Mr Sealey was over in England with the King, and he had to hurry back. He tried to recant, and he came down to Ottawa. The result was that he had to swallow the pill and declare himself in favour of reciprocity. But he qualified that to some extent by saying that the reciprocity pact could be changed at any time, and that he had arranged with Sir Wilfrid Laurier that if it was going to injure any vegetable or fruit grower, he would have it changed immediately. That statement was reported in the Hamilton Times of September 11, 1911, a copy of which I have here. We on this side of the House did not think the pact could be changed, but Mr. Sealey said he had a pull with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and he could get it changed at any time. Then, as time progressed and the people really found out what this reciprocity pact meant, Mr. Sealey got a little more anxious, and he came down again to Ottawa; and I am told on the authority of a Liberal friend that he came back, feeling that there was no doubt that he had to play the reciprocity game, but if he bet on the old cock and followed the white plume, he was promised that if he was defeated he would get a place in the Senate. Of course, he never thought we would rob the hen-roost, and that his party would never get back. I want to tell the right hon. the leader of the Opposition that I represent a peculiar riding——

Some hon. MEMBERS : It must be.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): Yes, it certainly is, and when you hear the result, you will not be able to say that a Conservative was returned in Wentworth because we took off the duty on cement, or because we made promises of post offices or anything of that kind; you will simply be forced to admit that the commonsense of the people triumphed at the polls. I will tell my hon. friends opposite why the people of Wentworth voted against reciprocity. Mr. Sealey was thought to be safe in his seat with 354 majority, and the cry I met all over the country was: 'Nobody can beat Sealey.' At the time, I had a seat in the Ontario Legislature, and I was asked to resign and contest the federal seat, not in my personal interest——

Some hon. MEMBERS : Oh, no.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): Not at all. I want to say to my hon. friends opposite, or to at least some of these Liberals sitting on the Opposition benches, that they do not seem to understand that a man can enter public life for other than ulterior motives. I wish to tell them further that I have higher ideas of public life, and, Sir, I hope to see the day when the people of this Dominion will appreciate men who enter public life in the interest of the people and at a loss to themselves. As I have said, I occupied a seat in the Ontario Legislature, and I was fighting there in the interest of the people, fighting the battle of the hydro-electric in the province of Ontario. And, to show you what the answer of the people was to the reciprocity pact, I mention that Mr. Sealey's majority of 354 at the previous election was turned into a minority of 893 on the 21st of September, 1911.

We are told that the farmers and fruit growers are all in favour of reciprocity. How can that be, when from a Liberal township where they used to get a majority of 450, it dropped down to 69, and so on all over the county? A great majority? No, nothing great about it, but the principles advocated are great, Canada for the Canadians. The people had common sense and that common sense was expressed at the polls on September 21. Somebody says, 'Truly reciprocity is dead.' They think we are trying to bury the dead. The member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) said it was dead, and somebody told him it was buried. We do not want to bury it at all, but all I say is, 'let the dead bury their dead.' I cannot tell you what nationality reciprocity is. I am of Scotch and Irish parents, therefore I can take a little liberty with them; but I would say that this reciprocity 'Bill' must have been an Irishman, because if he had been a Scotchman and died, that would have been the end of him, but if he had been an Irishman and died, they would 'wake' him.

Are the Liberals united? 'We are a united party on this side, we never vary,' are the words of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. We will have another experience meeting. I see the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) sitting in his seat. This is what he had to say in a letter addressed to the electors of Welland:

> The sole issue between parties in this contest is the reciprocity agreement made between the governments of Canada and the United States. As you know, I am opposed to that agreement. I do not believe it will result in any lasting practical benefit to the farmers of Canada, or even to this county, and I feel confident its general effect will be detrimental to the whole business interests of the country.

Are they a united party still! and does the member for Welland agree with his present leader? He has not so far stated how he stands on this question. I think it is in the interest of the House that the hon. member for Welland should give us his views, as he happens to come from a fruit and vegetable section of the country. I will pause for a moment and ask the hon. member if he takes the same stand as he did before. If he does I want to give him credit for it.

Mr. GERMAN: I have not changed my views from what I stated in the remarks the hon. gentleman has quoted.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): Then it is up to the hon. member for Welland to come over to this side of the House, and the leader of the Opposition is wrong when he says it is a united party. It is no such thing. The current and cross currents appear to be all on the other side of the sea. They are not on this side. I will read the views of an Ontario Liberal who formerly sat in this House:

> When reciprocity was first mentioned ninety per cent of the Liberal members at Ottawa were not in favour of it. When the question of the negotiations actually came up, I put the question to the Liberal members, and I honestly believe that if a caucus had been held the vote would have been ninety per cent against it.

That is what Mr. Lloyd Harris of Brantford said. We have heard a great deal about what reciprocity would do, and about who pays the duty. I want my hon. friends on the other side of the House to continue to juggle with that question. They do not seem to know very much about it. The member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) wants the duty kept on coal and although it would be for the benefit of the people of Ontario to have the duty off coal, still we are prepared to pay our share, and let the member for Cape Breton have the duty. We are, however, largely doing away with the use of coal in the province of Ontario; we are using the white coal, and, at some future time in this House, I propose to have the privilege of speaking to a resolution in connection with the hydro-electric proposition.

At one time, I think it was in 1896, the Liberals paraded this country talking about barbed wire, binder twine, and coal oil. On the hustings they declared that they were going to reduce the prices of these articles by removing the duty. They took the duties off. I have followed the hardware business for twenty-five years, and I know a little about these articles. When we had a duty of three-quarters of a cent a pound on barbed wire, we were able to sell it for $2 to $2.50 a hundred pounds and, more than that, it was Canadian barbed wire, made in Canadian factories, giving employment to

Canadian workmen who bought their produce from Canadian farmers. The Liberals took off the duty of three-quarters of a cent a pound, and to-day barbed wire is selling for $2.75 to $3 a hundred pounds. Who pays the duty? There is no duty to pay. Furthermore what about mergers, trusts and combines? You are in the hands of the United States steel and wire trust, it is American wire you are using, you are employing American workmen on the American side of the line who buy their produce from American farmers. That is reciprocity for you.

Then, they said they were going to reduce the duty on coal oil, and they did so. Coal oil sells to-day at from say, 15 to 20 cents a gallon. The duty was reduced to 2½ cents a gallon; it used to be 7 1-5 cents. I was able to sell coal oil at twelve cents a gallon, an imperial gallon at that, when we had protection; but the mergers, trusts and combines got in touch with our Liberal friends, and they took the duty off. Of course, it would have been an unpardonable offence to have the Standard Oil Company's tank wagons going up and down through Canada, because the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and the other members on the other side of the House could not stand for that. So what did they do? They got the Queen City Oil Company to use that name in the province of Ontario, and the Imperial Oil Company in the province of Quebec, but they are one and the same, namely, the Standard Oil Company.

As regards binder twine, they were going to do wonders. Binder twine was made in Canadian factories, they were going to take the duty off for the benefit of the farmers. The duty was taken off, but you have to pay more for binder twine to-day, and you are going to pay more next year than you paid last year. The removal of the duty has closed Canadian factories, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite say, 'If we had the reciprocity pact, it would be a benefit to the province of Ontario and to the Dominion of Canada.' You should put this matter before the people as a business proposition. You should send business men to Washington or England, or any other place, if you want to make a treaty. You should not send men who are theoretical free traders, because free trade may be all right in theory, but you cannot put it into practice.

The hon. member for Carleton, N. B., (Mr. Carvell) made a great oration the other night about potatoes. He said that in Woodstock, N. B., potatoes were selling at $1 a barrel, while across the line in Maine, just twelve miles away, I think he said, they were selling at $1.45. If I am wrong, I wish my hon. friend would correct me, as I do not want to make any misstatements.

If the hon. member for Carlton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) will come to my room, No. 316, to-morrow or next day, I will show him some potatoes from Woodstock, N. B., which I bought in Dundas, and for which I paid at the rate of $1.25 a bag. That hon. gentleman is always looking to the United States. Why cannot he look to his home market? Now, how does this potato question figure out? A barrel is 160 lbs. or 2⅔ bushels, or 1⅔ bags. The freight rate from Woodstock, N.B., to Dundas is 23 cts. per 100 in car lots. You can buy these potatoes in Woodstock, N.B., at $1 a barrel, but when they get to Dundas we are paying about $2.24 a barrel. And in Maine they are $1.45 a barrel. So, what is the use of looking to the United States? Why trade North and South?

We have heard throughout the country about 'Laurier and larger markets.' You know, it is funny, but the Liberal party always have a slogan. But the trouble is they cannot get the people to take it up. They had a slogan in Ontario 'abolish the bar,' but when an election came on in the county of Middlesex, they could not even get a standard-bearer. And in the case of the Macdonald election, which they said was a test on the question of reciprocity, they could not get a Liberal standard-bearer and had to take an independent. It certainly must be a splendid policy—when they are all so much afraid of it. But, to return to the question of potatoes, I am not going to quote my own figures; I got these from the Customs Department. We have heard that 'Laurier and larger markets' would be a grand policy. But let us see how it turned out. In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1912, we imported from the United States $388,680 worth of potatoes, and we exported to the 'larger markets' of the United States, $19,286 worth.

Mr. CARVELL: With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would ask if he would give us the figures for the first five months of the present fiscal year.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): I will give the figures for the year 1911. I have not the figures for the first five months of this year.

Mr. CARVELL: Will you go back two years?

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth): Yes, let us take the year ending March 31, 1911. In that year we imported from the United States $210,989 worth and exported $13,835 worth. I had not intended to give all these figures, but now that I have started I had better fully enlighten the hon. member for Carleton, N. B. But he is no more of a doubting Thomas than some of those I have in my own county. I went through the riding and sent out like literature show-

ing the facts as taken from the Blue-books. One man said he did not believe it. And I told him these figures were from the Blue-books sent out by the Laurier Government. He would hardly believe it even then. I do not wonder at it not realizing that 'larger markets' simply meant greater competition in like products.

Now, take the case of apples. In the fiscal year ending March 31, 1912, we imported from the United States $680,292 worth, if you want to go back further I will go with you, but I advise you not to; we exported into the United States in that year $21,429 worth. Not with the intention of rubbing it in, but for the further enlightenment of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., will that hon. gentleman listen while I state what we sent to Great Britain? In that year we sent $4,678,245 worth of apples to Great Britain. Do you wonder that the farmers of Wentworth did not take stock in 'Laurier and larger markets'?

Of bacon and hams we exported to the United States $82,241 worth and imported from the United States $1,473,296 worth; and we sent to Great Britain $7,821,246 worth. Of cheese we bought from the United States $47,616 worth and exported $31,653 worth—that is a somewhat 'larger market'—but we sent to Great Britain $20,733,064 worth. Take our trade in butter: We sent to the United States $103,819 worth, we imported from the United States $223,841 worth and sent to Great Britain $1,769,510 worth. Then take eggs: we exported to the United States $4,527 worth, and imported from the United States $1,613,108 worth. Of lard, we exported to the United States $34 worth, and imported from the United States $753,392 worth. Then take horses: we exported $312,639 worth to the United States, and imported from the United States $1,778,835 worth. We sent sheep and lambs to the United States of the value of $97,113, and we imported $578,055 worth from the United States. Where is the advantage in Laurier and larger markets?

The hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick, made a statement about lath, and would practically lead the people to believe that the Government were robbing his constituents because of the duties they had to pay. I was surprised to find how the lath and shingle proposition works out. The present duty on lath, going into the United States, is 20 cents a thousand, but there is no duty coming into Canada. And, as I recollect it, the hon. gentleman said the duties paid amount to $127,000 taken out of the pockets of his constituents. It does not matter whether I am exactly right in that figure or not.

Mr. WILSON (Wentworth).

The business-like Government that he supported was going to allow free entry into Canada, while the reciprocity treaty stated that the duty into the United States should be reduced from 20 cents a thousand to 10 cents a thousand. That shows the kind of business men they were—the fact that they made this jug-handled agreement with the United States. The hon. gentleman referred to shingles and made a statement of what his constituents paid on shingles going into the United States. Shingles are admitted into Canada free, but he was agreeing to have the duty upon shingles going into the United States reduced from 50 cents to 30 cents. Why not have the United States come down to our level before you make a treaty with them? But the trouble with the Liberal party has always been that they gave away everything, and then, when they start to make a treaty with the Yankees, the Yankees are ready to say: You will have to give us something else in order to make up for what we are now going to give to you.

We imported from the United States $123,102 worth of shingles, upon which there was no duty paid coming into Canada, and we exported to the United States $1,451,878 worth, and upon which the hon. member for Carleton states we paid $115,433 duty. Well, who is responsible for this duty being on? Certainly not the Conservative party of Canada. I would like to point out to hon. gentlemen opposite, and to have it go down on 'Hansard' for the benefit of those who do not believe that the fruit and vegetable industry would have been injured by the proposed pact, that the value of fruit imported from the United States in 1912 was $2,150,194, and the total value of fruit exported to the land of 'Laurier and larger markets' was $161,143. Why ask us to take off the present duty and still further displace Canadian products?

I heard some hon. gentleman—I think it was the hon. member for Carleton, N. B., (Mr. Carvell) refer to what reciprocity would have done, and I think he said that he had nailed his colours to the mast, or words to that effect. Now, I would like to explain that there is not very much of the mast left for the member for Carleton. If he has nailed his colours to the mast, they have been pretty well shot to pieces. I do not know what flag he is flying, but I think it must look something like the stars and stripes; at any rate I do not think it has the red ensign with the cross of St. Andrew, St. George or St. Patrick. In 1904 the hon. member for Carleton had a majority of 274 in this House; in 1908 it was reduced to 151, and in 1911, when he had his reciprocity flag flying, the timbers of his free trade craft were so shattered that his majority was reduced to eleven! I

think it is a lath that is left, and not a mast.

In regard to the statement made as to whether the pact could be repealed or not, I wish to quote from a statement made by W. O. Sealey, as reported in the Hamilton 'Times:'

It is no treaty, merely an agreement by joint legislation, and one of its clauses provides distinctly that either government can cancel it at any time. I have the assurance of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the Minister of Finance, and other members of the House that if it works any injury to the fruit or vegetable growers or any others they would join me in having that section cancelled.

I do not wonder that the leader of the Opposition does not appreciate the remarks of his old-time followers. I quote further from the same article:

I think I can be safely relied upon to have that carried out, and in my own mind tonight I am fully satisfied that I can have made null any item that works to disadvantage.

It might be well for some young members of the House to ask the leader of the Opposition if he ever said that. It was given with such assurance throughout the county of Wentworth that some of the people swallowed it at any rate. However, I do not intend to ask him any questions; we defeated the Liberal candidate and that is the end of it.

A great deal has been said about the prices paid by the Dominion Canneries, but I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite that the Dominion Canneries are paying more for fruit than is being paid on the American side. For Ontario, tomatoes at the factory, $10 per ton is being paid, while American tomatoes cost $8 per ton; Ontario corn $7 to $8 a ton; American corn $5 to $6 a ton. Regarding potatoes, I would remind the hon. member for Carleton, N. B., that they are sold in Stratford for $1.40 to $1.65 a bag, and in my own town they are selling at $1.40 for delivery in January. The hon. member for Carleton, N. B., should send word to his friends down there to the effect that they should not look to the United States for the disposal of their products, but that the home market is the best. Ontario plums sold at 20 cents to 50 cents for eleven quarts weighing 18 pounds; American plums at 18 cents to 23 cents; Ontario pears, No. 1 Bartletts, at 50 cents per 11 quart basket; American pears at 32 cents to 40 cents. I could enumerate similar statistics at great length, but I have already taken up too much time, but I must again ask why did the Liberals want to make the Canadian fruit and vegetable grower compete with southern labour.

I agree with the hon. member for South York that we want better transportation facilities, and I hope that when the Minister of Agriculture brings down his Bill he will include in it provision for the creation of a fruit commission, to be stationed in the old country, in order to insure proper care of Canadian fruit shipped to British ports.

With regard to the Macdonald election, I want to say that wrong done on either side should be punished, I care not who is guilty. We had our experience, and a bitter experience it was, in the province of Ontario, but we cleaned out the stables, and have never had any trouble since.

Regarding the question of the reduction of the duty on cement, and the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in respect to the action of the Government in that matter, I do not think the hon. member for Edmonton is doing himself or his party any good in the stand he has taken on this question. I would also suggest to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that if they had not used their obstructive tactics last session, we would now have a tariff commission, which would have been enabled to secure the necessary information as to conditions existing in regard to cement. Why cast all the blame upon this side of the House? What have hon. gentlemen opposite been doing for the last fifteen years? The leader of the Opposition avowed himself a strong free trader; he had no use for protection. Why in the name of common sense did he not wipe off the tariff the duty on cement? Simply because hon. gentlemen opposite have never been returned to power on a trade question. Every time the Liberal party have appealed to the country on a trade question, they have met with defeat, and every time they have been elected it has been on a side issue. They tried to obscure the issue by drawing a herring across the trail, but it did not work.

A great deal has been said about pre-election promises. I have with me a promise that was made in my riding. You know how suddenly the election was sprung, and there was such great haste that they started to dig out a post office foundation. I had the fun of having a photographer take pictures of it day by day. The first day we had one man and a horse, the second day two men and a horse, and Mr. Sealey would come up and look at it. He thought he could be elected by putting up that post office. The result you all know. There is a post office just about completed; but the difference between the old post office and the new post office is that the Sealey look about it has been wiped off. I want to tell you what the Sealey look is. It meant this, we were going to have a plain brick building with a sort of fire hall look, and we were to have American hardware fittings and Indiana limestone, and these were to come from the American side. But the electors of the Dominion of Canada put a stop to that. I hope some members of the Liberal party will have the privilege

and pleasure of coming to my town when that post office is completed and I will show them a post office built of Canadian brick and Canadian stone, cut by Canadian workmen, and of Canadian lime, Canadian cement, and Canadian lumber, to which my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., referred to as green lumber, and Canadian hardware will be used in that building. I do not refer to the member for Carleton, N.B., as green, I refer to the lumber. I wish to draw your attention to the fact how we changed the American hardware, and it was the result of the defeat of reciprocity. Here is the statement of the Yale & Towne Manufacturing Company :

General Offices, 9 Murray street,
New York City,
October 10, 1911.

To our Canadian customers:

You are already advised of our purpose to establish a branch plant in Canada for the better conduct and development of our Canadian business. We now have the pleasure of informing you that the plant will be located at St. Catharines, Ont., and that its business will be conducted by our subsidiary company, Canadian Yale and Towne, Limited. Buildings for the new plant are already under construction, and we hope to complete and occupy them early next year.

That is the result of the defeat of reciprocity. The Americans had to come over here and get the Canadian market, and that is why I am in favour of protection for the workingmen, for the farmer, for the vegetable grower, and for the manufacturer. Another result of the defeat of reciprocity is that in the city of Hamilton, the city which the county I represent surrounds, since September 21, 1911, we have some 12 new factories employing 2,087 men. That is a direct result of the defeat of reciprocity. We have in the city of Hamilton 44 American manufactories employing 12,087 men. That is the result of the National policy. I might go on adding to these facts, but I have taken up too much time already. Reciprocity, what did reciprocity mean ? I repeat it may not have meant territorial annexation, and if it did not mean territorial annexation it meant commercial annexation. I will go further and say it meant commercial annihilation. That is what it meant, and the people of the Dominion of Canada had enough common sense to turn it down.

The hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), referred to the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Ball) in not very high terms. He spoke of poor furniture which was a blow at a Canadian industry. The member for South Grey happens to be a furniture manufacturer, and the member for Carleton, N. B., is reported in 'Hansard' as saying :

I am told he has grown rich in manufacturing a pretty poor article of furniture out

of green wood grown in Canada, with a protection of $35 on the $100.

Well, that is a slur on Canadian manufacturers; but do not let anybody in the House forget that at the present time you, Mr. Speaker, are sitting upon a chair made by a Canadian manufacturer in the town of Dundas, and that the chair that you occupied last year was made by the same firm, and had been ordered through Mr. Sealey. But the present chair has a nicer look about it. It is lighter. We have dispelled the darkness in this House now, and we have a lighter finished chair. Possibly, if I were to follow the example of the leader of the Opposition in his speech when you were made Speaker of this House, I might say we had too much Orange shellac on it, but the green cushion relieves all that. I want the Liberal members to look at that chair and see there the Canadian emblem the maple leaf Canada's coat of arms, with the British lions as sentinels, and everything that points to a true Canadian product. And yet the member for Carleton, N.B., referred to a Canadian manufacturer as a manufacturer of cheap furniture. But there is a sequel to that story of the chair, and I would like the Liberal members to keep it in mind. When the former chair was brought here, an announcement was made by Mr. Sealey that the chair had been made in the town of Dundas, and that he had secured the order for it. Well, an order was given for the new chair this year, and there was no announcement in the papers that I know of. The announcement I want to make to the House is that the Valley City Seating Company, the makers of the former chair, were the makers of the present chair, but the manufacturer's ideas were remoulded. He was a man who voted against reciprocity and the Speaker's chair is a monument to a Canadian manufacturer who put his country before his party. Let me read what this gentleman says:

The United States never treated Canada right in our mutual dealings heretofore. Canada always got the worst end of the deal. The American people want our foodstuffs and we did not need to come to their rescue in their party squabbles. Our tariff is the best tariff in the world, and we were doing well. We should have left well enough alone.

That was the language of that gentleman. What was the opinion expressed at the polls by the people of Canada? It was summed up in lines like this:

'Consider well 'tis not the time
To stunt our growing powers,
And place our country's destiny
In other hands than ours.
So let our final answer be,
We are not to be sold.
We'll shape the future for ourselves
And what we have, we'll hold.'

If some hon. gentlemen are nailing their colours to the mast of reciprocity, I want to nail my colours to adequate protection for the Dominion of Canada. I believe in protection; I am here representing the artisan, the fruit grower, the farmer, the vegetable grower, and the manufacturer, and I can stand on any platform and still say that I stand by the old leader, Sir John A. Macdonald. The following expresses my view:

There is another thing in which I believe. I believe in the protection of Canadian labour. The hand that holds Aladdin's lamp must be the hand of toil. This nation rests upon the shoulders of its workers, and I want the Canadian labouring man to have enough to wear. I want him to have enough to eat. I want him to have something for the ordinary misfortunes of life. I want him to have the pleasures of seeing his wife well dressed. I want him to see a few blue ribbons fluttering about his children. I want him to see the flags of health flying in their beautiful cheeks. I want him to feel that this is his country, and the shield of protection is above his labour.

And I will tell you why I am for protection, too. If we were all farmers we would be stupid. If we were all shoemakers we would be stupid. If we all followed one business, no matter what it was, we would become stupid. Protection to Canadian labour diversifies Canadian industry, and to have it diversified touches and develops every part of the human brain. Protection protects integrity; it protects intelligence; and protection raises sense; and by protection we have greater men and better looking women and healthier children. Free trade means that our labourer is upon an equality with the poorest paid labour of this world.

Mr Speaker, why ask our agriculturists to compete with Southern labor? When the hon. Minister of Agriculture brings down his report I hope that it will contain something of interest to the agriculturists of this country. I hope that something will be done to conserve the water powers of Canada. We have made a grand start in Ontario. All credit to the Hon. Adam Beck for the stand he has taken. If there ever was a Canadian who deserved knighthood it is he. What are we doing in the province of Ontario? We are giving electrical power to the farmer and we are giving it to him so as to make life on the farm not a daily round of drudgery. We expect that in a year or so we will have electric light and power in every home in the county of Wentworth and we are going to give the farmer electrical current at a price which is within his reach.

I hope that I shall have the privilege of addressing this House on the question, but I desire to say now that there is a question with which this House can deal and it is the question of better transportation. It is proposed by the Hydro-Electric Commission to construct radial lines along our transmission lines and when they come here and ask a subsidy for electric railroads along these transmission lines I hope the Dominion of Canada will grant it, and that Parliament will give us every assistance towards the improvement of transportation in Ontario and not only in Ontario alone but throughout the whole of the Dominion of Canada. Other parts of this Dominion have not been as progressive as Ontario has been in the advancement of the hydro-electric-power development. I have been told that I will soon be in the asylum with the ideas that I have on the hydro-electric question. But there is one idea that I hope the hon. Postmaster General will take up and if he does he will relieve the members of this House of a great deal of trouble. I want to see the rural mail delivery carried on by means of electricity. That may seem to some hon. members a wild statement; but I hope that, when I have the privilege of discussing this question in the House, I will be able to put it in such a form that you will see the possibility in the near future of the farmers having their letters and parcels delivered at their doors by electricity. Furthermore, I hope that the day will soon come when we will have control of our streets. I agree with my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) in some of his statements. We have given up too much already. At the present time we control nothing. The corporations have secured too large a control of our streets and public rights. I want to see the name of Canada written in large letters across the sky of progress. I am a Canadian and I believe in and have faith in this country.

Now then, in conclusion, I want to touch on the question that some people are apparently so afraid of touching upon, and that is the navy. I do not want to hide behind any such excuse as that of emergency. We should do what this country should have done years ago and I certainly have no sympathy with hon. members on the other side of the House who try to put words into the mouths of French members on this side of the House. You will see the French members on this side of the House standing side by side in their desire to support the Mother Country. All that we ask for is the protection of the British navy. What does it mean? It means the protection of the British subjects on land or sea, it does not matter whether the British subject is black or white, rich or poor. We are all under the protection of the British navy, the efficiency of which means the peace of the world. You cannot go too far. Make every one of us feel in this country that we are giving something;

that is what I am prepared to do and I am as poor as Job's turkey as far as that goes. The hon. member for Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) says that we must show an emergency. Let them take that stand if they will, let them hide behind it if they will, but I stand for doing what we should have done long ago and in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I will say:

To our British institutions
And traditions 'Hold we fast,'
'Follow close to old Trafalgar,
Nail the colours to the mast.'
Clinch the ties that bind us to them,
Give the world no cause to think
That the Empire chain will sever
At our firm Canadian link.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Mr. Speaker, while the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson, Wentworth), who has just taken his seat made the quite unnecessary remark that he represented a peculiar riding, that will not prevent me from bearing witness to the fact that the House derived real entertainment from what he described as his maiden effort. In doing so I recall that in his speech at the opening of this debate, the right hon. leader of the Government (Mr. Borden) found fault with what he termed the grudging manner in which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had extended his congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address to be presented to His Royal Highness the Governor General. To us on this side of the House, there did not seem to be any lack of cordiality in the felicitations which my right hon. friend extended to the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Rainville) and the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle); and it would be strange indeed if, at this stage in his parliamentary career, the right hon. gentleman had even for once omitted to display that courtesy and sympathy which the younger members of Parliament on both sides of the House have always received at his hands. Like so many other remarks made by the right hon. the Prime Minister, there was no real foundation for his remark in this case. The mover and the seconder of the Address acquitted themselves creditably; the leader of the Opposition bore cheerful testimony to that fact, and in extending his congratulations, the right hon. gentleman voiced the feeling of all his followers towards my hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres and my hon. friend from Kingston.

Now, Sir, having regard to the amendment that we are discussing and to the circumstances that made the introduction of that amendment necessary, there was an omission on the part of the leader of the Opposition of which the Prime Minister might with much more propriety have complained. He might have complained that the leader of the Opposition had neglected to thank the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) for allowing him to make a speech in this House without being searched or threatened with arrest. The forbearance of the Minister of Public Works in this regard is all the more remarkable when we recall the indignities offered by his co-workers in the constituency of Macdonald to our fellow members from St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier and Vaudreuil (Mr. Boyer) for daring to exercise the privilege of free speech in that riding. But fortunately for all of us who believe in plain speaking, this is not the constituency of Macdonald, and it is not Manitoba; it is not even the Ontario of one year ago, and by the time this debate is concluded, the Minister of Public Works will realize that when he started out on his public career he made a fatal mistake in selecting Bill Sykes and the Artful Dodger as his political models, and he will realize further that in this free Parliament of a free people there is no place for the methods of which he is the exemplar and the champion, and no respect for the man who employs these methods.

Before dealing with a few matters that have arisen in this debate, I desire to say a word or two about the Speech from the Throne. In one of its opening paragraphs reference is made to the copious and welcome stream of immigration that poured into this country during the past summer. As that was a direct result of the vigorous immigration policy of the late Government, we congratulate our hon. friends opposite on having continued that policy, and we are at one with them in hoping that a still more copious stream of immigration will pour into the Dominion during the next year. In connection with this subject, let me direct the attention of the Government to a despatch that appeared in our newspapers on November 22 last, the day after this session opened. It is dated London, November 21, and the part to which I direct attention is as follows:

Giving evidence before the Dominions' Royal Commission which concluded its sittings yesterday, Earl Grey urged that the poor law children of England should be sent to Canada or other Dominions. In so far as Canada was concerned, he was satisfied that they would be well cared for and well placed. He opposed the suggestion that the cost of immigration should be borne by the Imperial Government and thought the Dominion Government would be wise in making the investment itself.

Mr. John Burns, questioned as to Earl Grey's proposal regarding the emigration of poor law children, declared himself in full sympathy with the project, and said the

Government were prepared to undertake a reasonable or increased expenditure.

If the suggestion contained in this despatch has been considered by the Government, I submit that Parliament should be informed at the earliest possible date as to whether the Government intends to employ the public funds in bringing these poor law children into Canada. It may be a laudable desire on the part of the people of England to rid themselves of such a burden, but before we assume it as part of our immigration policy we should be in possession of the facts and given ample time to consider them. The project is one that more particularly interests the representatives of labour and I have no doubt they will discuss it with the Government at the earliest opportunity, if indeed they have not already done so.

Further on in the Speech from the Throne there is an intimation that the Government will introduce a Bill for the improvement of highways; and presumably this Bill will be similar to the one introduced last session. If it is, and if the Minister of Railways and Canals will keep the promise he made in the House last session, there will be little difference of opinion regarding it. However, as the position of the Liberal party in Parliament with regard to the Bill of last session has been persistently misrepresented for the purpose of making political capital against us, I wish to restate it now so that there may be no further question about it. In moving for leave to introduce this Highway Bill last year the Minister of Railways and Canals stated, in reply to certain questions of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, that the money to be disbursed under that Bill would be payable on the same basis as subsidies are paid to the provinces, namely, on the basis of population. But the Bill, when brought down by the minister, contained no such provision. It was forced through this House despite our efforts to insert such a provision, and later on, the Senate amended it by adding a section containing the promise made to this House by the Minister of Railways and Canals. When the Bill came back from the Senate it was killed by the Government because it simply embodied the promise made to us by the Minister of Railways himself. That is a correct summary of what happened last session, and if the minister has gained wisdom by experience he will not attempt to trifle with Parliament again.

Turning from the Speech itself, let me direct the attention of the House to an observation made by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) in seconding the Address. The hon. gentleman, when speaking of the navy, said that in his judgment the general attitude on the question was one of doubt and uncertainty. In saying that, he was describing rather the attitude of his own party friends than the attitude of the general public, and so applied it is a perfectly correct description. How, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, could the attitude of any honest Conservative who scrutinizes the tortuous course of his leader on the navy question, be anything but one of doubt and uncertainty. He will see that in the first place in 1909 his leader declared for a navy built, manned, and owned in Canada; that in February, 1910, that same leader declared for a contribution equalling the price of two dreadnoughts, but leaving it to the Admiralty to say how the money should be spent; that in November, 1910, he declared against a contribution of any kind without first consulting the people; that in 1911 he made common cause with the Nationalists, who are opposed alike to a contribution and to a navy, and that in 1912 he has worked at home and abroad to find an expedient that will at one and the same time satisfy the jingoes and not drive away the Nationalists. And now we are told the right hon. the Prime Minister is about to propose an emergency contribution, the repeal of the Naval Service Bill, and further delay in adopting a permanent naval policy. Little wonder, Sir, that the Conservative who contemplates such a record as that, would be in a state of doubt and uncertainty as to what such a leader would do next. But, that doubt and uncertainty does not extend to the Liberals of Canada. In 1912, as in 1909, they believe in a navy built manned and owned in Canada, ready at all times to respond to the Empire's call if danger threatens and increasing in strength and efficiency as the people of Canada increase in numbers and in wealth.

Speaking in this debate last week, the Minister of Finance took high ground in repelling certain attacks made upon his administrative action with regard to the reduction of the duty on cement; but, the ground he took, I am bound to say, was not any higher than the opinion which he seems to hold of himself. On general principles, I do not blame him for that, particularly when I recall what his colleague the Minister of Labour said, about him at St. Thomas, on October 29, 1911. There was a nomination meeting in St. Thomas on that date, and the Ottawa Citizen of October 30, 1911, reported the Minister of Labour as having said:

> In the selection of Mr. Borden of his Finance Minister, the Hon. Mr. White, he was bringing strength and integrity into his Cabinet, which it might be difficult to get elsewhere.

If that was in the highest degree complimentary to my hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, it was pretty rough on all the

rest of the Tory party; but evidently my hon. friend endorses every word of it. Last week he demanded an apology because the leader of the Opposition and the member for Edmonton had accused him of reducing the duty on cement for the purpose of influencing the result of the Saskatchewan elections. How does he really stand with regard to that matter? To make out a case in support of his assertion that the cut in the cement duty was not made for the purpose of influencing the Saskatchewan elections, it was necessary for him to convince the House and the country that his attention had first been drawn to the practical effect of the cement shortage in the West on a date so close to the date of those elections, that his action would appear to be continuous from the date of receiving his first intimation up to the day on which the duty was cut in two. He proceeded to do this by reading a communication dated May 31, 1912, and he followed that up by reading other communications from the West on dates subsequent to the 31st of May last. Unfortunately for himself and his contention, he read one communication too many. I refer to the communication from Mr. C. N. Bell, of the Winnipeg Board of Trade, which the minister read in the following terms:

Winnipeg, June 7, 1912.

Please refer this Board's resolution December nineteenth and subsequent correspondence re cement merger contending rate of duty on this necessary article is excessive and petitioning Dominion Government for reduction or abolishment of duty. Since your letter March eighteenth stating matter would be laid before Government for consideration this board without any further advice. Serious shortage cement exists throughout western Canada. Building operations at standstill and erection of many postponed indefinitely. This board urge immediate action by Government in reduction or abolishment of duty as necessary to alleviate present serious situation.

C. N. BELL.

This communication reveals the fact that the Winnipeg Board of Trade had on the 19th of December, 1911, and on other dates thereafter, pointed out to the Government and to the Minister of Finance that there was a cement merger, that the rate of duty on cement was excessive, and had petitioned the Government for the reduction or abolishment of that duty. It further shows that, apart from other letters which the Minister of Finance may have received or sent, the Winnipeg Board of Trade specifically referred him to his own letter of March 18, 1912, in which he stated that the matter would be laid before the Government for consideration, and that from the date up to the date of this communication on June 7, 1912, the Winnipeg Board of Trade had been without any further advice from the Government. In other words, the Minister of Finance slept at his post from March until June and he asks us to believe that his waking up then was due to his discovery that one particular firm was suffering. And you will note that the particular firm happened to be a Winnipeg firm. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend is subjecting our credulity to a test that even the best of cement would not stand.

He said that his action had nothing to do with politics, that the reduction in the duty happened to synchronize—'I thank thee, Jew for teaching me that word,'—with the Saskatchewan elections. Why did not the minister frankly say that the cut in the duty was timed to synchronize with a certain banquet in Regina, and that it was all carefully arranged by the Government stage manager, the present Minister of Public Works? He might as well have done so, because the records available to the public disclose the whole story. The Order in Council authorizing the reduction in duty was passed on Saturday, June 8, but no announcement was made on that day or on Sunday, June 9, but on Monday, June 10, the Minister of Public Works, in the course of his speech at his widely advertised banquet in Regina, said:

I have to-day received from my leader a telegram stating that the duty on cement has been cut in two and the farmers of western Canada may now rest assured of an immediate supply of cement.

There is the synchronism; but I suppose the Minister of Finance in his 'strength and integrity,' to quote the Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers), would also ask us to believe that the sending of that telegram, so that the announcement might be made at the Regina banquet, was another accident, and formed no part of a specially arranged plan. It would be so unlike the Minister of Public Works to arrange anything of the kind! That, however, is not all the evidence proving collusion between the ministers, and how nicely the announcement was timed to produce political effect. The Order in Council was passed on Saturday, June 8th, and, although it is customary to issue an extra edition of the Canada Gazette whenever there is an important change of policy, which is to go into immediate effect, that course was not followed in this case, and the Order in Council was not published in the Canada Gazette until the 15th of June, when it appeared for the first time in these terms.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Five days after the banquet.

Mr. MURPHY (reading):

The Governor General in Council is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered as follows:—Upon the application by importers of Portland cement and hydraulic or water lime, in barrels, bags or casks, described in tariff item 290 of the Customs Tariff, 1907, for remission of customs duty on such Portland cement and hydraulic or water lime, and the bags in which the same is imported as described in tariff item 291, which have been entered on and after the twelfth day of June, 1912, and upon which duty has been paid, one-half of the duty so paid shall be refunded.

The concession for remission of the customs duty on Portland cement, and hydraulic or water lime, and coverings, as hereinbefore set forth, shall only be granted from the 12th day of June, 1912, to the 31st day of October, 1912, both days inclusive.

The publication of this Order in Council in the Canada Gazette shall be deemed to be communication of its provisions to such importers.

RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

Mr. GRAHAM: That was three days after it went into force.

Mr. MURPHY: You will observe that this announcement states that the remission of the duty was to date from June 12, 1912. The situation therefore, was this: the importers, received official notice from the Government through the Canada Gazette on June 15th, but the voters of Saskatchewan had received political notice from the Minister of Public Works on June 10, five days previously. The dissolution of the Saskatchewan Legislature took place on June 17, just one week after the Regina announcement, and this remarkable conjunction of dates and events the Minister of Finance describes as merely a 'synchronism.' Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentleman came to this House with a deservedly high reputation; but in his juggling with this cement duty, he evidently fell a victim to the wiles of the Minister of Public Works, and his defence of his action, I regret to say, did not add to his own good name.

Now, Sir, I ask the indulgence of the House while I refer as briefly as possible to the issues raised by the amendment of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. That amendment refers to two by-elections and in each the conduct of the Minister of Public Works is directly impugned. So far as the Richelieu by-election is concerned there is no doubt that a most glaring attempt was made to bribe the electors. That was admitted by the hon. member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) this afternoon, whose defence of the serious charge made against him went no further than to exonerate the Minister of Public Works from having given him a proxy to use at Sorel. The honours lie between them, and they can divide them as they please. But the case of the Macdonald election is vastly different. There the whole machinery of justice has been prostituted to the basest party ends and the moral sense of the country has been shocked to a degree which the Government is only beginning to appreciate. The facts relating to the illegal arrest of Sifton, Sullivan, Prince and Walkinshaw have been fully submitted to the House and it is not necessary to repeat them. But it will not be out of place to add a few expressions of public opinion to those which have been cited by previous speakers. The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) read to the House the resolution passed by the Presbyterian Synod of Manitoba. During the week following the adoption of that resolution a public meeting of protest against the outrages perpetrated in Macdonald was held in Winnipeg, and at that meeting Rev. D. S. Hamilton, is reported by the Winnipeg Free Press as having spoken as follows:

Glad of Synod's Action.

Rev. D. S. Hamilton referred to the agitation that had already been made against the actions of the Government. They had the platform and the press. They had had the church and now at last they had the people. Mr. Hamilton said he was glad that the synod had taken the stand that it did last week. He was glad that the organ of the Government had seen fit to abuse a man honoured by the city, by the province, by the Dominion, by the great republic to the south and by the whole world. He would have been glad to have seen Rev. Dr. Gordon on the platform so that he might know that Wininpeg admired the stand that he took. They saw the design of the organ of the Government. It could not attack the synod as a whole and it had to attack one individual. The synod had the old fashioned doctrine of the perseverance of the saints and it would go on in the sure and certain hope of triumph.

In order to make it plain that the indignation which has been aroused is not confined to one part of the country or to one side of politics, let me read the following expressions of public opinion. The first is from the Ottawa Citizen, the Government organ in this city. Speaking of the Macdonald election the Citizen says:

That it was a bitterly fought contest is certain. That influences quite apart from those of logic were used seems also certain. There has been a tremenduous amount of smoke, and the assumption of fire is unavoidable. From both sides come charges of financial manipulation. Apparently, the will of the people has not been in evidence, and money has been talking more loudly than common sense.

The second expression of editorial opinion is from the Halifax Chronicle, a Liberal newspaper. The Chronicle says:

One of the first duties which the Liberal Opposition at Ottawa should undertake when

Parliament assembles next month is to demand that there shall be a thorough and searching investigation by a committee of the House of commons into the methods employed on behalf of the Government forces in the recent by-election in Macdonald. This is a matter which concerns not merely the people of Manitoba and the constituency in which the contest was held; it is of vital concern to the people of the whole Dominion. Canada's reputation is at stake, and the right of free speech and the liberty of the subject must be vindicated.

And what answer to all this did we have from the Minister of Public Works? Not only did he flout the Synod, the press and the public, but he justified all the outrages committed in Macdonald. And, as his conduct has not been condemned by any of his colleagues in this House, they must share the responsibility that he has assumed for these outrages. And how did he justify them? He made no attempt whatever to do so in the case of Prince and Walkinshaw. In the case of Sifton, the hon. minister alleged that this man had committed illegal practices in years past, and he read three affidavits designed to support this statement. Even if this charge were true it would furnish no ground for Sifton's arrest in Macdonald, but the minister wholly ignored the fact that Sifton was neither put in jail nor brought to trial. As two of the affidavits read by the minister were furnished by the alleged special constables who arrested him, the disposal made by the magistrate of Sifton's case, apart from any other circumstance, effectually refutes whatever statements these constables may have sworn to. The third affidavit, that of the poor halfbreed, requires no comment. As to Sullivan, the minister achieved his crowning stroke by merely stating that this man was a nephew of 'Cap' Sullivan, of Ontario; and this relationship was, in the minister's opinion, quite sufficient to justify his arrest.

Mr. BLAIN: With the hon. gentleman's permission, I would like to ask where the minister made that statement?

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman will find it through the minister's speech where he referred to Sullivan.

Mr. BLAIN: I would like the hon. gentleman to show where?

Mr. MURPHY: I have read 'Hansard', and I refer my hon. friend to 'Hansard'.

Mr. BLAIN: The hon. gentleman cannot find it. What he says is unfair.

Mr. MURPHY: Now, Sir, I am not here to justify any infractions of the election law, no matter by whom committed. But, in justice to Captain Sullivan, there is this to be said, that whenever he took part in an election, he had the courage to face the consequence of his own acts, and he never tried to shelter himself behind a bogus Dominion detective, a venal police magistrate, or a drunken half-breed.

Mr. LANCASTER: Is not the hon. gentleman aware that this Sullivan of whom he speaks, after the occasion of the elections in which some of his outrageous acts were committed, went under an assumed name and nobody could find out where he was?

Mr. MURPHY: I am aware that on one occasion he explained that he had signed another name than his own, just as the Minister of Public Works and Sir Rodmond Roblin are charged with having done in St. Paul.

Mr. LANCASTER: If the hon. gentleman will permit me, that is not the question I asked him. Is not he aware——

Mr. MURPHY: I answered the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LANCASTER. I say is not he aware that it was proven that on several occasions—that of the West Elgin election being one—this gentleman could not be traced for six months afterwards because he dodged in every place, giving his real name?

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend has spoken of Cap. Sullivan; I thought his inquiry related to Mr. Sullivan, of Regina.

Mr. LANCASTER: But you were talking about Cap. Sullivan?

Mr. MURPHY: I did make reference to him, but, ridiculous as was the reason advanced by the Minister of Public Works to justify the arrest of J. J. Sullivan, of Regina, it disappears completely if the alleged relationship does not exist. Hon. gentlemen will remember how melodramatically the minister turned to his followers and, amidst the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite, made the statesmanlike announcement that Sullivan was a nephew of Cap. Sullivan, and therefore a most desperate character. You will also recollect that the minister offered no proof in support of his statement, but that did not lessen the pride of his followers in his matchless logic. He offered no proof, for the very good reason that there was none to offer; yet the minister's extraordinary argument, if such it can be called, was given wide publicity in his party press, and that very publicity, designed to add to the minister's peculiar glory, has resulted in his undoing. When Mr. Sullivan, of Regina, read what the minister had said about him, he sent a telegram to the member for Saltcoats, which that hon. gentleman has handed to me so that it

may be communicated to the House. That telegram reads as follows:

Regina, Sask., Nov. 29 1912.

Thos. McNutt, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Rogers' statement absolutely false. Am not related or in any way connected with Cap. Sullivan.

J. J. SULLIVAN.

The only other observation I have to make for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who cheered the Minister of Public Works, is that before his next set piece is presented to this House, they should have a private rehearsal with him, so as to ascertain how much of it is fact and how much fiction, and then they may regulate their applause accordingly.

In order that the House may fully appreciate just what credence may be attached to any statement made by the Minister of Public Works, let me refer for a moment to the 'Hansard' report of his speech of Thursday last, the 29th of November. Replying to a question asked by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), the minister said :

Mr. ROGERS: If the hon. gentleman will wait a minute I will tell him. The hon. gentleman opposite told us here the other day that a protest had been entered against the election of the member for Macdonald, and I now tell these gentlemen opposite that a counter protest has been entered against their candidate.

When I heard the minister make that statement, I thought it strange that in view of all the publicity given to the Macdonald election, we had not seen or heard anything about the counter protest which the minister stated had been entered against the Opposition candidate. Accordingly I wired to Winnipeg for information, and on Friday, November 29th, the day after the minister had made this statement, I received a telegram informing me that up to that time no counter protest had been entered. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Public Works will not be allowed further scope to set at defiance all the rules of public life. In view of his last offence, he should either apologize to this House or resign. If he does neither, and the Prime Minister refrains from doing his obvious duty in the matter, then, Sir, I submit the whole conduct of the Minister of Public Works in connection with the Macdonald election and this debate would very properly form the subject of a special representation to His Royal Highness the Governor General, who has the right to demand from all his advisers a much higher conception of public duty than that displayed by this present Minister of Public Works.

The course of the debate has made it clear that the amendment will be defeated by the votes of the Prime Minister and his followers, and the result will be heralded by the Tory press throughout the country as another great victory. But, Sir, that will not by any means be the end of the Macdonald election scandal. During the fourteen months that have elapsed since this Government was returned to power, we have been told over and over again that the intelligent electors throughout the Dominion, irrespective of party, voted in great numbers for the Borden candidates at the last election because these men were pledged to save the country from a danger that was then said to be impending. May I ask, Sir, if these same intelligent electors have not now to be reckoned with? Undoubtedly they have, and when the man who is supposed to represent them in the Cabinet, the hon. Minister of Finance, is called upon, as he will be called upon, to explain in what respect this Macdonald election scandal differs from the scandals that turned the independent vote against the Tory party in 1896 and helped to drive it from power in disgraceful defeat, he will have a task that no man will envy. As the hon. Minister of Finance is fond of dipping into the classics, I will suggest to him as the text for his explanation that old Latin maxim, 'facilis decensus Averni,' and it would be well for some other hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House to take the same maxim to heart before they vote against this amendment.

Mr. CHARLES A. WILSON (Laval): Mr. Speaker, as the hon. leader of the Opposition has so very properly said, the Speech from the Throne is remarkable for what it contains, as well as for what it does not contain. The first paragraph of the document informs us that during the course of the present year His Royal Highness spent several months visiting the most important places of the Dominion, from ocean to ocean, in order to familiarize himself with prevailing conditions. Certainly no one can take exception to that paragraph, and to the following ones, which refer to the rapid and steady increase of trade in Canada, and the anticipation that this trade will increase more in each and every year; that the total volume of our trade for the present fiscal year will greatly surpass that of any previous year. Nor can we take exception to that portion of the Address which reminds the people of the expansion of our revenues, and the activity, progress and prosperity evidenced in every branch of Canadian industry.

That visit of His Royal Highness conveys a lesson to every citizen of this country, and to every member of this House. The

geographical material, commercial, and even social conditions of this great country vary so much from one end of it to the other that no man can be well informed unless he familiarizes himself with them by travel. This remark is addressed, with all due respect, more particularly to the population of the East for the reason that the greater portion of the pioneers in the West have gone from the East and have the advantage of knowing the conditions there as well as in the East. But the Easterner is not so well informed of the conditions of the country because he has not the advantage of travelling so far as the westerner. As one of the remedies that might be applied to the situation, I would suggest an interchange of students between the universities, colleges and schools, following in this respect the example set by the late Cecil Rhodes, and carrying it on along similar lines if possible. After a certain period the students would return to their homes and give the benefit of their study and observation to their fellow-countrymen. That would advance their education and modify their judgment on many points, and it would be to the advantage of the commonwealth at large.

My hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who so ably seconded the Address, made a few remarks on this subject with which I will join issue. He said that we hear from time to time in this House from members opposite, referring to the members of the Liberal party, that there is antagonism between Ontario and the West. I would like to tell my hon. friend that there is worse than antagonism, there is ignorance, and ignorance is the cause of many evils, not only between Ontario and the West, but between the East and the West. According to what we hear and read, some people seem to me to know just as much about Quebec as a darkey from the Congo knows about Manchuria. I draw the attention of my hon. friend and his friends to the fact that there is a population of 2,000,000 in Quebec which they have classified as a very inferior race. I believe with my hon. friend, and I will support him in his contention, that one of the problems that exist in Canada to-day is that of assimilating the immigrant. I believe in that, and I am a strong supporter of my hon. friend on that point. That is all very well, but charity begins at home. Let us begin by assimilating ourselves, by developing a true sense of citzenship and of Canadianism, and let us start with unbiased minds and with a recognition of the good little principle that all men are equal. Let us have a little more tolerance, a little more respect for the rights of the minority. A little message to my hon. friend's friend, Sir James Whitney, concerning the teaching and speaking of the French language in Ontario would help greatly to minimize the antagonism between the races in that province at least. At the same time, my hon. friend might take the opportunity of pointing out to Sir James the example set by the province of Quebec on this subject. He might inquire from the minority in that province how it is treated.

In connection with this question, the noble words that fell from the lips of my hon friend from Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) the other night are most commendable if sincere, and we have no reason to doubt his sincerity. His noble sentiments might help to crush the conspiracy alluded to by my hon. friend, that infamous and infernal conspiracy which is on foot to deprive the French-Canadian of his language, and as a equence, to deprive him of his customs, history, traditions, and institutions.

Coming now to the naval defence scheme. We read in the eighth paragraph in the Speech from the Throne :

> Important discussions took place and conditions have been disclosed which in the opinion of my advisers render it imperative that the effective naval forces of the Empire should be strengthened without delay. My advisers are convinced that it is the duty of Canada at this juncture to afford reasonable and necessary aid for that purpose. A Bill will be introduced accordingly.

It is impossible for the moment to discuss that part of the Speech, because the policy of the Government is still hidden among the icebergs in the high seas. But one might say that the words 'without delay' convey a meaning of something pressing, emergent, something that cannot and should not be delayed one minute. That is my view of it, and I do not think I am mistaken. Now the stalwart brigade of four musketeers have banished all peaceful signs from our country. It has trembled with rumours of war, and of German menace since they put their iron heels on the banks of the St. Lawrence. Even the Postmaster General went as far in the Hochelaga election to threaten us with civil war. My hon. friend appears to deny that but we are so used on this side of the House to denials from the other side, that I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) to say it openly so that we may know what he means. Three months have passed since the right hon. the Prime Minister was informed that there was an emergency. Was there an emergency in July or August? When the Prime Minister came back to our shores, we had an announcement that the policy of the Government would be made known. Nothing of the sort happened. We have been sitting in this House nearly a fortnight, and no Bill has appeared so far. Perhaps my right hon.

friend (Mr. Borden) is sleeping or meditating over it. At any rate we do not know yet. We saw that the real first minister, the king of Manitoba, not the make-believe prime minister, not the king of the make-believe castle nor the prince of the make-believe castle, caused an order to be put on the Order Paper to the effect:

That the order for the consideration of a motion for the Address to His Royal Highness the Governor General in reply to his Speech at the opening of the session, have precedence over all other business, except introduction of Bills until disposed of.

Now, if there is imminent danger, if there is an emergency, to put it in the form which is more familiar to the people, why is there not a Bill in our hands now? Is the Prime Minister still meditating on it? We see in the papers every day that we are going to have it this week. Well, so much the better, for everybody is expecting it, and the more he delays the more he will give the impression that the emergency is not so great after all. Canada is waiting anxiously to hear the long-expected announcement of the naval policy which is to put Laurier's so-called tin-pot navy to shame, and to cause the German navy to flee from the North sea.

But no Bill has been produced so far, and we are still waiting. The Prime Minister seems to be afraid. I cannot blame him for his hesitation because he has not convinced himself that there is a menace. He does not feel that he is sufficiently afraid himself to play his part in the drama, and he is rehearsing behind the curtain. Let us wait for the raising of the curtain.

Some incidents have happened since the last session of Parliament which this House wants to hear something about, and one of them, not the least, is an explanation of what has become of the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works and member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and, more important, what has become of his portfolio. The man may disappear from public view, but the portfolio is here for all time to come. We find that the portfolio is in the hands of a minister but that the former minister is gone. Has he gone asleep, or has he gone to weep, or both? He is not in his seat. Unfortunately he is ill and that accounts for his absence. He has the sympathy of everybody on account of his bad health. Yes, he is ill and it is no wonder. I presume that the atmosphere of this Cabinet was too strong for this drooping lily of the valley of Nationalism. He has tendered no explanation of his retirement so far beyond the refusal of the Government to implement the promise of a plebiscite made to the electors of Quebec. That is no reason. It is a fact of ancient history, a fact as remote as his Lachine speech delivered befor his entrance into the Cabinet. Has he forgotten the pledges which he had given before he was sworn in as a Minister of the Crown? Did he denounce that pledge to his leader there? Was he promised that this pledge would be respected by the Prime Minister? Was he deceived by his leader? There is no word of explanation on this point. All we know is that he was disgusted with his colleagues and followers of the House who abandoned him as did the brothers of Joseph.

Mr. OLIVER: And sold him into bondage.

Mr. WILSON (Laval): They have sold him for promises of jobs, favours and offices, and, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, as the Premier put it very nicely, being a high-minded man and acting with a high sense of duty saw fit to resign his position in the Government. That explains why my hon. friend the Secretary of State Mr. Coderre is there now. This high-minded man with that high sense of duty saw that there was no room for him in this Cabinet. But is the ex-Minister of Public Works such a high-minded man and possessed of such a high sense of duty? I doubt it very much. He is ill; he is not in his seat now. We hope he will soon recover, and when he resumes his seat we will discuss this phase of his career in his presence. We want to be fair to him. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier is gone, but the portfolio would not follow him. It had to be given to someone else. There were, of course, scores of high-minded men with a high sense of duty in the rank and file of the Conservative party. There was the hon. T. Chase Casgrain, ex-member of this House, ex-minister of the Crown in the province of Quebec, ex-Attorney General, member of the Waterways Commission and a lawyer second to none in this Dominion; there was Mr. Marechal, King's Counsel, Montreal; there was Mr. Bisaillon, ex-batonnier of the bar, Montreal, and Mr. Beaubien, chief organizer of my right hon. friend in Montreal, all men very high-minded and all possessing a high sense of duty. Public rumour put them forward for the portfolio. I do not know whether that rumour is well founded or not, but what is certain is that these gentlemen with a high sense of duty, did not take the portfolio. Of course, with this qualification, I need not refer to the material that the Prime Minister had at his back in this House. The concrete fact is that my personal friend, the Secretary of State, has a portfolio now. He took it up. He jumped at the offer. He is a member of

the Government, and feels very happy there replacing a gentleman who was actuated by a high sense of duty and who, being a high-minded man, could not stay there any longer. The newly appointed minister told the electors during the recent election that he had gone to Ottawa, not to be a minister, but to get a position on the bench and now he finds himself in the Windsor gold lace instead of the white ermine. Was the ermine too white for him? The portfolio of Public Works is now in the hands of the hon. ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Rogers). Here is the explanation, it seems to me. Probably the Public Works portfolio, falling from the hands of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, had such a strong smell of Nationalism, that the Prime Minister, like the inquisitive wife of Bluebeard with the blood-stained key, wanted to rid the portfolio of this odor. The portfolio had been in the hands of a minister from Quebec. The right hon. gentleman seemed to be quite embarrassed at first. He thought of giving it to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier), but he thought, very wisely, that the smell of Nationalism would grow stronger if it were placed in the hands of that hon. gentleman, the hon. Postmaster General being a Nationalist although, of course, he denies it. The Premier knows better. The hon. Postmaster General changes his allegiance very often. His life is a book in many chapters, and every chapter relates the story of a fresh change. Then there was the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel).

Mr. LANCASTER: Will the hon. gentleman mind informing me what authority he is reading from?

Mr. WILSON (Laval): It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman who has just got up should understand, that when we, the French members from the province of Quebec are fair enough to prepare our speeches in his own language in order that he should understand them, he should not be so severe in insisting upon the rule of the House.

Mr. LANCASTER: I rise to a point of order.

Mr. WILSON (Laval): I have the floor.

Mr. LANCASTER: I understand that the hon. gentleman is not reading any authority, but is reading his own speech. If so, he is outside the rules of the House.

Mr. WILSON (Laval): I am consulting my notes, and I am not reading from a book or from a paper. The hon. gentleman gave us so much in 1908 and 1909 in this House——

Mr. SPEAKER: As I understand, the hon. member rises to a point of order.

I may say in reference to it that Dr. Flint says in his third edition:

Written speeches not permissible. It is a rule in both Houses of Parliament that a member must address the House orally, and not read from a written, previously prepared speech.

That is the rule.

Mr. WILSON (Laval): There are my notes and I will not use them any more. There was the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue. My right hon. friend thought of giving him the portfolio, but the Minister of Inland Revenue is known as a heavyweight Nationalist in Quebec. He also denies this, but my hon. friend knows better. At the very moment when the Prime Minister was meditating in his office, as to whom he would turn over the portfolio, the King of Manitoba came in, the man who is reported to have said: To Heavens with Quebec. Mr. Reporter, substituted for that a word commencing with the letter H and ending with a dash, because it would not be polite to use that word in this House. At all events, this gentleman said to the Prime Minister, I will take charge of that portfolio, and the Prime Minister was delighted to give it to him because he was sure that in the hands of the late Minister of the Interior, the rose of Nationalism would disappear entirely and another perfume would come to that portfolio, a perfume a little sweeter to the olefactory nerves of the Prime Minister.

I had the greatest pleasure in listening to-night to my namesake, Mr. Wilson, who represents Wentworth; we have the same name, but we do not belong to the same clan. He had his friends cheer him to the ceiling, because he quoted small figures for our trade with the United States and very large figures with respect to our trade with the mother country My hon. friend is against reciprocity, there is no doubt about that; and he is in favour of the British preference, that is plain enough too. But there was a time when the Conservatives were not so much in favour of British preference, and as we on this side of the House sometimes read, we can refer back to the utterances of these gentlemen at that period of their political existence.

The ex-Minister of Public Works was not at one time in favour of the British preference, and his departure from the Cabinet no doubt lifts a burden from the shoulders of the Prime Minister in that respect. I shall read an extract from 'Hansard' to prove that. I have the right to read this extract, as anyone can find out by consulting Bourinot on that point. On April 8, 1902, my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) was Post-

master General, and on page 2414, vol. 1 of 'Hansard' for 1902, I find:

Mr. MONK: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask if he favours the present one-sided British preference?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Undoubtedly, Sir, I favour that one-sided preference because it tends to alleviate the burden of taxation that lay heavy upon the consumers under the old tariff.

In 1903, Mr. Monk was speaking in this House, with reference to the British preference of which the supporters of the Government are so proud now, and on March 13 of that year ('Hansard' page 59, vol. 1) he said:

At present, under the preferential clause, we are sacrificed to the great manufacturers of Great Britain.

I repeat to-day what I said on a former occasion, when challenged by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance to express an opinion on this preferential clause, that if we gave a preference to Great Britain, we should in return have some corresponding advantage in the British market.

That opinion, I believe is held by many others, and that is the policy which my hon. friend the member for Montmorency (Mr. Casgrain) and myself advocated in this House long ago.

Ready and willing as we were to give Great Britain a preference, we were not prepared to grant such a preference as would imperil in any way our own great industrial interests.

Speaking in this House on March 26, 1901, Mr. Monk said:

Now, Mr. Speaker, as to the amendment which is now under discussion, I wish to be as brief as possible, and I lay before you the proposition: That by the preference which we are granting to Great Britain we lose in this country a sum stated in round figures to be $2,000,000 a year. I say we are losing that sum, because I defy hon. gentlemen opposite to prove to us that upon the articles exported from England and which reach here under the British preference, the consumer really gets the benefit of that preference. It goes as we all know—and hon. gentlemen opposite cannot establish the contrary—it goes to enrich the British manufacturer. It goes practically as a bounty to the manufacturers of Sheffield and Manchester and Bradford, as against our Canadian manufacturers, and we consumers in Canada do not derive the benefit which we ought to derive from that preference. Under these circumstances the question arises: Whether this lavishness, this immense degree of favour extended to a class of people who extend no favour to us is justified in the present state of this young country. Is our financial position such that we can afford to make this distribution of wealth in England where it is not required, to the detriment of our people?

I wonder if the Prime Minister when in England recently went to Sheffield, Manchester and Bradford and repeated what his ex-colleague said about them. Perhaps by the way, those British merchants have got rich enough out of British preference to be able to subscribe money to their navy so that we need not spend much as a contribution to the Empire. Then, on March 22, 1899, Mr. Monk, after referring to the benefit the preference had conferred on England said:

This is money taken out of our pockets to form the vaunted surplus which the Government is supposed to have in its coffers. But where is our profit?

I commend these remarks of the Hon. Mr. Monk to our friends on the Conservative side of the House, who are now so loud in their praise of the British preference.

The Speech from the Throne is interesting for what it contains, as it is interesting for what it does not contain. During the visit of the Canadian ministers to England last summer, I wonder if they consulted the Imperial authorities about the Panama canal. My hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. Barnard) said that not a week passed in his town but that Europeans were coming forward and buying land in view of the trade that it is supposed will develop through the Panama canal. I wonder if the Prime Minister consulted anybody in England as to the status of our ships in passing through that canal and as to what might be expected to become of our Canadian trade in that respect. Whether the Prime Minister did consult anyone in England or not, there is not a word in the Speech about it. Then, the Speech is silent about the Georgian Bay canal and what has my hon. friend from Renfrew (Mr. White) to say? He was eloquent about the Georgian Bay canal when we were in power, but he has not opened his mouth about it since 1911. Mute also is the Speech on the question of the high cost of living.

It seems to me the Government should be informed of the terribly high cost of living, and some investigation should be made in order to alleviate the burden that crushes the poor consumer.

The Speech from the Throne is equally silent on the question of the Civil Service, the outside service especially. There is no mention of increases in salaries in the Customs, the Post Office, the Inland Revenue, the Penitentiaries, and so forth. I am delighted to see my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, in his seat. He promised last year that a Bill would be introduced this session increasing the salaries of the employees in the penitentiaries. I must give him credit for the bonus given to that class of employees, but it is not a permanent condition of affairs, and a Bill should be introduced at once

raising and fixing the salaries of those public servants to assure them of at least three meals a day.

The Speech is also silent about the Copyright Bill. Can the Minister of Agriculture tell us if he has any fresh news from Mr. Buxton? I see that a Copyright Bill has been passed in the House of Commons in Great Britain, and I understand it can be enforced at any time here by proclamation, by His Excellency the Governor General.

The Prime Minister and his colleagues are also silent on the order passed in the House on the 24th of January last, for the production of the list of all the employees guillotined by the new administration since they came into power. The other day the Prime Minister said he had fulfilled all his pledges. That was more than a pledge, but there is no answer yet. At the end of last session, I reminded my hon. friend that the people of the country wanted to know exactly how many heads had been chopped off since the 21st of September, 1911. His answer was that it was a very comprehensive and a very long list, but we have the Auditor General, we have the Minister of Finance, and as those employees must be paid at the end of the month, the pay rolls would tell the story in a minute. I presume they do not want to produce it, that they are afraid, or are too busy chopping heads off, and have no time yet to count the victims. At the end of the session the Prime Minister pledged his word that this list would be furnished to me during the recess, yet nothing has been done so far. I hope my hon. friend, after the baby we all expect has been born, will have time to rest a little, and will give us the information we desire.

My hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) must have seen with great pleasure the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne asking for an increase of Senators. When I came to this House, the first paper I read was the Orders of the Day, and I noticed a long motion or resolution of some kind, which was all about the Senate.

Mr. LANCASTER: Did you vote for it?

Mr. WILSON (Laval): That is not the question at all. I am referring——

Mr. LANCASTER: I voted for it. Did you vote for it?

Mr. WILSON: I am referring to the Speech from the Throne, and the right hon. the Prime Minister——

Mr. LANCASTER: You talk one way, and vote the other.

Mr. WILSON—is asking for an increase of seats in the Senate,——

Mr. LANCASTER: In the West.

Mr. WILSON (Laval).

Mr. WILSON:—In order to be kind to his friends. Perhaps, if my hon. friend had a seat in the Senate, he would not be so anxious to interrupt me now.

There is one thing we do not read in the Speech from the Throne, and it is this: the population according to the last census has decreased in some parts, and increased in others. The word 'adequate' was the motto word; the word on the flag nailed to the mast by the right hon. Premier. We do not represent the people in any adequate manner here, and before this naval policy is brought down, the people ought to be properly represented in this House.

A moment ago I read a clipping from the Montreal Gazette of November 10, stating:

> On January 18, 1910, when the Laurier Naval Bill was brought down, Mr. Borden strongly urged the necessity of an immediate emergency contribution, and coupled with this the demand that the people should be consulted on a permanent policy. On February 18, Mr. Borden said. 'To attempt to force a permanent policy of this kind on the people of this country without giving them an opportunity of saying yea or nay with regard to it would be one of the worst mistakes that could be made by any man who favours such a policy.' This course on more than one occasion during this debate was advocated by the present Premier and is the course it is understood he consistently intends to pursue. Moreover, on November 21, 1910, asked what he would do if Premier, he outlined the policy he is now following—consultation first with the Admiralty so as to obtain the facts, then an appeal, if necessary to Parliament for immediate and effective aid, and he emphasized a permanent policy would have to be worked out and submitted to the people.

The first thing to be done was to consult the Admiralty, and then to bring a measure before the House. We expect to see that measure here soon, but it is the third point to which I wish to refer particularly. I do not favour the idea of a plebiscite or a referendum, but I claim that we should go to the people after the Redistribution Bill has been introduced, and then, when the people are adequately represented in this House, the measure can be brought forward.

I have referred to the mission, the visit to England of my hon. friends in a jocular way—I do not wish to offend the member—as the four musketeers. But there was a fifth, whom I cannot forget, a good friend of mine. Before this debate is ended I would like to find out what was the mission in England of Colonel the Hon. Sam Hughes, and why he has been forgotten in the Speech from the Throne. He not only visited England, but, as we read in the reports from the papers, he visited France and shook hands with President Fallieres.

We are told that the hon. gentleman has French blood in his veins. He must have been delighted indeed to pace the soil of la belle France. The hon. gentleman went to Germany, and even the Kaiser had to fall back. That, probably, is the German scare.

House divided on Amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

YEAS:

Messieurs:

Béland,
Boivin,
Bourassa,
Brouillard,
Brown,
Buchanan,
Cardin,
Carroll,
Carvell,
Cash,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Cruise,
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fortier,
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
German,
Graham,
Guthrie,
Kay,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lanctot,
Lapointe (Montreal, St. J.),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacNutt,
McCraney,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McKenzie,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, St. M.),
Michaud,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Oliver,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Proulx,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Robb,
Ross,
Séguin,
Sinclair,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Tobin,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warnock,
White (Victoria, Alta.), and
Wilson (Laval).—71.

NAYS:

Messieurs:

Achim,
Aikins,
Ames,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong (York, O.),
Arthurs,
Baker,
Ball,
Barker,
Barnard,
Barrette,
Beattie,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Simcoe),
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden,
Boulay,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Carrick,
Chabot,
Clare,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Coderre,
Cromwell,
Crothers,
Currie,
Davidson,
Doherty,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Fisher,
Foster (King's, N.S.),
Foster (Toronto, N.),
Fowler,
Fripp,
Garland,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Girard,
Green,
Guilbault,
Hartt,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),
Jameson,
Kemp,
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Lalor,
Lamarche,
Lancaster,
Lavallée,
L'Espérance,
Lewis,
Macdonell,
McCurdy,
McKay,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Meighen,
Merner,
Mondou,
Morphy,
Morrison,
Munson,
Nantel,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Paquet,
Paul,
Pelletier,
Perley,
Porter,
Rainville,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Robidoux,
Roche,
Rogers,
Schaffner,
Sévigny,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Shepherd,
Smith,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Steele,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stevens,
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Tremain,
Walker,
Wallace,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Leeds),
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Wentworth), and
Wright.—119.

PAIRS:

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Bristol,	Bickerdike,
Bennett (Calgary),	Clarke (Essex),
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),	McLean (Sunbury),
Thompson (Yukon),	Power,
Marshall,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Middlebro,	Bureau,
Haggart,	Gordon,
Elson,	Knowles,
Crocket,	Martin (Regina),
Alguire,	McMillan,
Hazen,	Pugsley
Maclean (York),	Boyer,
Monk,	Lafortune,

Amendment negatived.

Mr. A. MONDOU (Yamaska): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the following amendment to the Address:

That this House is ready and willing to adopt, at any time, efficient measures for the defence of Canada, an autonomous colony under the British Crown; but that this House is nevertheless of opinion that the Canadian Parliament has no right to impose on the Canadian people responsibilities in regard

to the general defence of the Empire, as long as under the present status of constitutional relations between Canada and the United Empire of Great Britain and Ireland, the Government of His Majesty and Ireland, the people of the United Empire alone, will reserve for itself the exclusive management and control of Imperial and international questions.

I do not propose to retain the House very long in connection with this proposed amendment which I brought to the attention of the Canadian people a few days ago, so as to enable the Government and hon. gentlemen in this House to form for themselves an opinion as to its merits. However, so as to make things more clear, I may be allowed to offer some explanations with a view to show what is the true character of our connection with the Mother Country, which some are intent on modifying to-day. Canada has been under British rule for one hundred and fifty years. At the outset we were given a taste of military rule, and later on replaced by the rule of irresponsible office holders. After years of strenuous opposition on the part of English-speaking as well as of French-speaking Canadians, Great Britain had to loosen her hold to a certain extent, and it is greatly to the credit of Canada that she was the first of the British colonies to be granted constitutional government.

It was in 1855, under the McNab-Taché government, during the Crimean war, that the question of our connection with the Mother Country came up for the first time. The British government at the time requested Canada to send over some men; the McNab-Taché government positively refused to do so. A few years later, Sir George Etienne Cartier carried through the Militia Bill, for the object of protecting Canadian territory only; but at the following elections his government was defeated and the Sicotte-Macdonald government took the reins of power.

In 1863, the Duke of Newcastle, then Secretary of State for the Colonies, requested the Canadian Parliament to grant by statute a fixed sum for the maintenance of militia in this country. But the statesmen of that time positively refused once more, and energetically claimed for Canada the right to vote the moneys for the maintenance of the militia as well as all other objects. In his reply to Parliament the Duke of Newcastle recognized the principle that the colonies could not be held to contribute either to the maintenance of the army or to that of the navy, that their only obligation consisted in the protection of our ports and the general defence of the territory.

We now reach the period of Confederation. In 1868 Sir George Etienne Cartier carried through a militia Bill exclusively for the defence of Canadian territory; that principle was embodied in the statute, and it was a second time adhered to in 1904, when the Liberal Government then under the leadership of the now leader of the Opposition (Sir W. Laurier), made a general revision of the Militia Act.

So, in 1868, it was acknowledged without a doubt that the militia would not serve for any other purpose than the defence of Canadian territory. Such was Cartier's policy, which was confirmed in 1882, when the British Government called on Sir John Macdonald, then Prime Minister and leader of the Conservative party, to send men to fight on Egyptian soil. Sir John refused, and those who took part in the Nile expedition did so as volunteers. Such are the basic principles of the policy of the Conservative party clearly laid down, and those who claim Cartier and Macdonald as their political forerunners cannot condemn such a stand. In 1899, a new demand was made to the Canadian government in connection with the South-African war. The now leader of the Opposition was then Prime Minister and what answer did he give? On the 3rd of October, 1899, founding himself on the constitution and on Canada's constant practice, he refused to comply with that request, and those who took part in the South-African war had to do so as volunteers. At the general elections of 1900, the Laurier government was returned to power by a great majority, which shows that the people approved of his not having gone any further than his predecessors. In 1902, at the time of the Imperial conference, the same principle was laid down by the leader of the Liberal Government, to-day leader of the Opposition, and at the general elections which followed, he was maintained in power by an immense majority. The same principle was recognized once more at the Imperial conference of 1907, and a third time, at the general election of 1908, the Government was returned to power by an immense majority, which shows that the people approved of the principle.

Now, rather as a surprise, a short time after that election. On March 29, 1909, on a Monday afternoon, and with three quarters of the members away from the House, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) moved his famous motion.

Let us examine what occurred in the light of the public documents we have in hand. The Foster motion reiterated the same principle, but the speech that gentleman made in support of his motion appealed strongly to Imperialist feelings, that is to principles quite in opposition to those laid down by Cartier and Macdonald.

The former Prime Minister (Sir W. Laurier) and the present leader of the Government agreed to modify the wording of the Foster resolution so as to put it in closer

agreeement with the feelings expressed in the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto. I will refer hon. gentlemen to 'Hansard' of that date, wherein they will find the confirmation of what I have just said. The Imperial scheme was being laid out for the first time. In 1910, founding himself on the new principle embodied in the Foster resolution voted in 1909, the hon. Mr. Brodeur introduced on the floor of the House a resolution providing for the establishment of a Canadian naval service. When that resolution was introduced, the hon. Mr. Monk, member for Jacques-Cartier, moved on its very first reading, on January 12, 1910, the following motion:

What is proposed to-day is to invite us to become responsible for the policy, for the diplomacy, for the treaties, for the alliances of which we know nothing, over which we have no control, made by men, excellent men no doubt, but men who are not responsible to us. And, the proposal is to ask us to assume all these responsibilities without our enjoying the privileges of representation. I do not speak for the province of Quebec; I say you will never find Anglo-Saxons who will willingly accept that responsibility, who will willingly bend their heads to what I consider to be an infraction of the ancient rights of British subjects established centuries ago in England. (1775).

At the time of the second reading of this Bill, Mr. Monk moved a sub-amendment which came up on February 3rd, 1910:

This House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion, that the Bill now submitted for its consideration changes the relations of Canada with the Empire and ought in consequence to be submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite.

At the following session, on November 22nd, 1910, Mr. Monk moved the following amendment to the Address in answer to the Speech from the Throne:

The House regrets that the Speech from the Throne gives no indication whatever of the intention of the Government to consult the people on its naval policy and the general question of the contribution of Canada to imperial armaments.

Here then is clearly stated the stand taken in this House by the hon. Mr. Monk against the proposal of the Liberal Government. A few days previous a bye-election had taken place in the constituency of Drummond and Arthabaska, when the Government submitted for the first time to the people their naval policy. The Government candidate was defeated, and on the day following that defeat, a monster meeting, at which it was estimated 20,000 persons attended, was held in the Ontario street rink, Montreal, and a resolution passed endorsing the stand taken on the naval bill by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, as follows:

The meeting approves and ratifies the verdict rendered by the electoral division of Drummond and Arthabaska, re-affirms the will of the Canadian people to uphold the rights of the British Crown in Canada, declares itself ready to approve all necessary and efficient measures to make sure the defence of Canadian territory, but it considers as contrary to the principle of Canadian autonomy and to the real unity of the Empire, any policy tending to impose upon Canada, that has no voice in the Government of the Empire, any share in its external responsibilities and its military defence outside of the Canadian territory,—the only portion of the Empire upon which the Canadian people may exercise any political or constitutional action.

My object in laying to-night before this House the words of the resolution carried at that meeting at the Ontario street skating rink, is to enable hon. gentlemen to compare it with that of the amendment which I am now introducing, and show at the same time that we are acting consistently and logically, that what we then stated before the public we have no reason to be ashamed of before this House.

The Government that carried through the Naval Bill in this House by a majority of 54, was defeated at the 1911 elections and left with a minority of fifty.

The naval question as contained in the various proposals initiated by the hon. Mr. Monk, was a capital issue at that election in the province of Quebec. It may not have been so in the other provinces, and it is possible that reciprocity and protection may in other parts have been the main subjects of contention, but it remains all the same that the Liberal Government, which had been all powerful until then, suffered irreparable defeat in that election.

It is just possible that in the course of that election young men, inexperienced barristers, went a little too far, even to the point of stating that we owed nothing to Great Britain, but as far as I am concerned, I may repeat here to-night what I stated to my constituents in regard to that question of help to Great Britain. Here is what I said: 'We hear it stated that we are greatly indebted to Great Britain in return for the protection she grants us; but at what time has Great Britain ever spent a cent to carry on wars of which Canada had been the occasion?'

In 1775 and 1812, when the Americans invaded Canada, it was the French Canadians who by their loyalty and bravery preserved it for the British Crown. And I would be tempted, history in hand, to say after Sir Richard Cartwright, that veteran of the Liberal party, on whom such praise has been bestowed within the last days by both sides of the House, that Great Britain owes more to Canada than Canada

owes to Great Britain. I hastened to add, however, 'that we had responsibilities as regards the Empire, but that, for the time being, such responsibilities were limited to the protection of our territory.'

Such are the sentiments which I uttered before my constituents and for which I assume the entire responsibility before this House, fully realizing what is implied in such responsibility.

Let us now look into the particular situation which is outlined for us at the opening of this session by the Speech from the Throne. My amendment refers more especially to the following paragraph of that same speech:

During the past summer four members of my Government conferred in London with His Majesty's Government on the question of Naval Defence. Important discussions took place and conditions have been disclosed which in the opinion of my advisers render it imperative that the effective naval forces of the empire should be strengthened without delay. My advisers are convinced that it is the duty of Canada at this juncture to afford reasonable and necessary aid for that purpose. A Bill will be introduced accordingly.

I for one in the light of the information I have in hand, cannot endorse the first part of that paragraph, if I take into account, as I am bound to do, the statements made before the British parliament on the 12th of July last, by the Prime Minister Mr. Asquith, by the Secretary for the Colonies, Lord Crewe, and more particularly by the First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. Winston Churchill, in answer to the Unionist party, which insisted, though in opposition, that the British government should strengthen the naval forces of the Empire.

The gist of such statements was that Great Britain had already enough ships, that if she built more, she would have too many and would be at a loss to employ them. So I cannot admit that the situation is such that, as stated in the Speech from the Throne, it is absolutely urgent that we should come to the rescue of Great Britain. Neither can I approve of the latter part of that paragraph which states that it is incumbent on Canada to offer a contribution, for then I would be asserting the principle laid down in its former part. I would have been glad to support the Government, had they been content with stating in the Speech from the Throne that a bill would be introduced towards increasing the naval armaments of the Empire. My amendment makes a plain and clear statement of the matter, for it is important that we should take a frank and well defined stand.

The House was entitled to the explanations I have just given; on the other hand, my constituents, in consideration for the trust they reposed in me at the last election, were entitled to my remaining faithful to the policy of the fathers of Confederation who have ever been guided by the great principles which should still inspire our Canadian statesmen; the maintenance of the autonomy of the provinces within the Dominion, and the maintenance of the autonomy of the Dominion within the Empire.

Mr. J. B. O. GUILBAULT (Joliette): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I may state at once that I shall not vote in support of the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Yamaska, but I wish briefly to explain my vote. The hon. leader of the Opposition, who is an old Parliamentarian, and an astute one at that, has deemed it an improper course to criticise the policy of the Government before it is propounded. That stand I think wise. The terrible blows he dealt us at times are evidence of his skill, and if under the circumstances the leader of the Opposition will not condemn a measure previous to being acquainted with its purport, it would be improper on my part, as a supporter of the Government to do any more. I consider myself bound to cast my vote against the amendment introduced by the hon. member, not on its merits, but solely as a matter of timeliness. Is it right to convict a man without his being heard? In the same way, is it right to reject a measure without knowing what is its purport? How do we know whether the proposed legislation does not embody such guarantees as are required by the hon. member for Yamaska? We are in the dark as to the conditions under which we will be called upon to assist Great Britain.

It goes without saying that I preserve my whole freedom of action as regards the Government measure when it is submitted to the House, as well as my right to vote against any proposed contribution, should I think fit to do so. I am unwilling to take a stand either for or against a contribution until I am acquainted with the terms. Then only will I be able to vote intelligently.

I may recall, however, the statement I made in Joliette during the election. What I insisted on particularly was that no such legislation should be passed without consulting the people. It was never contended in the county of Joliette that nothing should be done towards helping Great Britain, neither was it claimed that anything should be done. The cry was: Consult the people, to begin with. If they favour such legislation it will be passed, if not it should be discarded. Such is the position I took in the past, and I propose sticking to it when the Government measure is submitted to the House.

Mr. A. BELLEMARE (Maskinongé): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member for Joliette (Mr. Guilbault)

to be in the right. In a general way I approve the Speech from the Throne as read by His Royal Highness the Governor General. However, I insist on reserving my stand as to the paragraph relative to the increasing of the naval armaments of the Empire. Being satisfied that a bill to that effect will be introduced in the House, I consider it will be time then to judge it on its merits.

As regards the amendment introduced by the hon. member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou), I am not in a position just now either to support it or judge of its merits, as I am not posted as to the details of the Government's naval policy.

Mr. PAUL E. LAMARCHE (Nicolet): Mr. Speaker, I regret that owing to recent illness I am unable to discuss at such length as I would like, the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the member for Yamaska (Mr. Mondou). I cannot, however, as a member of this House, and being able to be here to-night, allow this opportunity to pass without declaring that I share the views of my hon. friend from Yamaska. During the election of 1911, I discussed the naval question in my county, and I may say with all frankness, that this has been the main issue of the elections in my constituency, and my arguments have been based on the principle that there shall be no taxation without representation.

What is taxation? Many hon. members of this House may differ with my opinions, but if they study the history of England they will find that taxation has been given different names. It has been called a duty; it has been called a gift, but whether gift, duty or taxation, it is taken from the people, or the treasury as belonging to the people, and it is the funds of the people we are disposing of. I consider that the amendment proposed by my hon. friend the member for Yamaska is entirely in order, as it deals with a principle to which I have been opposed in my recent election in the county of Nicolet. Therefore, without giving any further reasons, I may say that I have to follow the duties of my conscience before the duties of my party, and to support this amendment. It is with great sorrow I affirm that I have again to differ with many political friends whom I very much esteem, and whose views I hope I will in the future have reason to support. I wish hon. gentlemen also to understand that by voting for this amendment I do not look for a plank to cross over to the ranks of the Liberal party. My principles are with the principles of Cartier and Macdonald; and I stick to those principles. In my political life there are only two courses open—to go out of it altogether, or to stick to the Liberal Conservative party, but I have to adhere also to my pledges, and to be true to my electors. The right hon. the Prime Minister stated the other day in one of his speeches that Mr. Monk's action in resigning his ministerial portfolio was moved only by his high sense of duty. I hope that my right hon. friend will extend his broadmindedness not only to the ex-Minister of Public Works, but also to the humble member for Nicolet, who, while standing by the Conservative principles, is bound to do his duty and vote once more against the Conservative party.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, in my judgment the member for Yamaska is entitled at least to an answer to the remarks which he has made in the House this evening. The amendment which he has submitted is one of far-reaching effect, and which, if it were proposed at the proper time, ought to be very carefully considered by the House. But it seems to me that my hon. friend would have been better advised if he had waited for another occasion to propose this amendment. The speech from the Throne states that a measure will be introduced by the Government, and of course such a measure will open up the whole measure of naval defence. For my part, I have during the recess taken the position that it would be inadvisable to discuss any policy whatever relating to matters of defense until we had been acquainted of the measure which was to be introduced by the Government. On this side of the House we have formulated a certain policy, and for my part I have not yet any reason to depart from it, but at the same time I think it advisable that we should wait until the policy of the Government is placed before us before expressing any opinion.

My hon. friend stated in the course of his remarks that he is not aware at this moment as to what information that the Government received from the Admiralty. This reason alone is sufficient, in my humble judgment, to make it clear that the amendment cannot be properly considered until this information is before us. I will not express any opinion, either in the affirmative or in the negative, regarding the proposition the hon. gentleman has brought forth in his amendment, but for these reasons I prefer to vote against it.

Mr. BORDEN: I think the observations made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition in regard to the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska are very pertinent. It certainly would be undesirable for the House, on the eve of learning the proposals of the Government, even to enter into a debate on a proposition of this kind, which must be so intimately associated with the measure very shortly to be

presented for the consideration of this House and this country.

No one can deny that so far as the permanent participation of this country in any scheme of Imperial defense is concerned, the considerations which the hon. member for Yamaska has placed before the House are entitled to serious attention. It is not, however, a question of taxation without representation; there is no proposal, so far as I am aware, that the people of Canada shall be taxed, except by their own representatives in Parliament. The other considerations which have been alluded to will be held in regard in the future. I would go further than my right hon. friend in one respect. My right hon. friend says that the amendment has been proposed at an inopportune time, and he is not prepared to say what his attitude in regard to this amendment would be if it had been proposed at the proper time. Whether it properly came up in debate or not I would vote against it, for the reason that it would prevent Canada from lifting her finger in the defense of the Empire if war were declared to-morrow; it would have prevented the Government of Canada from sending a man or a gun to fight for the integrity of the Empire in South Africa ten or twelve years ago. So far as I am concerned it is not a question of the propriety of the time, but it is a question whether or not, pending the formulation of a policy of a permanent character, we are going so to bind ourselves that we cannot lift a finger if the whole existence of the Empire is imperilled by sudden war. I would be prepared to vote against the amendment of the hon. member for Yamaska for that reason, as well as for the one urged by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

YEAS:

Messieurs:

Achim,
Barrette,
Lamarche, and
Mondou.—4.

NAYS:

Messieurs:

Aikins,
Ames,
Armstrong (Lambton),
Armstrong, York, O.),
Arthurs,
Baker,
Ball,
Barker,
Barnard,
Beattie,
Béland,
Bellemare,
Bennett (Simcoe),
Best,
Blain,
Blondin,
Boivin,
Borden,
Boulay
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Boys,
Brabazon,
Bradbury,
Broder,
Brouillard,
Brown,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Burrell,
Cardin,
Carrick,
Carroll,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chabot,
Champagne,
Charlton,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clare,
Clark (Bruce),
Clarke (Wellington),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Coderre,
Cromwell,
Crothers,
Cruise,
Currie,
Davidson,
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Donnelly,
Douglas,
Edwards,
Elliot,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fisher,
Forget (Sir Rodolphe),
Fortier,
Foster (King's, N.S.),
Foster (Toronto, N.),
Fowler,
Fripp,
Garland,
Gauthier (Gaspé),
Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe),
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Graham,
Green,
Guilbault,
Guthrie,
Hartt,
Hazen,
Henderson,
Hepburn,
Hughes (Victoria, O.),
Jameson,
Kay,
Kemp,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavallée,
Law,
Lemieux,
L'Espérance,
Lewis,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Halifax),
MacNutt,
McCraney,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McKay,
McKenzie,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Montreal, St. M.),
Meighen,
Merner,
Michaud,
Morphy,
Morrison,
Munson,
Murphy,
Nantel,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson,
Nickle,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Osler (Sir Edmund),
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Paquet,
Pardee,
Paul,
Pelletier,
Perley,
Porter,
Proulx,
Rainville,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Rhodes,
Richards,
Robb,
Robidoux,
Roche,
Rogers,
Ross,
Schaffner,
Séguin,
Sévigny,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Shepherd,
Sinclair,
Smith,
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart (Hamilton),
Stewart (Lunenburg),
Sutherland,
Taylor,
Thoburn,
Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Thornton,
Tobin,
Tremain,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walker,
Wallace,
Warnock,
Webster,
Weichel,
White (Leeds),
White (Renfrew),
White (Victoria, Alta.),

Lalor, Wilcox,
Lancaster, Wilson (Laval), and
Lanctot, Wilson
Lapointe (Wentworth).—183.
(Montreal, St. J.),

Amendment negatived.

Motion (Mr. Rainville) agreed to.

Mr BORDEN moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:

That this House will on Tuesday next resolve itself into committee to consider the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr WHITE moved:

That this House will on Tuesday next resolve itself into committee to consider the ways and means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 1.02 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 4, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

SOREL MARINE RAILWAY.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any promise, written or verbal, been made of late by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Minister of Public Works, that a marine railway would be subsidized or built by the Government at Sorel, county of Richelieu?
2. If so, at what date, and to whom was such a promise made?

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN: There has been no promise, either written or verbal, with respect to the matter alluded to, made by the members of the Government who are mentioned in this question.

Mr. GRAHAM: Would there be by any other member not mentioned in the question?

Mr. BORDEN: Put the question as to that, and we will try to answer it.

GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. What steamers have been contracted for by any department of the Government during the past year, and what were the tenders received therefor from Canadian, British and foreign builders, respectively?
2. To whom were the respective contracts awarded and at what price?

Mr. ROGERS: None by the Department of Public Works.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Let it stand until it is answered by the different departments of Government.

Question stands.

MR. ARMAND LAVERGNE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the right hon. the Prime Minister aware of the statement made by Mr. Armand Lavergne, ex-M.P., at a meeting held in the County of Quebec on the 1st of November ult., and reported as follows in the Montreal Star of November 2, 1912:—

'Then Mr. Lavergne proceeded with his version of how the French-Canadian members of the Cabinet had been selected by the new Premier after his victory of last fall.

'The first names proposed,' Mr. Lavergne said, 'were those of Messrs. Monk, Tellier, and myself. I declined this offer of a portfolio in the Cabinet, and at Mr. Pelletier's request, I did my best to make Mr. Monk accept him in my place. He objected at first. Mr. Forget at the same time was working in favour of Mr. T. Chase Casgrain, but I refused to agree to that choice.

'It seemed understood then with the Premier and Mr. Monk that Mr. Pelletier would be the Quebec representative in the Cabinet. Later I learned that Mr. Borden's intentions were to have only two French-Canadian ministers in his Government, and it was at this juncture that I went to Montreal on a special train, paid for by Mr. Cahan, to impress Mr. Borden with the necessity of following the tradition, giving three French-Canadian representatives in the federal Cabinet, which point we finally gained.'

2. Is the above statement true?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.
2. The statement which relates to alleged confidential communications is not accurate, so far as the Prime Minister is concerned.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have considered this question carefully, and I have looked at

the decisions by different Speakers in the Imperial House of Commons, and my conclusion is that in the Imperial House this question would not be allowed. It does not concern the business of the Government or any business of the executive in connection with the administration of the affairs of the country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Do you not think that if the information has come to the Government it ought to be a matter for enquiry?

Mr. SPEAKER: The reference is to the statement of an outsider who is not a member of this House, and it has been held that the Government has nothing to do with such statements.

MARRIAGE LAWS IN FEDERAL TERRITORY.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. What portions of the Dominion of Canada are solely under federal control and jurisdiction?
2. What are the laws with respect to marriage in these districts?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. The territory which remains subject to the legislation of the Dominion and not subject to any provincial powers is comprised in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory, being all that part of the Dominion not included within the boundaries of any province.

2. The law affecting marriage in the Northwest Territories is the law of England as the same existed on July 15, 1870, in so far as applicable and in so far as not repealed, altered, varied, modified or affected by any Act of the Parliament of the United Kingdom or of the Parliament of Canada applicable to the territories or by any ordinance of the Northwest Territories. See Revised Statutes, 1906, chapter 62, section 12.

The law affecting marriage in the Yukon Territory is that which was in force in the Northwest Territories on June 13, 1898, in so far as applicable, and in so far as not repealed, abolished or altered by the Parliament of Canada or by any ordinance of the Governor in Council or the Commissioner in Council under the provisions of the Yukon Act. See Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chapter 63, section 19.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—GUYSBOROUGH BRANCH.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Is it the intention of the Government to provide for the construction of a branch of the Intercolonial railway into Guysborough county during the present session?

Mr. COCHRANE: This matter is under consideration.

PONTBRIAND WHARF.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

When was the Pontbriand wharf purchased by the Department of Public Works, and what was the amount paid for it?

Mr. ROGERS: On May 9, 1912, for $15,000.

QUEBEC CUSTOMS COLLECTOR.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Who has been appointed collector of customs at Quebec?
2. What salary does the new incumbent receive?
3. Is any salary paid to the former collector of customs besides his retiring allowance? If so, what salary?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. William Henry Carter.
2. $3,500 a year.
3. The former collector of customs is paid a salary of $2,058 a year as acting officer of customs.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—QUEBEC TERMINUS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Government reached any decision with regard to the site of the terminus of the National Transcontinental railway at Quebec?
2. Does the Government contemplate the tunnelling of Cape Diamond, with a view to locate said terminus at any other point than the one already selected at Champlain market?

Mr. COCHRANE: The following information is supplied by the National Transcontinental Railway Commission:

1. No; it is under consideration.
2. Under consideration.

RICHELIEU AND ONTARIO MAIL SUBSIDY.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any mail subsidy been paid to the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company during the fiscal year 1911-12? If so, what amount?
2. What is the duration of the contract entered into?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Chicoutimi and Quebec, $2,831.40; Montreal and Quebec, $3,213; total, $6,044.40.

2. No contract executed; payment made on authority of Postmaster General to continue rate paid in 1910-11.

WIRE FENCING.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any promise been made by the Government that before the end of the present year wire for fencing would be taken off the free list?
2. If so, to whom has such a promise been made, and by whom?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): No.

PARCEL POST.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Postmaster General read the latest report of the Toronto Board of Trade's committee on the cost of living, which contains the following:—

'We have no parcel-post service, so that the express companies, that is to say the railway companies again, can and do make us pay dividends on stock that has been shown to be largely water. It seems to be the universal opinion of shippers and consignees that in spite of, perhaps it is because of, the monopoly these railways enjoy, they do not give proper facilities for bringing produce into the city. It would be difficult to overestimate the advantages of a parcel-post service such as is maintained throughout Europe, even in Russia, whereby produce could reach the consumer directly from the farmer. The small charge necessary for such service would at once put a limit to the profits of the middlemen, and would compel the express companies to meet the competition of the postal service.'

2. Is it the intention of the Post Office Department to establish the parcel-post system in Canada?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. The question is under consideration.

WRIGHT COUNTY POST OFFICES.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Have any new post offices been opened in the county of Wright since September 21, 1911?
2. If so, where and at whose request?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. (a) Nesbitt Corners, township of Masham; Lambert Corners, township of Northfield. (b) By instructions of the Postmaster General.

HULL WHARF.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. Is the Government aware that the Hull wharf is in urgent need of repair?
2. What has been done with the money voted at the last session of Parliament to repair same?
3. What causes the delay in the work?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes; work under way, and will be completed this week, if weather permits.
2. A vote of $800 is available this fiscal year, and will be expended in making repairs required.
3. Pressure of other work in the Ottawa district.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MONCTON TO LEVIS.

*Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. When is it expected that the Transcontinental railway between Lévis and Moncton will be opened for traffic?
2. What arrangements, if any, have been made for its operation?

Mr. COCHRANE: The following information is supplied by the National Transcontinental Railway Commission:

1. It is expected that this portion will be completed ready for operation in September, 1913. It is not known when it will be opened for traffic.
2. None, but the commissioners are operating a tri-weekly service between Moncton and Edmunston, which was started on the 20th of November, instant.

THE BRITISH PREFERENCE.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to pass an Order in Council pursuant to the authority already granted by Parliament for that purpose, limiting the British preference to goods brought by vessels direct to a Canadian port?
2. If so, when is it intended to take such action?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): It is the practice to make announcements respecting the tariff only in the Budget speech.

'DUKE OF CONNAUGHT' DRY DOCK.

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. At what amount was the floating dry dock, the Duke of Connaught, valued for the purpose of entry at the customs for payment of duty?
2. What amount of duty was paid on such dry dock?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The floating dock ship Duke of Connaught has not been valued for duty, having been reported inwards as a British built ship.

2. No duty has been paid in this case—the importers claiming that a British built ship of British registry is exempt from duty.

MIRAMICHI RIVER DREDGING.

*Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Was the contract for dredging in the Miramichi river, New Brunswick, held by A. & R. Loggie, or the Eastern Dredging Company, cancelled by the Government during the past year? If so, when and at whose request?
2. Was there a new contract thereupon entered into for such dredging? If so, with what person or company?
3. What was the price per cubic yard paid to the contractors whose contract was cancelled?
4. What is the price per cubic yard being paid to the present contractor?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No; but the contractors abandoned the contract on 7th May, 1912, and forfeited their security deposit.
2. New tenders were called and contract was awarded to the Northern Dredging and Construction Company.
3. Eleven cents per cubic yard, scow measurement.
4. Twenty cents per cubic yard, scow measurement.

THE ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many accidents have occurred on the St. Lawrence route since the opening of navigation this year?
2. What is the name of each vessel wrecked and where did each accident occur?
3. Have investigations been held?
4. What was the cause of each accident?
5. Does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries contemplate any change in the pilotage system?
6. Have the insurance rates been raised as a result of said accidents? If so, to what extent?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Twenty-six casualties have been reported.
2. A list of all vessels stranded or wrecked, with full particulars, is hereto attached.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Answered by No. 2.
5. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is awaiting the results of all investigations now pending, before reaching a conclusion in this respect.
6. No.

LIST OF VESSELS STRANDED OR WRECKED.

Name of Vessel.	Nature of Casualty.	Place of occurrence.	Whether investigation held or not and cause.
S.S. 'William Hackett'	Sprung a leak and foundered	Grand River	No investigation held.
S.S. 'Manchester Importer'	Stranded	White Island	Investigation could not be held, vessel having sailed. Report not sent in in time to department.
Gov. Tug Carmelia' and Coal Barge 'Accommodation' belonging to Government	Collided	Off Sorel	Investigation held. Engines of tug not reversing when required.
S.S. 'Empress of Britain' and S.S. 'Helvetia'	Collided in fog—Helvetia sunk	Off Gaspe Coast	Investigation held. Excessive speed in fog.
Schr. 'James Grey'	Sprung a leak and foundered	Magdalen Islands	No investigation held.
S.S. 'Lake Champlain'	Grounded, no damage	Off Longue Pointe	Investigation held. Lights being obscured.
S.S. 'Hungarian'	Steering gear having jammed the vessel grounded. No damage	St. Lawrence River	No investigation. Not necessary.
S.S. 'Virginian'	Run into by tug 'Lord Strathcona'. Slight damage	Quebec	No investigation. Error of judgment.
S.S. 'Bengore Head'	Stranded	Flowers Island, Strait of Belle Isle	Investigation held. Carelessness of Officer in charge.
S.S. 'Mapleton'	Stranded	Opposite Longueuil	Investigation to be held at close of navigation.
S.S. 'Inishowen Head'	Grounded	Upper Traverse	Investigation pending.
S.S. 'Manchester Importer'	Struck quay wall, slight damage	Quebec Harbour	Investigation pending.
S.S. 'Bellona'	Stranded	Upper Traverse	Investigation held. Result not made public up to date.
'G.T.D.' Wrecking schooner	Collided with Lightship. Considerable damage	Upper Traverse	Investigation pending.
S.S. 'Royal George'	Stranded	Isle of Orleans	Investigation pending.
Schr. 'Ste. Celestine'	Wrecked	Mille Vaches	Investigation pending.
S.S. 'Gladstone'	Stranded	Isle of Orleans	Investigation held. Result not made public up to date.
S.S. 'Boethic'	Grounded	Hare Island Shoal, River St. Lawrence	Investigation pending.
S.S. 'Ansonia'	Grounded. No damage	Lower St. Lawrence	No investigation held, but pending.
S.S. 'Laurentic'	Grounded. Damage not known	Below Quebec	No investigation held, but pending.
Schr. 'Will'	Cut in two by S.S. Montreal	Off Isle of Orleans	Investigation pending.
S.S. 'John J. Ketchum'	Grounded	Near Varennes	Investigation to be held at close of navigation.
S.S. 'Manchester Inventor'	Collided with iceberg	Strait of Belle Isle	No investigation held. Ship repaired at St. John's, Nfld., and proceeded to United Kingdom.
S.S. 'Panther'	Grounded	Lower St. Lawrence	Investigation to be held at close of navigation.
S.S. 'Omaha'	Ashore. Slight damage	Near Bersimis	No investigation held, but pending.
SS. 'Canada'	Collided with fishing boat	Grand River	Investigation held. No lights exhibited on fishing boat.

MR. MONK'S RESIGNATION.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the right hon. the Prime Minister aware of a statement by Mr. Armand Lavergne, ex-M.P., at a meeting held in the county of Quebec on the 1st of November ult., and reported as follows in the Montreal Star of November 2, 1912:

Mr. Lavergne made the affirmation that before entering the Conservative Government Mr. Monk had received the assurance from Mr. Borden that a plebiscite would be taken taken before any kind of contribution to the British navy should be decided upon. The Prime Minister also promised his colleague that the Government would do something, Mr. Lavergne did not say what, for the Catholics of Manitoba and Keewatin. It was because

Mr. Borden failed to carry out these pledges that the Hon. Mr. Monk sent him his resignation.

2. Is the above statement true?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. No.

2. No promises of the character alluded to were made by the Prime Minister.

THE MINISTER OF MILITIA AND IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Did the Minister of Militia and Defence make the following statement attributed to him by the press of the Dominion, in a speech delivered at Vancouver, B.C., on August 6, 1912, and reported as follows by the Associated Press:—

'Gentlemen, we are not more than half civilized today, and war is closer than you dream; the great peril is from Germany. Why? Because Germany must have colonies within a generation or she will begin to go down. She is building ships on borrowed money and must seek new territory. She has large numbers of citizens in the South American countries, and there are only two fields where she can find the needed outlet for her surplus population. One is along the South American seaboard, the other is the British colonies.

'It is well known that Germany is establishing herself at Agadir, a port in Morocco. She meant to establish a naval base there, but Britain told her to get out. For two days war was very near. Germany has to be taught a lesson, and the lesson to be taught her is that Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand are behind the Mother Country. We know that Germany was behind Kruger, and that there was a definite scheme to oust Great Britain from South Africa, but the fact that the colonies sprang to arms and sailed from all quarters of the globe to the assistance of Great Britain caused the scheme to be frustrated.

'Now, gentlemen, the time has come when a definite plan of Empire defence must be adopted. Let it take the form of a full partnership with the Mother Country.'

2. Was the hon. minister authorized to make the above statement ? If so, by whom?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES:

1. The Minister of Militia and Defence did not give any notes of his speech on this occasion to any person, and he is not responsible for the report, which is evidently from hasty and disjointed transcription, and consequently is not in all respects literally accurate.

2. The Minister of Militia and Defence did not need any such authority, and is alone responsible for what he uttered on that occasion.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL AND IMPERIAL DEFENCE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Did the Postmaster General make the following statement, attributed to him in the Montreal Star of September 12, 1912:—

The Canadian ministers have secured much valuable information from the admiralty, and they would receive still more in the course of a few days. It would then be the duty of Mr. Borden and his colleagues to study the naval problem calmly and dispassionately, and draw their conclusions therefrom. Little time would be lost in making their policy public, and all could rest assured that the people of Canada would have an opportunity to pronounce upon its merits.'

Mr. PELLETIER: On the occasion in question as well as on all others when he referred to that matter, the Postmaster General has always declared that, in his opinion, the people of Canada should have an opportunity to pronounce upon the merits of a system of naval defence which, by its nature and character would bind the future of Canada to a certain line of policy of the Militia Department.

THE MILITIA DEPARTMENT—PRIVATE CAR.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has a private car been purchased by the Militia Department?

2. If so, what was the price paid for said car?

3. Was it purchased in Canada or in the United States?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria): No.

MR. OLIVAR ASSELIN.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Was Mr. Olivar Asselin, of Montreal, employed by the Department of the Interior? If so, what is the date of his appointment, and what salary does he receive?

2. Is he still employed by the department?

3. Has he made a report to the department on his work? If so, what is the object of said report?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes. He was employed for four months, commencing 5th of January, 1912, at a salary of $150 per month.

2. No.

3. Mr. Asselin's report has not been handed in, but an interim report in the form of a letter has been sent in prior to his final report. His interim report refers to the immigration office at Paris.

PIEDMONT POST OFFICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Was the location of the post office at Piedmont, Quebec, changed by the present Government?

2. If so, to what building has the said post office been transferred?

3. What is the nature of the business carried on in the building in which the said post office is now located?

4. Has the Government or any member thereof received any protests against the post

office being located in the said building? If so, what are the names of the persons sending such protests?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2, 3 and 4. To the premises of the new postmaster, in special quarters arranged for that purpose, in order to meet representations made by Mr. Hannaford and Rev. Mr. Desjardins.

COUNTY OF RUSSELL POSTMASTERS.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. How many investigations have ben held since November 1, 1911, into charges of offensive partizanship made against postmasters in the county of Russell?
2. By whom were the charges made in each case?
3. By whom were the investigations conducted?
4. In how many cases were the charges sustained?
5. What amount has been paid in connection with the said investigations?
6. Are there any further amounts to be paid? If so, how much, and to whom?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Three, charges of political partisanship having been preferred against the postmasters of Metcalfe, Longtinville and St. Onge, in this county.
2. Requests made through Mr. J. U. Vincent.
3. By Mr. C. A. Seguin, barrister, of Ottawa.
4. In the cases against the postmasters of Metcalfe and Longtinville.
5. Metcalfe—$55.50; Longtinville—$37.25; St. Onge—$7.50.
6. No.

MR. MONK'S PRIVATE SECRETARY.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Since the resignation of Hon. F. D. Monk as Minister of Public Works, what duties have been assigned to his former private secretary?
2. What is the name and the present rank and salary of the said official?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. George F. Buskard, 1B, $2,400, and $600 for private secretary's allowance.
2. Private secretary to Minister of Interior at same salary as above.

ROCKLIFFE RIFLE RANGE.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. In what year did the Government purchase the site for the Rockliffe rifle range?
2. From whom were the several parcels of land purchased, and what price per acre was paid for each?
3. How many acres of land were purchased, and what was the total amount paid therefor?
4. How many buildings of all descriptions have been erected on the said range?
5. What was the cost of erecting such buildings?
6. Did the Government pay any portion of the cost of extending the line of the Ottawa Electric railway to the said range? If so, what was the amount?
7. How much money has been expended by the Government on the said range for all purposes from the date of the original purchase of the land up to November 1, 1912?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1. 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1905 and 1906.

	Per acre.
2. Keefer, T. C.	$277.70
Robert, Z.	292.73
Villeneuve, M.	317.40
Martin, S.	207.28
Eagleson, C.	231.05
Lang, G.	78.92
Simpson, L. T.	75.00
Snow, C. H.	100.00
Wallace, Jas.	100.00
Wallace, Jas.	120.73
Brownlee, J.	103.00
Brownlee, J.	100.00
Clark Estate.	90.17
Cousineau, T.	84.61
Snow, C. H.	305.88

3. 443·83 acres were acquired—

Cost of land	$72,934.76
Cost of expropriating	12,189.65

4. 30.
5. $33,642.26.
6. Yes, $12,882.92.
7. $271,432.57.

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS WORKS.

*Mr. CARVELL:

1. Since the last session of Parliament, has any work been commenced under the instructions of the Minister of Railways and Canals, or of any of his officials, for which an appropriation was not voted by Parliament?
2. If so, what is the work in question, how much has it cost, and what amount of money will be required to complete it?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.
2. New connection between Intercolonial railway and Canadian Pacific railway at Ste. Rosalie Junction, estimated cost to complete, $2,320; about $100 expended to date.

Re-arrangement of tracks at Rimouski and transfer of freight shed, estimated cost $2,685; work now going on and about $150 expended. This is for additional track occasioned by changing of freight shed site.

THE DUMPING CLAUSE.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Were any applications or requests made to the Government, or to any member thereof, for a suspension of the dumping clause?
2. If so, by whom and to what lines of goods did the said applications or request relate?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes.

2. By The Imperial Steel & Wire Co. Limited, in respect of wire rods ; by The Carter White Lead Co., The Thomas Robertson & Co. Limited, The Imperial Wire & Cable Co., and by M. & L. Samuel Benjamin & Co., in respect of pig lead.

CREAM EXPORTS.

Mr. ROBB :

1. What was the quantity and value of cream exported from Canada to the United States during twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

2. What was the amount of duty paid on cream exported to United States during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. 712,084 gallons, value $651,859.

2. The Government has no information as to the amount of duty paid in the United States on this cream.

BUTTER IMPORTS.

Mr. ROBB :

1. What was the total quantity and value of butter imported during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

2. What was the amount of duty collected by the Government on butter imported during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

3. What was the quantity and value of butter imported from the United States during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. 6,115,694 pounds, value $1,656,834.

2. Duty collected on butter imported for consumption, $195,398.06.

3. 1,479,735 pounds, value $412,076.

OATS IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. ROBB :

1. How many bushels, and what grade of oats were imported from the United States to Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, and the number of bushels in each grade?

2. What was the value of oats imported from the United States to Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

3. How much duty was collected on oats imported from the United States during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

4. What quantity of such oats were re-exported either as oats, meal, oatmeal, rolled oats or feed?

5. Was any portion of duty refunded on account of grain or meal exported during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912? If so, how much?

6. Has any application been made for a refund of duty on account of grain, flour or meal, exported during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. The quantity of oats imported from the United States into Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, amounted to 1,742,786 bushels. Imports of oats are not classified by grades in customs statistics.

2. $771,671.

3. Duty collected on oats imported for consumption from the United States was $12,633.20.

4. The quantity and value of foreign oats exported from Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, amounted to 2,256,037 bushels, value $1,078,442.

WHEAT IMPORTS AND EXPORTS.

Mr. ROBB :

1. How many bushels of wheat and of what grade were imported from United States to Canada, during twelve months ending October 31, 1912, and the number in each grade?

2. What was the value of wheat imported from United States to Canada during twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

3. How much duty was collected on wheat imported from the United States during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

4. What quantity of such wheat was re-exported, either as wheat or flour?

5. Was any portion of duty refunded on account of grain, flour or mill feed exported during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912? If so, how much?

6. Has any application been made for a refund of duty on account of wheat, flour, or mill feed exported during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. The quantity of wheat imported from United States to Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, amounted to 4,927,473 bushels. Imports of wheat is not classified by grades in Customs statistics.

2. $4,922,628.

3. Duty collected on wheat imported for consumption from United States was $23,691.60.

4. Quantity and value of foreign wheat exported from Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, amounted to 6,564,360 bushels, valued at $6,602,437.

THE GOVERNMENT'S NAVAL POLICY.

Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. Has the right hon. the Prime Minister read the following letter published on Monday, November 18, in the Montreal press, and addressed to Dr. J. M. Lalonde, of St. Cunégonde by the ex-Minister of Public Works:—

'My dear friend,—You inform me that certain ones are causing a rumour to be circulated to the effect that I am opposed to the contest which is now going on in Hochelaga division. I am surprised to learn this, and I regret the fact such reports have gained currency. I am not taking any part in the contest, believing that in following such course I am acting rightly. I gave up my place as a member of the Cabinet for the reason that the Government has decided not to institute

a plebiscite on the question of a naval contribution. I find it just that the electors should profit by the present election to manifest their will in regard to this question.'

F. D. MONK.

2. Is it true, as alleged in the above letter, that the Government has decided not to institute a plebiscite on the naval question?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. The Prime Minister had not read the letter in question until it was brought to his attention on the Order Paper.

2. The Government will announce its policy on the naval question in due course.

TRACADIE LAZARETTO

Mr. TURGEON:

1. To whom was the contract for the construction of the dwelling of the physician of the Lazaretto of Tracadie awarded.
2. What was the amount thereof?
3. Was that tender the lowest?
4. On whose recommendation was Théodore Arseneau appointed as inspector for that work?
5. How long did he act in that capacity?
6. Under what authority was he dismissed?
7. Who was appointed in his place and under what authority?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. George Eddy Company (Ltd.), Bathurst, N. B.
2. $7,000.
3. Yes.

4, 5, 6 and 7. Theodore Arseneau was not appointed inspector; the superintendent of buildings for New Brunswick is the inspector.

ARTHABASKA POST OFFICE.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. When was a keeper nominated for the new post office building of Arthabaska?
2. When did the keeper take possession of his residence?
3. Has the postmaster of Arthabaska taken possession of the post office in that new building? If not, why has he not done so?
4. Has the Department of Public Works paid a man named Joseph E. Baril, overseer of the works, $4 a day since June last?
5. What amount has Joseph E. Baril received each month as salary since his nomination in November, 1911?
6. What has been the cost of the hydrant put up near the post office building of Arthabaska?
7. What has been the cost of the several movings of that hydrant and of the repairs which have been made to it?
8. Who has given authority for that expense and who has been paid for work in connection with that hydrant in Arthabaska?
9. How much has been paid by the Government for having a letter box put up outside the post office, and how long have workmen been employed in connection with that box and who has received the money?
10. How much has been paid for the sidewalks and gangways of the post office of Arthabaska, who has obtained the contract and what was the amount of that contract?
11. Have tenders been asked? If so, who were the different tenderers and what was the amount of each tender?
12. What was the price per ton paid by the Government for coal for heating the post office of Arthabaska?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Dr. E. A. Belleau, November 22, 1911.
2. Notified to take possession August 12, 1912.
3. No—fittings not ready—Post Office Department notified that building was ready on November 23, 1912.
4. Yes.
5. 18th November to 31st December, 1911 .. .. $144
   January, 1912 108
   February, 1912 100
   March, 1912 104
   April, 1912 104
   May, 1912 108
   June, 1912 100
   July, 1912 108
   August, 1912 108
   September, 1912 100
   October, 1912 108
   ——$1,192

6 and 7. $141.50. This price includes changes in position of hydrant, digging trenches and repairs.

8. (a) Department of Public Works. (b) Ludger Lavigne.

9. Street receiver included in contract, with exception of brass plate which was supplied by the Government.

10. Not paid, as work is not completed. Contract awarded to A. Quesnel at the following rates: Concrete walks, 35 cents per sup. foot; gravel walks, 25 cents per sup. foot; curb, 60 cents per lineal foot; levelling and sodding, $75. Estimate cost of all above work about, $700.

11. A Quesnel asked to tender, and tender received from him as stated in No. 10.

12. $10.25 per ton.

CIVIL SERVICE VACANCIES AND APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

Can the right hon. the Prime Minister tell us why the following Order of the House dated January the 24th 1912, has not yet been complied with:—

By Mr. Wilson (Laval):—Order of the House for a return showing all the employees of the different departments at Ottawa, and also in the nine provinces and territories of Canada, and other places outside of Canada, in the inside and outside service, who have left their employment since the 1st October, 1911, up to the 10th January, 1912, inclusively with their names, christian names, age, nationality, employment and salaries respectively; the date of their appointment; the date of their leaving; their salaries at the time of their appointment and at leaving; the reasons of their leaving; and if replaced

or not; the names, christian name, age, nationality, employment and salary of those who have replaced them; and in the case of dismissals, a list of the persons who asked for their dismissals; in the case of these replacing them, a list of the persons who recommended their successors.

Mr. BORDEN: The Prime Minister is informed that the return has not yet been completed. The difficulty is, as I understand from inquiry of the Secretary of State, that a great many particulars are asked with regard to different officials, and there has been some delay in securing the information. The Secretary of State has been requested to use all possible expedition in expediating this inquiry.

Mr. WILSON (Laval): If my right hon. friend will permit me, perhaps he can give me an answer to my question with reference to other departments than that of the Secretary of State, and I could wait for particulars from that department.

Mr. BORDEN: I am afraid the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wilson, Laval) does not understand me. When questions or returns relate to all the departments of government, they are put into the hands of the Secretary of State who secures the information from the various departments, and until this information comes the question cannot very well be answered. I can assure my hon. friend there is no desire or intention to withhold the information. It will be secured for him as soon as possible.

CEMENT IMPORTS.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. What was the quantity and value of cement imported in Canada in the year 1912, during the temporary reduction of the customs tariff upon cement?
2. From what countries was the same imported and what quantity from each of the said countries?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. 3,466,435 cwt. valued at $1,332,240.
2.

	Cwt.	Value.
United Kingdom	190,111	$ 61,869
United States	3,214,835	1,244,229
Hong Kong	47,500	20,804
Belgium	12,000	4,438
Germany	1,989	900

INTERPRETATION OF TARIFF—COUNSEL FEES.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Was any counsel employed by and on behalf of the Government of Canada or any department thereof in any hearing, argument, appeal or proceeding before the Exchequer Court or Supreme Court of Canada, respecting the interpretation of tariff item No. 504?
2. If so, whom, and what is the total amount payable to date for such services?

Mr. WILSON (Laval).

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes.
2. Mr. J. T. Lewis, K.C.

Mr. Lewis has been paid $816.85.

NAVAL AND MILITARY EMIGRATION LEAGUE.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government or any member thereof, received any proposal or request from the Naval and Military Emigration League of Great Britain regarding immigration to Canada?
2. If so, what is the nature of such proposal or request, and does it involve assistance to immigration?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. The league has asked the Government. (a) To advance the fares, with or without interest, of suitable and carefully selected ex-service men of good character and physique, who may be in circumstances requiring such assistance, under conditions set out in their proposal. (b) To arrange through the immigration officers of this department, in co-operating with the committees and correspondents of the league throughout the Dominion, to secure the repayment of the amounts so advanced.

BACK SHORE AND PICTOU MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Were tenders called during last summer for the mail service between Back Shore and Pictou, in the county of Pictou? If so, who were the tenderers and what was the amount of each tender?
2. Has the contract been awarded to any person? If so, to whom?
3. If the contract was not awarded, why not?

Mr. PELLETIER: Tenders were invited, due 13th September, but they are still under consideration in the public interest.

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Post Office Department to increase the rates of postage on newspapers. If so, to what extent?

Mr. PELLETIER: The demands made by railway companies for an increased rate of pay on account of the larger amount of mail matter which they have to carry, has brought this question to the attention of the department, and the Canadian Press Association has taken this matter up with the Postmaster General for consideration at the proper time when all the facts and circumstances have been fully inquired into and ascertained.

IMMIGRATION BONUSES.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Is the recruiting of immigrants remunerated? If so, what classes?
2. What amount has been paid per head, and from what countries?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes. (a) Those who have been farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, carters, navvies, or miners, and who signify their intention of following farming in Canada. (b) Female domestic servants.

2. £1 per head. United Kingdom, France, Belgium, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Iceland. $3 per male adult, $2 per female adult, and $1 per head on all others of same classes sent from United States by local commission agents.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has the Government taken any action regarding the toll to be charged on American and foreign vessels which will enter the Panama canal?
2. If not, does the Government intend making representation in that regard to the Imperial Government or the American authorities?

Mr. BORDEN: The Government has been in communication with both the Foreign Office and the British Ambassador at Washington with regard to this question. The communications are, for the present, confidential.

WEST INDIAN TRADE.

Mr. BELAND:

What was the amount of the total trade during the first six months of the current year between Canada and the British West Indies, between Canada and the British Islands, and between Canada and the United States, respectively.

Mr. REID (Grenville):

British West Indies ..	$ 7,550,534
United Kingdom	145,945,122
United States	297,508,766

VETERAN GRANTS.

Mr. BELAND:

1. How many applications have been made for the bonus granted to veterans by Act of last session?
2. How many in each province respectively?
3. How many have been accepted by the military council?
4. How many have received the bonuses?

Mr. SAM HUGHES:

1. 13,770.
2. Claims are being dealt with in the order in which they have been received, and not by provinces or battalions.
3. 4,000.
4. 3,900.

THE GRAND TRUNK DIRECTORS.

Mr. MACLEAN (York):

1. Who is the Government representative on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's directorate?
2. What are his duties and what instructions have been given to him by the Government?
3. What report, if any, has been made by the said director to the Government?
4. Has any report of the revenues and expenditures of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, been submitted to the Government?
5. Is the Grand Trunk Pacific Company one of the contractors upon the construction of the National Transcontinental railway between Wininpeg and Moncton?
6. What amount of money has been paid to said company by the National Transcontinental Railway Commission on this account to date?
7. How much money has been expended by the Government to date on account of the construction and equipment of the Transcontinental railway between Winnipeg and Moncton?
8. What assistance has been given by the Government to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to date by cash payments loans and guarantees re the construction of its lines between Winnipeg and Prince Rupert?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Jules Hone, Quebec, Que.
2. His duties are the same as those of any director of a railway corporation, with the exception that, instead of representing a body of shareholders, he represents the Government and keeps it informed on such matters as he deems necessary.
3. No written report has been received since Mr. Hone's appointment in May last. It had been the custom of the previous director to submit his report at the end of the fiscal year.
4. The revenues and expenditures of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are submitted monthly by the company and audited by an official of the Railway Department.
5. Yes.
6. $15,454,118.29.
7. $125,053,267.53.
8. (a) Cash payments — Implementing money under clause 5 of agreement of February 18, 1904 (schedule to cap. 24, Acts of 1904).. .. ..$ 4,994,416 66

(b) Loan under cap. 19, Acts of 1909.. .. ..$10,000,000 00

(c) Guarantee of 3 per cent bonds authorized by cap. 98, Acts of 1905, schedule 'A': Bonds sold, £7,200,000, or.. ..$35,040,000 00
Bonds pledged, £2,619,000, or.. 12,745,800 00

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—HALIFAX TERMINALS.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Has any detailed report of engineers as to the extent, route and cost of the proposed Intercolonial railway terminal improvements at Halifax, N.S., yet been made to the Minister of Railways?

2. If not, is such a report under preparation, and when is it likely to be completed?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. The report is under preparation and will be completed as soon as possible.

MR. MALCOLM G. McLEOD.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What position was Malcolm G. McLeod appointed to in the Customs Department in Nova Scotia, and what is his salary?

2. Has he been permanently appointed?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Malcolm G. McLeod has been employed as special officer of customs to investigate claims for drawback of customs duties and for general service on the staff of the Chief Inspector of Customs. His salary is $1,500 a year.

2. He has not been appointed by Order in Council.

MR. JOHN BAILLIE.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What position does John Baillie fill in the Customs Department at Pictou or New Glasgow, and what is the amount of salary paid him?

2. Has he been permanently appointed?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. John M. Baillie is employed as an acting officer of customs to assist in the general work of the port of New Glasgow and to act as a relieving officer at other ports and outports. His salary is $1,200 a year.

2. He has not been appointed by Order in Council.

FISHERIES ADVISORY BOARD.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Have any steps been taken by the Department of Marine and Fisheries towards the appointment of a Fisheries Advisory Board?

2. How will the proposed board be constituted?

3. Will each province be represented? If so, how many from each province?

4. Have any appointments been made to date? If so what are the names?

5. What are the qualifications necessary for appointment to said board, and how are the members to be elected?

6. What are to be the duties of the said board, and how long will they hold office?

7. What will be the remuneration?

8. Will Fishermen's Union be represented on the board?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.

2. It will be composed of persons representing the different branches of the fisheries industry and of certain departmental officials.

3. All except Ontario and the inland portions of Quebec.

3 from Nova Scotia.
2 " New Brunswick.
1 " Prince Edward Island.
1 " Gulf Coast, Quebec.
1 " Manitoba.
1 " Saskatchewan.
1 " Alberta.
3 " British Columbia.

4. No.

5. Persons will be chosen who have an intimate knowledge of the branch of the industry they are to represent. The members will be named by the minister.

6. To advise and confer with the department on matters pertaining to the welfare of the fisheries. They will hold office during the pleasure of the minister.

7. Ten dollars per day when attending the meetings of the Board or the Committees thereof.

All those engaged in the different branches of the industry will be represented on the Board.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MURPHY:

Is it the intention of the Government to reintroduce at the present session the Act amending the Companies Act, which stood among the Government Bills not disposed of at the second last session of Parliament?

Mr. DOHERTY: The matter of introducing the Bill referred to is now engaging the attention of the Government.

MR. W. F. TYE, CONSULTING ENGINEER.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has Mr. W. F. Tye, formerly chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company been employed by the Government?

2 If so, for what purpose, for what length of time, and what remuneration is he to receive?

3. Has he made any reports? If so, what are their respective dates?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. The services of Mr. W. F. Tye, consulting engineer, have been secured by the Transcontinental Railway Investigating Commission.

2. For the purpose of examining certain documents and giving testimony thereon. Employment is to cease when this testi-

mony is given. Remuneration to be $100 per day for each day actually engaged on the work, together with travelling expenses.

3. Answered by No. 2.

COMMISSIONERS GUTELIUS AND LYNCH-STAUNTON.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. What amounts have been paid from February 1, 1912, to November 1, 1912, for salaries and expenses respectively, to Commissioners Gutelius and Lynch-Staunton?

2. Have the said commissioners made any reports? If so, on what dates?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Amounts paid from February 1, 1912, to November 1, 1912, for salaries and expenses, respectively to Commissioners Gutelius and Lynch-Staunton, respectively, are as follows:

	Salary.	Expenses.	Total.
F. P. Gutelius	$15,990.00	$903.03	$16,893.03
G. Lynch-Staunton	10,335.00	459.25	10,794.25

2. No report has yet been received.

INCORPORATION OF COMPANIES.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the Government, or any of its members, given any provincial government, or any of its members, or person acting in its behalf, any promise or intimation that the case now before the Supreme Court of Canada to determine the respective jurisdictions of the Dominion and the provinces with regard to the incorporation of companies, will be withdrawn?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to press for a speedy determination of the issues raised in the said case?

3. If not, what is the policy of the Government with regard to Dominion jurisdiction in the matter of company incorporation?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No. It was represented on behalf of the provinces that they desired to have additional questions submitted, or to have some modification of the existing questions, and the argument was postponed until the beginning of the February sittings of the Supreme Court to enable the provinces to submit their suggestions and for consideration of such suggestions.

2. It is the intention of the Government to proceed with the argument at the February sittings.

LINWOOD MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish):

1. Who is the contractor for carrying the mails between Linwood station and Linwood post office?

2. What remuneration does he receive?

3. When does the contract expire?

4. Is it the intention to renew the contract at the same sum?

5. If not, will tenders be called for the services before the present contract expires?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. H. D. Coste.

2. $96 per annum.

3. 31st December, 1912.

4 and 5. Authority was given on the 31st August, 1912, to make a new contract from the 1st January, 1913, with D. Delory at the same price, $96 per annum.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—ISSUE OF COMMON STOCK.

Mr. MACLEAN (York):

1. Was any application made to the Government since January 1, 1912, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for an Order in Council sanctioning an issue of common stock under the provisions of the Canadian Pacific Railways Act, 1892?

2. Was any communication made by said company or any officer thereof, to the Government or any member thereof, respecting an increase in the capital of said company since January 1, 1912?

3. Was any application or petition received by the Governor in Council since January 1, 1912, from the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, asking that the proposed issue of capital stock be approved by said Governor in Council?

4. Was said application passed upon by the Governor General in Council?

5. Did said Railway Company increase its capital by issuing common stock without the consent of said Governor General in Council after the filing of its said application or petition?

6. Did the Canadian Pacific Railway Company issue said common stock without the knowledge or consent of the Government?

7. Did the Government or any member thereof, communicate with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any officer thereof, between the filing of the said application of the company and October 2, 1912?

8. When will the Government lay before the House copies of all correspondence, petitions, orders and proceedings, relevant to the foregoing inquiries?

Mr. WHITE:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. Application was made in August, 1912, by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the sanction of the Governor in Council of a proposed increase to the par value of $75,000,000 in the authorized ordinary share capital of the Company.

3. Yes. Letter dated August 13th, 1912, addressed by the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister.

4. No.

5. The Railway Company has, it is understood, increased its ordinary share capital to the amount of $60,000,000 par value under the authority of Section 2 of Chapter 35 of the Statutes 55-56 Victoria.

6. The Government was informed of the intention of the company to make the increase in capital referred to in (5).

7. The President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company verbally informed the Government of the intention of the company to issue the $60,000,000 of stock referred to in (5) in addition to the $75,000,000 referred to in (2).

8. Herewith.

Canadian Pacific Railway.

Extract from the minutes of a meeting of the Board of Directors of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, duly called and held at the principal office of the company at Montreal on Monday the 12th day of August 1912.

The question of the desirability of increasing the ordinary capital stock of the company having been discussed at length, the president submitted the following resolution on the subject, which was adopted, namely:

Whereas the authorized ordinary capital stock of this company at this date is $200,000,000, divided into 2,000,000 shares of the par or face value of $100 each;

And whereas pursuant to the provision of Section 3 of the Act 55, 56 Victoria, chapter 35, Canada, the company being duly authorized in that behalf by its shareholders at a special general meeting duly called for the purpose, may from time to time increase its capital stock for any purpose for which the company requires new capital, to such amount and at such times as the shareholders at any such meeting may determine, such issue being first approved by the Governor in Council;

And whereas the company requires from time to time new capital for the purposes of its undertaking, and it is desirable to increase the amount of the said authorized ordinary capital stock to $275,000,000 being an increase of $75,000,000.

Now therefore it is resolved as follows, that is to say:

That it is in the interests of this company that the ordinary capital stock of the company be increased from $200,000,000 to an amount not exceeding $275,000,000 in shares of $100 each, or its equivalent in sterling money of Great Britain, to be issued and sold for the purposes of its undertaking as may be determined by resolution of the shareholders of the company.

That the president of the company be and he is hereby authorized to make an application in the name of the company to the Governor in Council to have the said proposed increase of stock duly approved of.

Certified a true extract,
(sgd.) W. R. BAKER,
Secretary.

Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

Montreal, August 13, 1912.

Dear Sir,—The last issue of the company's common stock, on which the final subscriptions will be paid in the course of the next couple of months, exhausts the amount authorized by Order in Council, August 17, 1908, for the ordinary purposes of the company, and the proceeds will be no more than sufficient to meet the expenditures already made and those to be made in the course of the next few months under existing contracts. Notwithstanding the vastness of the company's expenditures for increased facilities of every description to keep abreast with the transportation requirements of the country, terminal yards, sidings, track facilities and buildings that were completed three or four years ago, and that were then thought to be sufficient for a number of years to come, now prove to be entirely inadequate, and with the outlook for a continued increase in immigration, and the corresponding enlargement of the country's production and trade, it is evident that to avoid very serions congestion indeed, the outlay for increased facilities at almost every important point on the system, for the extension of the double track to the Pacific coast, and for equipment, must be continued without cessation and the works must be completed as rapidly as circumstances will permit. A percentage of the money required for these purposes is derived from surplus earnings and from other sources, but by far the largest portion must be secured by the issue and sale of the company's ordinary share capital.

The directors desire to recommend to the shareholders that the authorized ordinary capital stock of the company be increased $75,000,000, subject as provided in Statute 55, 56, Victoria, chapter 35, to the approval of the Governor in Council; this additional capital, when so authorized, to be issued in such amounts and at such times as may be necessary or desirable for the purposes of the company.

Enclosed herewith please find a certified copy of the resolution of the Board of Directors adopted at the meeting held August 12, 1912, which provides for the proposed increase of capital and sanctions this application, and I beg to request that the proposed increase of capital stock be approved by an Order in Council containing the same conditions and restrictions as those that were incorporated in the Order in Council of August 17, 1908.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Yours very truly,
(sgd.) T. Shaughnessy,
President.

Right Hon. R. L. Borden, P.C.
Premier,
Ottawa, Ont., August 13, 1912.

Dear Sir,—To-day Mr. Wanklyn handed me your letter of the 13th instant and also the one addressed to the Prime Minister enclosing a certified copy of resolution passed by your board of directors at their meeting held on the 12th instant with the request that the proposed increase of capital stock should be approved by an Order in Council. The Minister of Finance is away at present but I expect him back the first of next week and as soon as he returns I will bring this matter before council for consideration as requested.

Believe me,
Yours very truly,
(sgd.) George H. Perley.

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy,
Canadian Pacific Railway,
Montreal, Que.

RURAL MAIL ROUTES.

Mr. ROSS:

1. What rural mail routes have been put in operation by the present Government in East Lambton, North Middlesex and West Middlesex?

2. What is the length of each route and what is the carrier paid in each case?

Mr. PELLETIER:

Name of Route.	Length of route (miles per round trip.)	Amount paid Courier per annum.
Lambton East Riding.		
Alviston special route southwest	14¾	$268 18
Alvinston and Napier	19	575 00
Alvinston and Tancreed	12½	250 00
Petrolea special route southeast	25	800 00
Petrolea special route northwest	18	600 00
Petrolea special route east	18	599 00
Oil Springs special route southwest	24	800 00
Oil Springs special route southeast	27	870 00
Middlesex North Riding.		
Park Hill special route	13½	250 00
Brinsley special route No. 1	24	575 00
Kerwood special route No. 2	15½	350 00
Kerwood special route No. 1 (extension)	5¼	72 91
Middlesex West Riding.		
Glencoe special route No. 2 (extension)	6¾	189 84
Glencoe special route No. 1 (extension)	6½	292 10
Ekfrid special route No. 4	8	250 00
Muncey special route No. 3	11	239 00
Southwold Station special route No. 1	4½	124 00

IMMIGRATION FOR 1911-12.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What is the total number of immigrants who have come to Canada during the year 1911-12?

2. From what country of origin did they come, and in what provinces were the settled?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. 354,237.

2.

British	138,121
South African	144
Australian	184
Austro-Hungarian	21,651
Belgian	1,601
Bulgarian	3,295
Chinese	6,247
Dutch	1,077
French	2,094
German	4,664
West Indian	393
Greek	693
Hebrew	5,322
Italian	7,590
Japanese	765
Newfoundland	2,598
New Zealand	61
Portuguese	6
Polish	5,060
Persian	19
Roumanian	793
*Russian, N.E.S.	9,805
Finnish	1,646
Doukhobor	24
Spanish	191
Swiss	230
Servian	209
Danish	628
Icelandic	205
Swedish	2,394
Norwegian	1,692
*Turkish, N.E.S.	632
Armenian	60
Syrian	144
Arabian	2
Negro	138
Hindoo	3
Mexican	3
From the United States	133,853
Settled in Maritime Provinces	15,973
Settled in Quebec	50,602
Settled in Ontario	100,227
Settled in Manitoba	43,477
Settled in Saskatchewan	46,158
Settled in Alberta	45,957
Settled in British Columbia	51,843

*N.E.S. Not elsewhere specified.

BRITISH CATTLE EMBARGO.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is there any truth in the statement cabled a few days ago to the Canadian press that the British cattle embargo will soon be removed as far as Canada is concerned?

Mr. BURRELL: On the appearance in the Canadian press of the despatch referred to the Government communicated with

the High Commissioner in London in regard to its truth and have been advised by him that the deputation mentioned in the despatch had reference only to restrictions on the importation of Irish store cattle into Great Britain, imposed in consequence of an outbreak of foot and mouth disease in Ireland and that the Canadian cattle question remains practically unchanged.

CEMENT IMPORTS.

Mr. NESBITT:

1. What proportion of the duty on cement was remitted in 1912?
2. For what length of time was the suspension operative?
3. What was the amount of cement imported during the time of said suspension of duty?
4. What was the amount of cement imported during the corresponding period of year 1911?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. One half the duty was refunded.
2. The refund applied to cement entered for duty after 11th June, 1912, and prior to 1st December, 1912.
3. The imports of cement during the months June, 1912, to October, 1912, inclusive, amounted to 3,466,435 cwt. valued at $1,332,240.
4. The imports of cement during the months, June, 1911, to October, 1911, inclusive, amounted to 1,573,548 cwt. valued at $560,559.

CATTLE EXPORTED TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. ROSS:

1. How many cattle were exported from Canada to the United States in the months of June, July, August, September and October, 1912, and what was the value?
2. How many of these were exported from the county of Middlesex during the aforesaid months and what was the value?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. 5,489 head. Value, $290,765.
2. The number of cattle exported from the county of Middlesex during the period stated cannot be furnished from the Customs returns as the local origin of exports is not given on the export entries.

THE DREDGE 'INDUSTRY.'

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe):

1. Does the Dominion own a dredge named the Industry?
2. When, where and from whom was said dredge purchased?
3. Was same purchased by private tender, auction or how?
4. What was the price, including charges for transport, if any?
5. Who was Minister of Public Works at the time of purchase of said dredge?

Mr. BURRELL.

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. (a) 3rd September, 1908; (b) at Messina, N.Y.; (c) from James K. Phillips.
3. Private sale.
4. Cost of dredge including 500 yard steel scow $157,378 78
   Duty paid.. .. .. 39,351 85
   Legal expenses 150 00
   Towing to Cornwall.. .. .. 5,000 00
   New anchor 160 00
   New boiler.. .. .. 9,300 00
   Spare parts.. .. .. 8,342 29
   Repairs to scow.. .. .. 4,307 92
   $223,990 84
5. Hon. William Pugsley.

FENIAN RAID VETERANS.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. How many applications have been received for the bounty of $100, as provided by the Act of last session for the Fenian raid veterans?
2. How are the applications being dealt with?
3. How many have been disposed of?
4. How soon is it expected that claims concerning which there can be no dispute will be dealt with?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton):

1. 13,770.
2. In the order in which they have been received.
3. Passed 4,000
   Disallowed and claims in abeyance.. 2,000
   6,000
4. As reached, each satisfactory claim is passed and a warrant issued for the claimant shortly after.

MISS DEVEREAUX, TEACHER.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Have any charges been made against Charlotte Devereaux, teacher in charge of the Indian school at Salmon river, Richmond county, N.S.?
2. Have any communications been received asking for the dismissal of Miss Devereaux?
3. By whom were the charges made, and from whom were the communications received?

Mr. ROCHE:

1 and 2. Information was received by the department that Miss Devereaux's services were not satisfactory, and asking that she be not re-engaged.

3. Communications were received from J. A. Gillies, K. C., Sydney, Cape Breton, as well as a report from the agent.

MAISONNEUVE POSTAL STATION.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to proceed with the work of erecting the postal station in Maisonneuve town, Montreal?

2. Have tenders been called for from the plans approved by the department? If so, what were the names of each tenderer and the amount of each tender respectively?

3. If it is the intention of the Government to proceed, when may we expect to have tenders asked again?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.

2 (a) Yes.

(b) A. Gratton.. .. ..$72,180
Fournelle (Ltd.).. 76,900
J. Trudel & Co.. 84,796
Harris Construction 93,000

3. As soon as suitable plans prepared for the new site.

SALES OF CROWN LANDS.

Mr. NEELY:

1. What Crown lands, not including pre-empted and purchased homesteads or school lands, have been sold since October 1, 1912?

2. To whom have these lands been sold, and at what prices?

3. What was the method of sale, by tender, public auction or otherwise?

4. What negotiations for further sales are now pending, if any, with whom are these negotiations being entered into, and at what price per acre for the land?

Mr. ROCHE:

1 and 2:

Land Sold.	To Whom Sold.	Price Per Acre.
Lot 71 Baie St. Paul, Man	Ambroise Lecuyer	1 00
NE ¼ 1-16-11-W. 3rd	Peter Neufeld	5 00
NE ¼ 28-53-2-W. 4th	Patrick Gervais	3 00
Pt. W ½ 33-30-13 W. 3rd	Enock L. Robert	3 00
Pt. E ½ 12-42-20-W. 4th	Gustave A. Sahlin	3 00
Pt. N ½ 33-8-30-W. 2nd	Lewis H. Walton	3 00
Fr. SW ¼ 2-45-17-W. 4th	F. Scholes	3 00
Fr. NW ¼ 34-66-22-W. 4th	Fredk. E. Maroney	3 00
Fr. SE ¼ 3-49-28-W. 4th	Wm. D. Fleet	3 00
Pt. NW ¼ 3-33-20-W. 3rd	G. T. P. Railway Company	3 00
Lot 41 21-10-W. P. M.	Myles McDonald	3 00
Fr. NE ¼ 14 6 3 W. 5th	Lionel Ed. Drake	3 00
Pt. NW. ¼ 14-30-20-W. 4th	Canadian Northern Railway Company	3 00
Fr. SE ¼ 21-59-2-W. 5th (North of River.)	George B. Ashley	3 00
E ½ of E ½ of SE ¼ 28-57-27-W. 4	Marion B. Grantsenberg	3 00
Pt. NE ¼ of 5-6-12-W. 2nd	Canadian Northern Railway Company	3 00
Pt. SE ¼ 13-34 21 W. 4th	Canadian Northern Railway Company	3 00
Pt. SE ¼ 6-13-6-W. 4th	Redcliff Brick & Coal Co	00
Pt. SW ¼ 23-30-20-W. 4th	Canadian Northern Railway Company	3 00
W ½ of SE ¼ 19-80-4-W. 6th	Fredk. E. Maroney	3 00
Pt. NE ¼ 34-27-4-W. 4th	Canadian Northern Railway Company	3 00
Pt. S ½ of 1-47a-24-W. 2nd	Edmond W. Eede	3 00
Park Lot F. F. F. St. Andrew, M	Duncan McRae	15 00
Pt. SE ¼ 35-18-18-W. 3rd	Canadian Pacific Railway Company	3 00
Frl. S ½ of 18-31-7-W. 2nd	Nicholaus Petreszen	3 00
Frl. W ½ of 16-56-16-W. 5th	Herman Lebke	3 00
Pt. NE. ¼ 29-13 I.E.P.	John Haig and Ed. H. Dennest	6 00
Pt. of Lot 39, Spirit River Settlement	Wm. S. O. English	3 00
Pt. NW ¼ 20-41-18-W. 4	Canadian Northern Railway Company	3 00
Pt. W. ½ 17-31-14-W. 3rd	Jas. Spiers	3 00
Frl. NE ¼ 14-48-24a-W. 2nd	Daniel C. Ellison	3 00
N ½ 23-6-27-W. 2nd	A. D. McLean	3 00
SW ¼ 3-9-28-W. 2nd	Herbert H. MacDonald	3 00
Frs. L.S. 10 & 15 of Sec. 12-52-27-W. 3rd	H. P. Adomitt	3 00
Frl SW ¼ 13-58-18-W. 4th	Wasyl Demoszyn	5 00
S ½ of NW ¼ 34-57-9-W. 4th	Omer Massicotte	6 00
N ½ of NE ¼ 9-8-5-W. 5th	Geo. Hy. Bradley	3 00
SW ¼ of 22-12-5-W. 3rd	J. B. Quesnell	3 00
SW ¼ of 15-22-5-W. 4th	A. E. Forester	3 00
Fr. S.E ¼ 27-31-7-W. 5th	Samuel W. Gamble	3 00
Fr. NW ¼ 2-54-20-W. 3rd	Peter J. Rollings	3 00
Fr. NW ¼ 6-47-16-W. 3rd	A. E. Rotsey	3 00
Fr.NE ¼ 10-68-16-W. 4th	Isidore Plamondin	3 00
SW ¼ of 2-59-11-W. 4th	Wm. Dewey	3 00
Frl. SE ¼ 24-72-8-W. 6th	Leonard Kouschak	3 00
Frl. SE ¼ 34-38-11-W. 2nd	Alcandre Marleau	3 00
Fr. SW. ¼ 9-33-10-W. 2nd	Edward Bull	3 00
Lot 73, Baie St. Paul, Man	John Cameron	6 00
SE ¼ 33-15-7-W. 3rd	Reo R. Arnsdorf	1 00
NW ¼ 16-9-8-W. 3rd	John Richardson	3 00
Fr. NE ¼ 3-10-28-W. 2nd	Edmund Lenhard	3 00
NW ¼ 31-13-17-W. 3rd	Melbourn J. Boyd	3 00

Frl. SE ¼ 20-49-25-W. 2nd	Andrew Olson	3 00
Frl. SE ¼ 20-49-25-W. 2	John Vald	10 00
Frl. SE ¼ 14-50-6-W. 5th	C. S. MacLeod	4 00
Frl. NW ¼ 36-28-18-W. 1st	Wasyl Klobiczk a	3 00
Frl. SW ¼ 32-39-15-W. 2nd	M. A. Osterbery	4 00
Frl. NE ¼ 34-54-6-W. 4th	Jas. Attfield	3 00
Frl. NE ¼ 36-50-27-W. 2nd	Stuart Kemp	3 00
NW ¼ 24-12-26-W. 1st	Chas. Brodman	3 00
Frl. NE ¼ 24-72-7-W. 6th	Edwin Gully	3 00
Frl. S ½ of SE ¼ 13-72-7-W. 6	J. B. Thompson	3 00
Frl. N ½ of SE ¼ 13-72-7-W. 6th	W. A. Thompson	3 00
Frl. S W½ 34-71-2-W. 6th	R. A. Sprague	3 00
NW ¼ 10-8-4-W. 5th	D. C. Drain	3 00
Frl. L. S. 5-16-52-2-W. 5	Ivan Sabadashko	3 00
Frl. L S. 5-16-52 2 W. 5th	Erick E. Linquist	3 00
N ½ of L. S. I. 34-19-17-W. 6th	Robert H. Hollis	5 00
Lots 9, 10, 11, Blk. 5, T. Yale	Theresa N. Richards	50 00
Lots 7, 10, Blk. 7, T. Yale	Wm. King Gwyer (each)	17 50
Lots 19, N. 25th St., Townsite of Battleford	Emilien Belanger (for lot)	30 00
Lot 20, Blk. 6, Lloydminster	Thos. Beveridge (for lot)	50 00
N ½ & SW ¼ 23-14-3-W. 4th	Robert Nelson	3 00

3. By ordinary sale under the regulations; not by tender or public auction.

4. None.

REDISTRIBUTION.

Mr. NEELY:

Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a measure of redistribution at the present session? If not, why not?

Mr. BORDEN: No, for the reason that it will be more convenient and more desirable to introduce the measure at the following session when information will be more fully available and more thorough consideration can be given to so important an enactment.

HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. MARTIN:

1. What is the number and the names of the homestead inspectors in the province of Saskatchewan on the 21st of September, 1911?

2. What is the number and the names of the homestead inspectors in the province of Saskatchewan on July 1, 1912?

3. How many homestead inspectors were attached to the Regina Land Office on September 21, 1911?

4. How many homestead inspectors were attached to the Regina Land Office on July 1, 1912?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. 32. D. McLeod, A. McLeod, M. B. Budgeon, Jas. Moffat, L. Duggan, W. F. Nichol, D. J. McCarthy, G. H. Clouston, G. G. Smith, Wm. Milburn, Ed. Oliver, J. T. Dodds, R. P. Pentland, Alex. Skene, F. Kennedy, C. Sutton, L. C. Porteous, Alfred Nurse, Gordon Macdonald, A. J. Blackwell, I. S. Doze, T. J. Cunningham, A. Link, S. H. Simmons, A. W. Brook, E. D. Gowen, E. Robinson, Adam Baptie, W. A. Robertson, John B. Green, Frank Whiteside, Joshua Fletcher.

2. 28. J. C. deBalinhard, R. J. M. Parker, Geo. McGowan, Thos. L. Sutherland, Sinclair Snell, Arthur Smyth, Wm. Morrison, Daniel Anderson, A. Dewar, Wm. Rathwell, J. Mines, R. R. Miller, W. H. Errott, H. L. Bowyer, A. E. Sparshatt, Wm. Shields, Thos. Hunter, A. C. Sipes, P. R. Brandt, Jas. Balfour, C. J. Oulette, Wm. K. Walker, F. M. Collins, J. G. Johnston, W. S. Jones, Geo. Dickson, R. G. Mackey, Peter McLaren.

3. Two.

4. Four.

GROSSE ILE LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. LAPOINTE:

1. Were tenders asked for the construction of the lighthouse at Grosse Ile, Kamouraska?

2. What are the names of the tenderers and the amount of their respective tenders?

3. Were other tenders asked for before the month of May, 1912? If so, what are the names of the tenderers and the amount of their respective tenders?

4. Why was the contract not granted at the time of the first tenders, and who asked or recommended that such contract should not be granted?

Mr. HAZEN:

Nos. 1, 2 and 3, Yes. Tenders were invited up to noon on the 1st April, 1912. Three tenders were received as follows, but none of these were accepted:

Lachance & Fils, contractor, Fraserville Station, P.Q., $3,975.

J. B. P. Tremblay, Kamouraska, P.Q., $4,300.

L. Laplante & N. Laplante, St. Germain, P.Q., $5,225.

New tenders were invited up to noon 26th August, 1912. Four tenders were received as follows, the lowest being accepted:

Lachance & Fils., Fraserville Station, Temiscouata, P.Q., $4,375.

Chrysostome Leveque, Ste. Helene, P. Q., $4,800.

Leonce Laplante & Noel Laplante, St. Germain, P.Q., $4,900.

J. B. P. Tremblay, Kamouraska, P. Q., $5,300.

4. It was found necessary to make changes in the plans and specifications and therefore in fairness to all parties it was decided departmentally to call for new tenders.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION ADVOCATE.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. Who is the advocate or legal advisor of the Harbour Commissioners at Quebec?
2. Is this advocate or legal advisor appointed by the Government or on the recommendation of the Government?
3. Have petitions been addressed to the Government or to any member of the Government, since the 21st September, 1911, by advocates of the city of Quebec relating to this position, and what are the names of the said advocates?

Mr. HAZEN :

1. Mr. Gustavus G. Stuart, K.C.
2. No. He is appointed by the Harbour Commission.
3. No.

TERREBONNE POSTMASTER.

Mr. SEGUIN :

1. What is the name of the present postmaster of Terrebonne, and who recommended his appointment?
2. What salary does he receive for his services?
3. What were the reasons for the dismissal of Mr. Rodrique Deschambault, and how long did he act as postmaster of Terrebonne?
4. Was there an inquiry before his dismissal and who asked for his dismissal?
5. Has the honourable Postmaster General received any protests, letters or petitions from the citizens of Terrebonne on the subject of this dismissal?
6. Who were the persons who manifested their appreciation of the change of incumbent as postmaster of Terrebonne?

Mr. PELLETIER :

1. Joseph Archambault, appointed by Postmaster General.
2. This varies from year to year according to the revenue of the post office.
3. Mr. Archambault having been dismissed in 1897, he was re-instated by the present Postmaster General. Mr. Deschambault had been postmaster since 1st June, 1897.
4. No investigations are necessary to reinstate a dismissed postmaster.
5. No.
6. The whole thing was done on authority of the Postmaster General.

CANADIAN CATTLE EMBARGO.

Mr. BICKERDIKE :

Has the Government reached an understanding with the Imperial authorities regarding the removal of the embargo on Canadian cattle?

Mr. BURRELL : No.

OFFICE OF SOLICITOR GENERAL.

Mr. MACDONALD :

1. Is the office of Solicitor General still vacant?
2. If so, when does the Government intend to fill it?
3. Do they intend to abolish the office?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. Yes.
2. Under consideration.
3. The subject has not been considered.

MONTREAL IMMIGRATION OFFICIALS.

Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. What are the names of the physicians appointed at the Montreal immigration office?
2. When were they appointed and by whom recommended?
3. What is their respective salaries?

Mr. ROCHE :

1. Dr. A. D. Stewart, Dr. R. D. Gurd, and Dr. G. E. Beauchamp.
2. Dr. Stewart, 15th July, 1903; Dr. Gurd, 24th April, 1907; Dr. Beauchamp, 16th July, 1912.
3. Dr. Stewart, $1,600.00 per annum ; Dr. Gurd, $1,500.00 per annum; Dr. Beauchamp, $1,500.00 per annum.

Note : The question 'by whom recommended' is not answered, as we have not this information in the Immigration Branch.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Is Mr. Eugène Sévigny still employed at the immigration office at Montreal?
2. If so, what is his salary, and has it been increased?
3. Was he recommended by Mr. Albert Sevigny, M.P.?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. $2,000 per annum. Increased to this figure September 1, 1912.
3.

ST. BAZILE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Were tenders asked for carrying the mails; between the post office at St. Bazile village and the station, county of Portneuf?
2. If so, what are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender?
3. To what tenderer was the contract given and was it given to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. Eugene Delisle, $250 per annum; Nap. Germain, $500 per annum; Elzear Hardy, $400 per annum; A. Thibaudeau, $300 per annum.
3. Contract awarded to N. Germain at $348 per annum, which was same price as before, the other tenderers not offering sufficient guarantee of effective service.

NEWVILLE MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Were tenders asked for carrying the mails between the post office at Newville village and the station, county of Portneuf?
2. If so, what are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender?
3. To what tenderer was the contract given and was it given to the lowest tenderer?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. B. Bureau, $200 per annum; Israel Hamel, $187.80 per annum; Fortunat Belleau, $200 per annum, reduced to $180; Jos. Langlois, $200 per annum.
3. Contract awarded to F. Belleau at $180 per annum. H. Beland, the former contractor, offered to perform the work for $140, but he was the man whose contract had to be terminated.

NOYAN CUSTOMS OFFICERS.

Mr. KAY:

1. How many officers are employed in the port of Noyan, county of Missisquoi, at the present time, what are their names and of what nationality are they?
2. How many officers were employed at this port in October, 1911, of what nationality were they, how many of them are still in the service of the Government, and what is the date of the appointment of those still holding office?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Five officers are employed at the outport of Noyan Junction, county of Missisquoi, at the present time, viz: William Matthew Jameson, Canadian; Frank Tuttle Derick, English; Everett Griggs Fadden, English; Rodney Calvin Derick, English; Ray Leon Derick, English.
2. Four officers were employed at this outport in October, 1911, viz: William Matthew Jameson, Canadian; David Arlington Collins, Irish; Louis Eugene Regnier, French Canadian; Charles Ransom Vosburgh, English. One of these officers is still in the service of the Government, viz, William Matthew Jameson; date of first employment, April 1, 1898; date of permanent appointment, January 1, 1899.

DORCHESTER COUNTY MAIL CONTRACTS.

Mr. BELAND:

1. How many contracts for the carriage of mails have been cancelled in the county of Dorchester, Quebec, since the 10th October, 1911?
2. What are the names of the mail carriers thus removed from their duties?
3. For what reason have these contracts been cancelled?
4. Have tenders for new contracts been asked for in each case?

Mr. PELLETIER.

Mr. PELLETIER:

Culdaff and St. Joseph de Beauce.—Contractor, R. Gilbert, was carrying the mail at $670 per annum. Three months' notice of cancellation as provided in contract was given February 22, 1912, and tenders invited. New contract awarded to R. Gilbert at $590 per annum.

St. Isidore de Dorchester and Ste. Henedine railway station.—Contractor, H. Guay, at $195. Three months' notice of cancellation as provided in contract was given June 8, 1912, and new contract made with Heliodore Guay (du Bras) at the same price, viz, $195 per annum.

Ste. Rose de Watford and Railway Station.—Contractor, J. L. Lamontagne; service to be superseded on the establishment of a rural mail route. The contractor has been given three months' notice of the cancellation of his contract July 23, 1912. The tenders for the rural mail delivery route were due on September 27, 1912, but it has been decided to continue the present service.

CUSTOMS SEIZURE AT NOTRE DAME DES BOIS.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Is the Minister of Customs aware that goods supposed to be in transit were said to have been lately seized at the place of Mr. Elzear Roberge, of Notre Dame des Bois, county of Crompton?
2. What has become of the goods so seized?
3. What reasons has the officer in charge given for effecting this seizure?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes.
2. The goods have been released on deposit, pending further investigation and decision.
3. For infractions of customs regulations.

CUSTOMS OFFICERS AT NOYAN.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. What was the number of employees of Customs at Noyan, county of Missisquoi, on September 21, 1911, and their names, Christian names, ages, nationalities and salaries respectively?
2. What is the present number of Customs employees at Noyan, county of Missisquoi, their names, Christian names, ages, nationalities and salaries respectively?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Four, viz.: William Matthew Jameson, age, 66 years; Canadian; yearly salary, $800. David Arlington Collins, age, 43 years; Irish; yearly salary, $750. Louis Eugene Regnier, age, 43 years; French-Canadian; yearly salary, $750. Charles Ransom Vosburgh, age, 47 years; English; yearly salary, $750.
2. Five, viz.: William Matthew Jameson, age, 67 years; Canadian; yearly salary, $1,000. Frank Tuttle Derick, age, 35 years;

English; yearly salary, $800. Everett Griggs Fadden, age, 34 years; English; yearly salary, $800. Rodney Galvin Derick, age, 23 years; English; yearly salary, $800; Ray Leon Derick, age, 23 years; English; yearly salary, $800.

EMPLOYMENT OF ARTHUR GILBERT.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska):

1. Is Arthur Gilbert, who was elected in 1910, member for the county of Drummond and Arthabaska, now in the employ of the government?
2. If so, what position does he occupy, what is his salary, and by whom was his appointment recommended?

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Does Mr. Arthur Gilbert, a former member for Drummond and Arthabaska, occupy a position in the Department of Inland Revenue?
2. If so, what is his salary and who recommended him for this position?
3. Was his predecessor removed in order to take his place?
4. Where does he keep his office at Victoriaville?
5. How much rent does the Government pay monthly for the office of Mr. Gilbert?
6. Has Mr. Gilbert an assistant collector of excise?
7. What is the name of this person, and his salary?
8. Does Mr. Gilbert live at Victoriaville? If not, how many times a week does he come to his office?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes.
2. $800. The hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue.
3. No.
4. In a building rented from Mr. Labelle.
5. $20 per month, which covers heating, lighting and keep of office.
6. No.
7. Answered by the last question.
8. At Stanfold, a few miles from Victoriaville. He attends at his office according to the rules of the department, he being in attendance when necessary.

PURCHASE OF LAND AT FREDERICTON.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. How much land has been purchased by the Department of Agriculture, or any other department of the Government, at or near Fredericton, N.B., for the purposes of an Experimental Farm?
2. From whom was the land purchased?
3. What amount was purchased from each of the above persons and what amount paid to each?
4. What amount, and to whom paid, was paid to others than the owners thereof in connection with the purchase of said lands?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. 442 acres.
2. Dell Gunter, Alfred H. Waterhouse, John Quincy Adams, Harry C. Jewett, Walter W. Boyce.
3. Dell Gunter, 118 acres.. .. ..$5,000
   Alfred H. Waterhouse, 4 acres.. 1,000
   John Q. Adams, 100 acres.. 2,000
   Harry C. Jewett, 110 acres.. .. 2,000
   Walter W. Boyce, 110 acres.. .. 4,000
4. H. G. Fenety, legal fees.. ..$ 92 30
   A. D. Thomas, for obtaining and making over options.. 1,000 00

ST. JOHN & QUEBEC RAILWAY—SUBSIDY CONTRACT.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Has the Government or the Department of Railways and Canals signed a subsidy contract with the St. John and Quebec Railway Company for the construction of a railway from St. John to Grand Falls in the province of New Brunswick, or any portion thereof? If so, for what portion?
2. Have plans and specifications of the said railway been filed with the Department of Railways and Canals?
3. If so, for what portion or portions thereof?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes, for a line of railway from St. John to Grand Falls, N. B.
2. Yes.
3. (a) From Fredericton to mileage 87, north of Fredericton. (b) From Fredericton to mileage 33, south of Fredericton. (c) From St. John river to Kenebecasis river.

ALBERTA INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Is the Government considering opening the Blood Indian reserve in Alberta for settlement?
2. Have any negotiations in that direction been undertaken with the Blood Indians?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.
2. Negotiations were had with the Blood band of Indians in 1907 in regard to a surrender of portion of the reserve, but the Indians expressed their unwillingness at the time to surrender any of their land, and the Department has had no negotiations with the Indians since that date.

APPOINTMENT OF JOHN RUTHERFORD AS FOREST RANGER.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. On what date was John Rutherford appointed forest ranger, and at what salary?
2. Was he dismissed? If so, on what date?
3. Were there any charges against him? If so, by whom?
4. Was an investigation held? If so, by whom?
5. Did he at any time receive an increase in salary? If so, how much?
6. On what date did he receive an increase and on what date was he dismissed?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Appointed 5th January, 1903, dismissed 13th December, 1904, and re-appointed 3rd April, 1905.
2. Yes, 29th May, 1912.
3.
4.
5. Yes. $300.00.
6. 1st October, 1908, 29th May, 1912.

LEVEL RAILWAY CROSSINGS.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. How many level railway crossings have been removed by order of the Board of Railway Commissioners between October 31, 1911, and October 31, 1912?
2. How many have been protected by orders from same body?
3. What amounts have the Government contributed to such removal or protection during the same period under the statute passed for the purpose?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. By Subways, 6; bridges, 5; diversions, 3; closing, 1—15.
2. As above, 15; by gates, 15; electric bells, 35—65.
3. Total amount paid out of Railway Grade Crossing Fund to date is..$17,665 37

TERMINUS OF HUDSON BAY RAILWAY.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Has the Government decided on the ocean terminus of the Hudson Bay railway? If so, what is its decision?
2. How many miles of railway are under contract between Pas Mission and the Hudson Bay?
3. Who were the successful tenderers in each case?
4. How many miles were graded?
5. How many miles of steel are laid?
6. How many miles or right of way are cleared?
7. How many men are now employed in actual construction work?
8. Has the Government completed any arrangements for the construction and operation of a line of ships between Hudson Bay and a British port? If so, what is it?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. Port Nelson.
2. 418·5 miles.
3. John D. McArthur.
4. 50 miles were graded.
5. No steel laid.
6. Seventy miles cleared.
7. 200 men were at work on November 16, about 150 at present time.
8. No.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. What is the total expenditure for expenses and salary of the commission and its employees appointed to investigate the construction of the eastern division of the Grand Trunk Pacific?
2. Out of what funds has this amount been paid?
3. Has the commission yet made its report? If not, when may Parliament expect to have it?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $31,200.39.
2. Surveys and Inspections—Railways.
3. No. Several months at least.

CATTLE SHIPMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. NESBITT:

1. What was the value of the cattle shipped from Canada to the United States from May 1, 1912, to November 1, 1912?
2. What was the value of cattle shipped from Canada to the United States during the same period of 1911?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. According to returns to Customs produce of Canada, $482,605.
2. According to returns of Customs produce of Canada, $493,821.

'FARM WEEDS' DISTRIBUTION.

Mr. STEELE:

1. How many copies of the book 'Farm Weeds' have been published?
2. How many free copies have been distributed?
3. How many copies have been sold?
4. What amount has been realized from the sale of this book?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. 40,000.
2. 31,020.
3. 4,858.
4. $4,858.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE MAILING LIST.

Mr. STEELE:

1. How many persons in each province are on the mailing list of the Department of Agriculture, and to whom are sent the publications of the Department?
2. How many such are there in each of the following Ontario counties: Perth, Oxford, Waterloo and Wellington?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. Prince Edward Island, 7,292; Nova Scotia, 13,925; New Brunswick, 7,311; Quebec, 44,628; Ontario, 56,601; Manitoba, 6,576; Saskatchewan, 7,689; Alberta, 12,502; British Columbia, 7,181.

The mailing lists include besides persons who apply to be put on, members of Parliament, members of the Senate, prominent officials of provincial departments of Agriculture, many boards of trade, public libraries and similar institutions.

As a rule publications are sent to all persons whose names are on the lists of the branches by which they are issued. This rule is departed from in cases of publications of the experimental farms designed to give warning of the spread of noxious weeds and the introduction of dangerous plant diseases. Such publications are sent out not only to persons on the Experimental Farms mailing list, but also the public schools, post offices, railroad stations, cheese factories, creameries, and other places where farmers meet.

Publications are also sent to 6,407 persons whose addresses are in foreign countries.

2. Perth, 1,343; Oxford, 1,851; Waterloo, 753; Wellington, 2,548.

NUMBER OF FARMERS IN CANADA.

Mr. STEELE:

1. How many farmers according to the last census are there in each province of the Dominion?

2. How many in each of the following counties: Perth, Huron, Middlesex, Oxford, Waterloo and Wellington?

Mr. FOSTER:

The Census and Statistics Office reports that the information requested will not be available for three or four months.

FENIAN VETERANS' GRANT.

Mr. PROULX:

Does the Department of Militia intend to give to David Lacelle, Jean Baptiste Robillard and Francis Cayen, of Hawkesbury, Ontario, the Fenian Veteran grant of $100? If not, why not?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton):

1. David Lacelle, claim has been disallowed for the reason that the Active Service Pay List of the company for the period claimed does not contain his name.

2. J. B. Robillard, this claim will be allowed upon a fresh application received on the 30th November, which differed most essentially from the original claim, even as to name of applicant and year of service.

3. Francis Cayen, claim has been disallowed for the reason that the Active Service Pay List of the company for the period claimed does not contain his name.

TERMINAL ELEVATOR SITES.

Mr. NEELY.

1. What acreage of land has the Government acquired at Port Arthur or Fort William for terminal elevator purposes?

2. When was the purchase made and who was the purchasing agent for the Government?

3. What was the price paid per acre, and from whom was the land purchased?

Mr. FOSTER:

1. Thirty-seven and three-quarters (37¾) acres.

2. In July 1912, under authority of the Governor in Council, by the Board of Grain Commissioners for Canada.

3. The price per acre was $2,384.10, and the land was purchased from the Canadian Railway.

GUYSBOROUGH-CHARLES COVE MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Who was the contractor carrying the mails between Guysborough, Larry's River and Charles Cove in the year 1911?

2. What was the rate paid per year?

3. When did the contract expire?

4. How much per month was paid for the service after the expiration of the contract?

5. For how many months was this rate paid?

6. What is the present rate per year and who is the present contractor?

7. What is the date of the present contract?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Mark O'Connor.

2. $673 per annum, less 1 per cent for the Guarantee Fund.

3. 30th June, 1912.

4, 5, 6 & 7. A renewal of the contract was authorized for a further period of four years from 1st July, 1912, at the same rate of payment. Mr. O'Connor accepted the renewal and continued the service. He was paid for the quarter ending 30th September, 1912, at the rate of the old contract —but did not execute the renewal.

On 29th October, the Inspector notified the Department that Mr. O'Connor would not agree to continue the service unless paid at the rate of $75 per month.

The Department has been obliged to accept the contractor's terms temporarily but is now inviting tenders for a new contract which will take effect as soon as the new contract is executed.

The tenders are due at the Department on the 10th January, 1913.

FISH TRAP LICENSES IN GUYSBORO.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What is the name and postoffice address of each person or firm in Guysboro County, N.S. to whom license to set fish traps have been issued during the current year?

2. What is the date of each license and the fee paid by each applicant?

Mr. HAZEN:

Names and addresses of holders of trap net licenses in Guysborough county during the current year, dates of issue of licenses, and fees paid:

Licensee.	Address.	Date of Issue.	Fee.
			$ cts.
T. F. Carter	Queensport	Feb. 19, 1912	8 00
Currie Dort	Halfway Cove	" 19, 1912	10 50
H. McKenzie	Canso	" 19, 1912	11 50
Chas. Horne	Dover	" 19, 1912	11 50
Jas. Harding	Hazel Hill	" 19, 1912	10 50
"	"	" 19, 1912	14 00
Wm. L. Taylor	Cook's Cove	" 19, 1912	12 00
E. K. Goodwin	Canso	" 22, 1912	14 00
"	"	" 22, 1912	10 00
"	"	" 22, 1912	12 00
Geo. Ryler	Halfway Cove	" 22, 1912	9 00
J. L. McKenzie	Hazel Hill	April 6, 1912	10 00
P. T. Smith	Guysboro'	" 6, 1912	9 00
A. Armsworthy	Peas Brook	" 10, 1912	8 00
Pat'k Ryan	Canso	" 10, 1912	10 00
H. Horton	"	" 10, 1912	7 00
Jos. Genge	Halfway Cove	" 10, 1912	11 00
Elias Hendsbee	Half Island Cove	" 10, 1912	8 20
Jos. Greencorn	"	" 10, 1912	10 00
Wm. Matthews	"	" 10, 1912	7 00
W. Hadley	Hazel Hill	" 10, 1912	6 50
Geo. F. Scott	Canso	" 10, 1942	13 00
B. McKay	"	" 10, 1912	7 00
Wm. A. Dort	Halfway Cove	" 15, 1912	9 50
Geo. W. Dort	"	" 15, 1912	8 00
R. T. Matthews	Queensport	May 10, 1912	11 00
W. S. Harris	Whitehead	" 17, 1912	8 00
M. Rossong	Hazel Hill	" 17, 1912	10 00
A. M. Roberts	Canso	" 27, 1912	11 00
"	"	" 27, 1912	11 00
J. W. Myers	Half Island Cove	" 27, 1912	10 50
Wm. S. Myers	"	June 11, 1912	10 00
J. S. Wells	Whitehead	" 27, 1912	9 00
Geo. Murphy	Fox Island	July 2, 1912	11 50
M. Daley	"	" 8, 1912	8 00
C. D. Ehler	Queensport	Aug. 8, 1912	9 00
Wm. Ehler	"	" 8, 1912	6 00

CANSO LOBSTER HATCHERY.

Mr. SINCLAIR :

1. What are the names and the remuneration paid to each of the employees of the lobster hatchery at Canso, N.S., for the operating season of 1911?
2. What are the names and the remuneration paid to each of the employees of the lobster hatchery at Canso, N.S., for the operating season of 1912?

Mr. HAZEN :

	Per day.
1. James Meagher	$3.00
H. Hanlon	3.00
V. Cohoon	2.00
T. Sullivan	1.75
H. Fanning	1.50
J. Tobin	1.50
B. J. Meagher	1.50
2. James Meagher	$3.00
James Sullivan	3.00
Samuel Grover	2.00
James Meads	1.75
Richard McDonald	1.50
William Peitzsch	1.50
James Richardson	1.50

Mr. HAZEN.

GOLDBORO LOBSTER HATCHERY.

Mr. SINCLAIR :

1. What are the names and the remuneration paid to each of the employees of the lobster hatchery at Goldboro, N.S., for the operating season of 1911?
2. What are the names and the remuneration paid to each of the employees of the lobster hatchery at Goldboro, N.S., for the operating season of 1912?

Mr. HAZEN :

	Per day.
1. J. H. Macmillan, officer in charge	$3.00
Ashley Allen, instructor	2.50
Fred E. Cox, engineer	2.00
Simon Hodgson, "	2.00
W. B. Langley, assistant	1.75
John Cumming, "	1.75
	Per day.
2. J. H. Macmillan, officer in charge	$3.00
Robert McArthur, engineer	2.00
Stephen M. Giffin, engineer	2.00
Harry Silver, assistant	1.75
Handlon Fanning, "	1.75

WHEAT THROUGH SAULT CANAL.

Mr. SINCLAIR :

1. How many bushels of wheat were transported through the Canadian canal at Sault Ste. Marie, during the year ending December 31, 1911?
2. What proportion of the Canadian wheat that passed through the said canal during the said year reached the sea by way of American ports, and what proportion by way of Canadian ports?
3. Of all the commodities transported through the canals of Canada in 1909, 1910, 1911 and 1912 respectively, what proportion of same originated in the United States?

Mr. COCHRANE :

1. 80,034,777 bushels.
2. 44·9 per cent reached the sea through American ports and 55·1 per cent through Canadian ports.
3. 1909.. .. .. 78·1 per cent.
   1910.. .. .. 81·7 "
   1911.. .. .. 79·5 "

The figures for 1912 are not available, as the season of navigation ends with the calendar year.

FARMERS' BANK ENQUIRY.

*Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Has the Farmers' Bank inquiry been completed?
2. If not, when is the report expected?
3. Has new counsel been appointed in place of Mr. Hodgins, who was appointed to the Bench?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. No.
2. The Government has received no definite information from the commissioner as to when the report may be expected. The commissioner has only returned from abroad within the last few days. Before that I had assurances from him that a report might be expected before the end of the year. I have no further information about it.
3. No. Because it is considered unnecessary, the inquiry being about completed.

WENDOVER WHARFINGER.

Mr. PROULX :

1. Has there been a change lately in the position of the wharfinger of the Government wharf at Wendover, county of Prescott, Ontario? If so, for what reasons?
2. Has there been an investigation held?

Mr. HAZEN :

1. Yes. Political partisanship.
2. An investigation was held on instructions given by the Postmaster General, the wharfinger being also postmaster

A. SMYTHE, HOMESTEAD INSPECTOR.

Mr. NEELY:

1. When was A. Smythe appointed a homestead inspector for the Humboldt agency?
2. By whom was he recommended, and what salary was given him?
3. Is he still acting as a homestead inspector?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. April 16, 1912.
2. $100 per month.
3. Yes.

SASKATCHEWAN FOREST AND FIRE RANGERS.

Mr. NEELY:

1. What was the number of forest and fire rangers employed in Saskatchewan on October 1, 1911?
2. What is the number of forest and fire rangers employed in Saskatchewan at the present time?
3. What is the increase per month in the cost of this service since October 1, 1911.

Mr. ROCHE:

1. 34.
2. 8.
3. $742.20.

THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY MANAGEMENT.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Has the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any of the other members of the Government been called to a report of a speech delivered at a recent meeting or convention of the Westmoreland County Conservative Association by Mr. M. G. Siddall, who was the Conservative candidate in that county at the last Dominion general election, in which he is reported to have said in effect that he had then just returned from Ottawa and could promise them that a change would be made in the Intercolonial railway management at no distant date?
2. Is it the intention of the Government or of the Department of Railways and Canals, or of the Minister of Railways and Canals, to make any change in the management of the Intercolonial railway? If so, what is the nature of the change proposed and when will it take effect?
3. Was Mr. M. G. Siddall authorized by the Minister of Railways and Canals, or by any other member of the Government, to make the said announcement or any other announcement to that effect?
4. Did the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any other member of the Government, give any assurance to the said Mr. M. G. Siddall that any promise made by him to the effect as aforesaid, would be given effect by the Government?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No information.
2. Under consideration.
3. Not in so far as this department is concerned.
4. Not so far as this department is concerned.

MR. SETTEE'S APPOINTMENT AS FOREST RANGER.

Mr. NEELY:

1. When was one Settee appointed forest ranger for Northern Saskatchewan?
2. By whom was he recommended and what salary does he receive?

Mr. ROCHE: Mr. Settee has not been appointed a forest ranger.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY ISSUE OF NEW STOCK.

*Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Has the Government given consent, by Order in Council or otherwise, to the issue of $60,000,000 new common stock by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?
2. If not, does the Government intend to give authority to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, to issue the said $60,000,000 common stock?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. No.
2. No application has been made to the Government by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in connection with the issue of the $60,000,000 stock referred to.

SCATERIE ISLAND FOG ALARM KEEPER.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Who is the present keeper of the fog alarm at Scaterie island, Cape Breton?
2. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries received any complaint of conditions there?
3. If so, what were the complaints, by whom were they made, and what action has the department taken to remedy same?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Mr. Archie McLean.
2 and 3. No.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has John W. Davis, fishery officer, of Guysboro, been dismissed? If so, why?
2. Who laid any information against him?
3. If the case was tried, before whom was it so tried, and where?
4. What are the names of witnesses examined in said investigation, if any was held?
5. Was the accused refused the right to cross-examine the witnesses? If so, why?
6. Was the accused refused the right to be represented by counsel at the investigation? If so, why?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes. For offensive political partisanship.
2. Mr. G. A. Rowlings.
3. The investigation was conducted by Mr. H. P. Duchemin, at the town of Guysboro.
4. Commissioner's report states that Mr. James A. Peart, of Guysboro, Mr. Thomas Spanks and Mr. William D. Smith were examined.
5. The Commissioner's report states that Mr. Davis did not wish to submit any questions to Mr. Smith, nor was he willing to go on the stand and give evidence himself.
6. Department has no information, beyond the general instructions of the minister to the commissioners that accused should have the right to be represented by counsel, if they so desired.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has John Milward, Postmaster at Stormont, Guysborough County, N.S., been dismissed? If so, for what reason and on whose complaint?
2. What was the date of the appointment of the said John Milward to office?
3. Who has been appointed in his place and on whose recommendation?
4. What was the expense incurred in connection with the said investigation, including Commissioner's fees, witness fees, and all other expenses?
5. Was the man refused the right to be represented by counsel at the investigation? If so, why?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes, for political partisanship after a judicial investigation into the charges against him.
2. 1st July, 1899.
3. Mr. Jairus Ross, on authority of Postmaster General.
4. $24.73.
5. It is not to the knowledge of the Department that this man made application to be represented by counsel.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have any employees been dismissed at the Royal Military College, Kingston, since October 1, 1912?
2. If so, who were they and what were the reasons of their dismissal?
3. On whose recommendation were they dismissed?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Yes.
2. William S. Burke. Political partisanship. J. B. Quinn. Political partisanship.
3. The Minister of Militia and Defence assumes all responsibility.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has Mr. J. A. Filteau been removed as Postmaster at St. Ubalde, County of Portneuf?
2. If so, on what date?
3. For what reason and who instigated his removal?
4. If removed, who has been appointed to succeed him, and who proposed the latter's appointment?
5. Has there been an inquiry? If so, by whom?

6. Were accusations brought against him? If so, who was the accuser and the nature of the complaint?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. On the 18th March, 1912.
3. For political partisanship.
4. Mr. Camille Gagnon, on authority of Postmaster General.
5 and 6. An enquiry was not required, because the facts of political partisanship were sufficiently to the knowledge of the Postmaster General to avoid the useless expense of an investigation.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has Mr. Joseph Perron been dismissed as postmaster at Rivière à Pierre, county of Portneuf?
2. If so, on what date?
3. For what reason and who instigated his dismissal?
4. If dismissed, who has been appointed to succeed him and who proposed the latter's appointment?
5. Was an inquiry held? If so, by whom?
6. Were accusations brought against him? If so, who was the accuser and what was the nature of the complaint?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. On 20th September, 1912.
3. For political partisanship, which was established by a judicial enquiry.
4. Mr. Hubert Perron, on instructions of Postmaster General.
5. Yes. By Mr. J. P. Jolicoeur.
6. See answer to No. 3.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Has Mr Joseph Perron been dismissed as postmaster at Rivière à Pierre, county of Portneuf?
2. If so, on what date?
3. For what reasons and who instigated his dismissal?
4. If dismissed, who has been appointed to succeed him and who proposed the latter's appointment?
5. Was an inquiry held? If so, by whom?
6. Were accusations brought against him? If so, who was the accuser and the nature of the complaint?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. September 25, 1912.
3. For political partisanship, which was proven by a judicial investigation.
4. Mr. Philias Gonthier, on authority of Postmaster General.
5. Yes. By Mr. Sainte-Foye Belleau, of Quebec.
6. Investigation ordered by the Postmaster General.

Mr. DESLISLE:

1. Has Mr. Georges Chateauvert been dismissed as postmaster of St. Marc des Carrières, county of Portneuf?
2. If so, on what date?
3. For what reasons and who urged his dismissal?
4. If dismissed, who has been appointed to succeed him and who proposed the latter's appointment?
5. Was an inquiry held? If so, by whom?
6. Were accusations brought against him? If so, who was the accuser and what was the nature of the complaint?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2 and 3. It was considered advisable to make a change in the location of the St. Marc des Carrieres post office, removing it to a more convenient site, near the church. It became necessary, therefore, to make a change also in the postmastership. The change was authorized on the 2nd December, 1911.
4. Mr. Rodolphe Caron, on authority of Postmaster General.
5 and 6. See answers to Nos. 1, 2 and 3.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has Mr. Philibert Plant, Postmaster of St. Frederic, Beauce county, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason and has an inquiry been held in this case?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. For political partisanship. Before going to the expense of an investigation the postmaster was given an opportunity to sign a declaration that he had not acted as a partisan, but he would not do so. Further inquiry was consequently not considered necessary.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has Mr. Ernest Jacob, postmaster) of Bleriot, Beauce county, been dismissed from his duties?
2. If so, for what reasons and has an inquiry been held?
3. Who has been appointed to replace him?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. For political partisanship, which was admitted by the postmaster. An inquiry was not therefore necessary.
3. Mr. Gedeon Pomerleau.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Was Thomas Cameron, preventive officer at Andover, N.B., dismissed from office? If so, when and for what reason?
2. Was an investigation held into his conduct? If so, when and by whom?
3. Was the evidence taken at such investigation reported to the Department of Customs with a recommendation thereon?
4. Did the department make the dismissal on such recommendation?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes, 12th September, 1912, for political partisanship.
2. Yes, 16th and 17th February, 1912, E. T. C. Knowles, Esq., commissioner.
3. Yes.

4. Dismissal was made under the authority of Order in Council of 12th September, 1912, on the recommendation of the hon. the Minister of Customs, based on the report of the investigating commissioner.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has Mr. L. V. Bernier postmaster of St. Anselme, Quebec been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason and by whom has he been replaced?
3. How many years has Mr. Bernier occupied the position of postmaster?
4. Was there an inquiry in this case?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. (a) For political partisanship. (b) By Mr. Edmond Filteau.
3. Twenty-five years.
4. No, not necessary because the member for the county represented that he had personal knowledge of the postmaster's active partisanship.

Mr. DEMERS:

I. Has Mr. A. N. Deland, collector of Inland Revenue at St. Jean, county of Saint Jean, Iberville, been dismissed as such?
2. If so, for what reasons?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes.
2. Political partisanship.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. When was Mr. George Epenard, overseer of works at the new post office in the town of Arthabaska, dismissed?
2. For what reasons and who asked for his dismissal?
3. Who has been proposed as his successor?
4. Is his successor a competent man?
5. Was an inquiry held?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2. On November 18, 1911, by order of the minister.
3. J. E. Baril.
4. Yes.
5. No.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. When was Mr. Anthime Theophile Paré, caretaker of the public building in the town of Drummondville dismissed, or when was he forced to resign as such caretaker?
2. For what reasons was his resignation requested?
3. Who forced him to resign?
4. Who has been proposed as his successor and at whose request?
5. Has an inquiry been held?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Resigned July 1, 1912.
2 and 3. No information in department as to reasons for resignation.
4. O. H. Bernard on a petition from citizens.
5. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville):

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Were complaints made against J. N. Poirier, collector of Excise at Victoriaville?
2. Who made the complaints and what was the nature of them?
3. Was there an inquiry?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes.
2. By a person in whom the department has confidence. Political partisanship.
3. Yes.
4. Yes. A. Gilbert.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Miss Rosa Triganne, postmistress at Warwick, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reasons?
3. Was her dismissal requested by Mr. Arthur Gilbert or Mr. Francois Laflèche?
4. Who proposed her successor?
5. Was an inquiry held?
6. Who has been appointed postmaster in place of Miss Triganne?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. As a result of investigation.
3 and 4. On Postmaster General's opinion and responsibility.
5. Yes.
6. Dr. F. Lafleche.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Madam E. Desrosiers, postmistress at Wickham West, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reasons?
3. Was her dismissal requested, and by whom?
4. Who proposed her successor?
5. Was an inquiry held?
6. Who has been appointed postmaster in her place?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2 and 3. For neglect of duty and incivility towards the public, and on report of the Post Office Inspector.
4. Her successor was chosen by Postmaster General.
5. Yes.
6. Mr. Evariste Roberge.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has William Carrier, postmaster at St. Francois Xavier de Brampton, Que., been dismissed?
2. If so, who requested his dismissal?
3. Was an investigation held?
4. Who called for an investigation?
5. Has any petition been received asking that Mr. Carrier be not dismissed?
6. How many signed the petition?
7. How many applications for the position have been received by the Postmaster General?
8. Who is Mr. Carrier's successor, and who recommended his appointment?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2, 3 and 4. An investigation took place in the usual course.

5, 6. None has been received.

7, 8. Mr. F. A. Morrisette was appointed by the Postmaster General.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has Mr. Lambert, postmaster of St. Fortunat, Quebec, been dismissed?
2. If so, who requested his dismissal?
3. Was an investigation held?
4. Who called for an investigation?
5. Has any petition been received asking that Mr. Lambert be not dismissed?
6. How many signed the petition?
7. How many applications for the position have been received by the Postmaster General?
8. Who is Mr. Lambert's successor and who recommended his appointment?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2, 3 and 4. An investigation took place on instructions of Postmaster General.

5 and 6. None has been received.

7 and 8. Mr. Gedeon Bedard; instructions of Postmaster General, was appointed postmaster.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has M. S. E. Adam, postmaster of Disraeli, Quebec, been dismissed?
2. If so, who requested his dismissal?
3. Was an investigation held?
4. Who called for an investigation?
5. Has any petition been received asking that Mr. Adam be not dismissed?
6. How many signed the petition?
7. How many applications for the position have been received by the Postmaster General?
8. Who is Mr. Adam's successor and who recommended his appointment?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2, 3 and 4. An investigation was ordered and held in the usual course and dismissal took place as the result.

5. Yes.

6. 333 signatures.

7. There were three applicants: Messrs. J. E. Rheault, Calixte Bergeron and Zacharie Beaudoin.

8. Mr. Zacharie Beaudoin, on responsibility of Postmaster General.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has A. E. Dionne, postmaster of Strathford Centre, Quebec, been dismissed?
2. If so, who requested his dismissal?
3. Was an investigation held?
4. Who called for an investigation?
5. Has any petition been received asking that Mr. Dionne be not dismissed?
6. How many signed the petition?
7. How many applications for the position have been received by the Postmaster General?
8. Who is Mr. Dionne's successor and who recommended his appointment?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2, 3 and 4. The postmaster was given an opportunity to sign a declaration that he had not acted as a partisan, but he refused to do so, and therefore it was not necessary to go to the useless expense of an investigation.

5, 6. None has been received.

7, 8. Mr. J. I. Campeau, on authority of Postmaster General.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has Mr. Joseph Lord, Keeper of lighthouses of lights at Point à la Mule, on the River Richelieu, in the Parish of St. Blaise, County of St. Jean and Iberville, been dismissed?
2. If so, on what date and for what reasons?
3. Were there any complaints made against him? If so, by whom were they made?
4. Was any correspondence exchanged respecting this dismissal?
5. Has Mr. Lord been paid the whole of his salary? If not, why not?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. 22nd June, 1912, for the purpose of reinstating Mr. D. Menard who was dismissed in 1903, and against whom no charge was made.
3. No.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has Mr. Francois Chagnon, lock-keeper at St. Jean, County of St. Jean and Iberville, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reasons and by whom has he been replaced?
3. Was there one or more complaints against him?
4. If so, by whom were they made, and when?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Political partizanship; replaced by H. Lancieux.
3. Complaints were made by J. E. Molleur and J. E. Lareau, on the following dates:—on March 20th, 1912, on April 18th, 1912, on June 3rd, 1912, on September 27th, 1912, on September 28th, 1912, on September 30th, 1912.
4. Answered by number three.

Mr. McCREA:

1. Has Duncan McLeod, appraiser of Customs, Sherbrooke, Quebec, been dismissed?
2. If so, on whose complaint?
3. Was there any investigation?
4. If so, who was the investigator?
5. What salary was he receiving at the time?
6. If discharged, who was appointed in his place, and was there more than one person?
7. If new appointee or appointees, what salary or salaries do they receive?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes, for neglect of duty.
2, 3 and 4. On information obtained through seizures of goods by special officers of customs, and by investigation into the work of his office by customs inspectors.
5. $1,250 a year.
6. George C. Harkness has been appointed acting appraiser in his place.
7. The salary of Mr. Harkness is $1,500 a year.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has W. A Hattie, Preventive Officer, Mulgrave, Guysboro County, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. On whose complaint was the dismissal made?
4. Was there an investigation?
5. If so, what witnesses appeared?
6. Who has been appointed to the position and at what yearly salary?
7. What yearly salary was paid to Mr. Hattie?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes.
2. On account of political partizanship.
3. G. A. R. Rowlings.
4. Yes.
5. W. A. Hattie, William Bouche and Lorenzo Duff.
6. No officer has been employed in the place of W. A. Hattie, the preventive work at Mulgrave and vicinity being attended to by Mr. David Murray, who was employed prior to Mr. Hattie's dismissal.
7. $75 a year.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has David Reid, Fishery Overseer, Port Hilford, Guysboro County, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. On whose complaint?
4. Was there an investigation? If so, before whom?
5. Who has been appointed in his place, and at what salary?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Offensive political partizanship.
3. That of Mr. G. A. R. Rowlings.
4. No; an investigation was unnecessary, Mr. Reid having acted as agent for Mr. J. H. Sinclair at poll 12, Guysboro county, at the Federal election in 1911. That he did so was verified by the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery.
5. Robert V. Cooper. $200 per annum.

Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. Was George C. Mann, Indian Agent of Hobema reserve, dismissed from the service? If so, for what reason?
2. If for partizan reasons, was an investigation held?
3. How long has he been in the service?
4. Does he receive a superannuation allowance? If so, how much? If not, why not?

Mr. McCREA.

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Mr. Mann has been advised that his services are to be dispensed with from the 1st of May, 1913, owing to his enfeebled physical condition.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Since April, 1882.
4. No. He is not eligible under the Superannuation Act.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the name of Mr. Roche be substituted for that of Mr. Rogers on the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF DAVID FALCONER.

Mr. MACDONALD moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of David Falconer, lightkeeper at Caribou Island, county of Pictou.

Mr. BORDEN: There are a great many motions on the Order Paper that seem to overlap each other. There is no disposition whatever to withhold any documents that are ordinarily brought down with respect to such matters, but I think that if these motions are passed, it will be necessary for some hon. gentlemen who have moved them to meet some member of the Government, or some official of the Secretary of State's office, and arrange that the returns shall not be duplicated and endeavour to get some system out of the very great number of proposed Orders of the House, which I think, will overlap each other in many cases.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I see no objection at all to that, but if it does not involve too much labour, the mere mechanical work of preparing the answers might be done because it might be that two members might ask for the same thing and yet ask a little more in one case than in the other. But, if the motions are identically the same, I see no reason why they should be duplicated.

Mr. PELLETIER: There are several motions on the Order Paper for returns on account of the dismissals of postmasters in a certain county, and then there is a motion asking for the papers relating to all dismissals all over the country. Perhaps the one motion covering all of the cases might suffice.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. PELLETIER: We will have to give the same answers in each case.

Mr. CARVELL: Make duplicates.

Mr. PELLETIER: We will be duplicating all the time.

Mr. CARVELL: That will not hurt you.

Mr. GRAHAM: The difficulty would be that the information in a general return would be so voluminous that it would take a year to get it while, in individual cases, you can find the information required quicker. I see no reason why, if the larger return were brought down and the questions answered, the Government could not, with respect to subsequent questions, refer the member to such and such a page of 'Hansard.'

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria): I would point out that the motion No. 176 proposed by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) is very indefinitely worded. It asks for an Order of the House for:

A copy of all letters, telegrams and other papers and documents previous to the resignation of——

So and So. I do not know whether it concerns all the departments of the Government or whether it concerns this gentleman only. I am only pointing this out as an example of the indefiniteness of motions. One is at a loss to know what is meant. I do not know whether the hon. gentleman wants all the papers in the possession of the officers of my department, or whether the motion concerns this one party.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend need not worry about this. The wording of this particular resolution is purely a clerical error on the part either of my clerk or of the officials of the House. This is a motion which will form the subject of discussion, it is not an ordinary motion for papers, so that everything connected with it will be made clear before the Order of the House is passed.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentlemen are debating motions on the Order Paper which is irregular.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF ANGUS SMITH.

Mr. MACDONALD moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Angus Smith, pilot on the steamer Earl Grey, and also of all the evidence taken at the latest investigation held in regard to the said complaints, and of the report of the investigation with regard to the same.

He said: This was a case in which the dismissal was made as the result of the proceedings of that delectable gentleman Mr. Duchemin. Some of the ministers in response to Orders of the House, undertook to bring down the evidence that was taken by that gentleman, but failed to bring it down. I would like to ask the minister to see that the return is complete, in accordance with the Order of the House and the motion.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—TRANSFER OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MACDONALD moved for:

Copy of all correspondence, telegrams and other documents relating to the order made by the Railway Department for the transfer of engineers and firemen in conection with railway traffic between Truro and New Glasgow, in the county of Pictou.

He said: Before the development in an industrial way of eastern Nova Scotia—a development which has created more traffic in this portion of the province than is to be found anywhere along the line of the Intercolonial railway—and when the Intercolonial railway was in a crude state, this particular piece of road from Truro to New Glasgow was operated by officials who had control of the road between the cities of Halifax and Moncton. With the construction of what was known as the short line railway, from Oxford Junction to New Glasgow, with the subsequent development of the coal, iron and steel industries in the county of Pictou and the institution of the Dominion Coal and Steel Company in the county of Cape Breton, there arose these abnormal conditions which required to be dealt with by the railway authorities. After due consideration, and at the request of gentlemen interested in these industries, it was decided some fifteen or sixteen years ago that proper railway operation made it necessary this portion of the road should be operated not as an adjunct of the main line from St. John to Moncton, but as a portion of that division of the Intercolonial railway known as the Oxford and New Glasgow division, running from Oxford Junction in the county of Cumberland, to Sydney in the county of Cape Breton. Since that time an attempt was made, solely by some of the employees in the town of Truro and that vicinity who were connected with the main line, to have the operation of this branch detached from its natural adjunct with the Oxford and New Glasgow division, and brought back to the main line of railway. Such a proposition necessarily involved a great deal of inconvenience to the people who were handling the freight carried on the eastern division. If you could imagine a condition of affairs by which the railway division superintendent's office was within a mile or so of large coal and steel industries, and that these people placed on their sidings and forwarded to the central point of the division their products for transportation to other places, if

you could conceive a railway policy under which goods to be transported had to remain on the sidings until men came from another division fifty miles away to move them, then you could realize the condition of affairs which practically exists to-day as the result of an order which the present Minister of Railways put in force. I know that the officials of the road have endeavoured to minimize the difficulties created by this anomalous condition, and I would ask the minister to suspend any departure from the system that has existed for so long without first hearing the representations of the men and of the business interests of eastern Nova Scotia, as both the men and the business interests are affected by the change. I was somewhat surprised that the minister, after the assurance he gave me last year, should have made any order in regard to the matter without consulting the people affected. If the order which has been made and which partially interferes with the traffic were extended its affect would be most prejudical to the business interests of Nova Scotia. The object of my notice is to obtain from the Department a full statement of what has been done and the reasons which have been urged on the minister for taking this course. I think the minister should suspend all action in regard to this matter until the people of eastern Nova Scotia should have the fullest opportunity of presenting their case to him and pointing out wherein their case would be prejudicially affected by the continuance of the present order.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I desire to express my sympathy with the view taken by the hon. member from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). As a member representing eastern Nova Scotia, I am interested in this question. I supposed that a few years ago the whole matter had been settled but there was confusion for a number of years and it always seemed to me to be more or less of a labour question, a question whether the employee residing at Truro and in that vicinity should obtain more than their share of the work on the Intercolonial railway. If the railway is to be run on business principles one would suppose that the men who do the work on the eastern branch would be the men who belong to that branch, and one can hardly understand why the department should bring men from another branch in order to carry on the work on the eastern division. I do not think there is any parallel for this way of doing business on any other division of the Intercolonial railway. So far as I am able to ascertain each division is separate and is managed from its own head office and there is no necessity in the world, unless for the purpose of favouring some particular people, why the eastern division should be treated differently from all other divisions. Geographically the branch between Truro and New Glasgow belongs to the Eastern division. It was placed under the eastern division a number of years ago and, in order that no injustice might be done to the men who, at that time, were working on the old Halifax division, all the men, I understand, who were employed on that road were taken over by the eastern division and had a right to promotion on that branch. This question was in a disturbed state for a number of years. Some years ago all the parties were heard and the matter was settled, but it has been opened up again. I feel certain that on the first occasion it was settled properly, and it ought to have remained settled. The business ought to be handled from the main office of the eastern division. The present system that is carried on will be inconvenient to the patrons of the road, as my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) has said, and it will be more or less unjust to the employees of the eastern division. I would like to draw that to the attention of the minister. Besides, it appears to me that, to take men all the way from Truro in order to man a train at Stellarton, 40 miles distant, is a waste of time and is unbusinesslike. I trust the minister will give this matter his best consideration and restore the old arrangement which was, I think, fair and satisfactory to the patrons of the road and to the employees on the eastern division.

Mr. STANFIELD : Mr. Speaker, I did not know that this debate was coming up this afternoon. Some papers that I have, are, unfortunately, not in the House. This has been a vexed question for years. There has been not only the question affecting the engineers, but also the question affecting the conductors and brakesmen. I am not going to enter into any discussion of the question at the moment, but the hon. member for Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) made mention of promotion. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said that the men from Truro were those chiefly interested in this question, but I would like to say that the men from Halifax to Truro are just as deeply interested in this question as the men from Truro. With regard to the question of promotion, we have men on the main line from Halifax to Truro, who, previous to this change, were seniors by a good many years, and yet they are still acting as brakesmen on special trains, while younger men are acting as regular conductors. The grievances of the men from Truro to Halifax are just as great as are those of the men on the eastern division, and even greater. My understanding of the settlement made with regard to

the engineers and firemen is that neither the engineers, firemen nor their brotherhood agreed to it. When the question was brought up I was never consulted with reference to it. I understand it was handled altogether through the brotherhood and no political reasons were advanced for the settlement. With regard to what the hon. member for Guysboro was remarking about engineers starting from a certain point, it must be remembered that there is this difference between engineers and conductors, that they do not run over the same divisions, and that engineers and firemen are under a different authority from that which controls the conductors. The conductors are under the divisional superintendent, while the engineers and firemen are under the master mechanic. When this question comes up a little later on, I expect to be able to go a little more fully into it, and to explain the reason why it is that men between Truro and Halifax are deeply interested in this question.

Mr. COCHRANE (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I was called out of the House when this matter came up, or I would have asked to have it stand. I have not the papers in the department and have had to send to Moncton for them. I will move the adjournment of the debate till a further date when I can have the papers before me. I want to assure my hon. friend from Pictou that there was no intention of not keeping my word in the matter, and if this change has been made without giving the proper parties notice, we will certainly give them notice.

Mr. MACDONALD: I quite agree with the proposal of the Minister that the matter should stand, and I have felt sure that the hon. gentleman overlooked the assurance that he gave me. All I ask is that he sees that the business interests and the interests of the men on the eastern division are not prejudiced and that the order made should be suspended in the meantime.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—PURCHASE AND SALE OF SHEEP.

Mr. MACDONALD moved for:

Return showing the number of sheep purchased by the Department of Agriculture, for sale in the province of Nova Scotia, the prices paid for the same, the parties who purchased them and the places where they were purchased and from whom; also showing the time and times at which the same were sold and the prices for which the same were sold, and also for any reports in regard to the purchase and sale of said sheep.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in moving the motion which you have just read, I have done so for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to certain statements made in the public press of Nova Scotia with regard to the transactions of the Department of Agriculture in reference to the sale of sheep which was held in our province during the past autumn. The statements are of such a character that the House and the minister should investigate them fully. They do not come from opponents of the Government but from friends of my hon. friends on the other side. The letter which I intend to read is written by Mr. D. M. Cameron of Elgin, in the county of Pictou, dated October 11, 1912, to a paper known as the Free Lance, published in the county of Pictou, and it is to the following effect:

Editor Free Lance,—As I had the privilege of attending one of the recent sales of pure bred sheep, I would like to give the farmers some of my impressions regarding the same. You are aware that the Dominion Government last session, granted a large sum of money for the development of agriculture. Part of this money was handed over to the Dominion Sheep Breeders' Association, for the purpose of stimulating the sheep raising industry in the maritime provinces, British Columbia and parts of the Northwest. The recent sales are the result in my humble opinion, part of this money has been misspent on account of the poor class of stock that has been brought down here.

I claim the privilege of judging the same as I have been a breeder of pure bred sheep with fifteen years of practical experience. A few years ago the local Government inaugurated similar sales. Professor Cummings was commissioned to purchase the stock. First he secured what was offered by the local breeders, friends of the Government of course, the balance in Ontario.

It has been suggested to the present commission (Mr. Corning, M.P.P, of Yarmouth, being the representative for the maritime provinces) that the local breeders were entitled to some consideration on their part, but no attention was paid to it.

Comparing the stock secured by Professor Cummings and the stuff offered at Antigonish, they are not in the same class.

The House will notice that this gentleman declares that the stock which the Federal Government purchased for sale in Nova Scotia did not begin to compare with the stock which was purchased by Prof. Cummings who has charge of agricultural operations for the provincial government.

Outside of a dozen individual rams, the balance were only fit for the shambles. The grade ewes were ordinary looking sheep, numbers of better ones could be bought up around here for one-half the money that was paid for those.

When I looked over the bunch I must say that I would be ashamed to acknowledge that I was a Conservative. I am no expert in

sheep raising, but this gentleman who writes this letter claims to be, and he says that this stock that the present Minister of Agriculture sent down to Nova Scotia, for the purpose of improving the sheep industry in our province, was so bad that when he looked at them he was ashamed he was a Conservative.

I would like to ask the farmers of this county if they are satisfied with the way the special grant from the Dominion Government and handed over to the local authorities is being distributed. The cheque from the grant to the Lorne Agricultural Society amounted to the mangificent sum of seventy-eight cents.

I understood that some thousands of dollars is being spent on the Agricultural College and Farm at Truro. Do not you consider that this money could be spent in a way that the average farmer could derive some practical benefit from it?

Now compare prices realized at Antigonish. Average prices for rams, seven dollars each; local sales at Windsor and Port Hawkesbury, more than three times that amount. I do not remember the exact amount but can produce the figures. Seven dollars each for rams that thirty dollars was paid for in Ontario. For instance to show that the farmers know good stock when they see them, one of the best of the lot at Antigonish sold for twenty-seven dollars. I have been informed that those sales down here will not realize one-half the cost.

I presume that some good stock has been purchased but the best has been shipped West. As I understand that those sales are to be continued, I think it about time our representatives and farmers would sit up and take notice, and not allow Ontario men to run our business, giving them liberty to dump all their refuse down here, without a protest.

That letter is signed by D. M. Cameron of Elgin, county of Pictou, a good Conservative, a good farmer and stock-raiser, a man who knows what he is talking about, and if the statement he makes is true, then the Department of Agriculture which was going to do such tremendous things, under the new minister, has badly failed in this respect. We were told when this Government came into power, that the hon. Mr. Fisher, a practical farmer who had to do with that business all his life, and knew something about it, was going to be put in the shade by the new minister. But we now find, according to the statement of his Conservative friend in my county, that while the new minister may know something about raising apples, he knows nothing about sheep, if one is to judge by the character of the animals he sent to our province. At all events, the statements in this letter indicate that the minister has been deceived; he evidently has been relying upon the advice of some persons who went out and purchased second class sheep in Ontario or elsewhere, took them to Nova Scotia, held a public auction, and sold them at ridiculously low prices, because the farmers of Nova Scotia had sense enough to see that they were no good and could not improve their stock. The situation is one which does not indicate that the Minister of Agriculture has been displaying any particular acumen or unusual ability in dealing with the agricultural side of his department. The charge made definitely and positively by the gentleman who takes the responsibility of writing this letter, is one which demands the attention of the minister, and I would be very glad to hear what he has to say by way of explanation. I trust that the papers, when brought down will contain full information, in order to satisfy Mr. Cameron and these other gentlemen as to where the stock was purchased, what was paid for it, the character of the men who bought it and the whole history of the transaction which is so roundly condemned in this letter.

Mr. STANFIELD: While I am not a judge of sheep, I know something about the product of sheep wool. I rise to state that the sale of these sheep was held in Truro, and I know that the gentlemen who had charge of bringing these sheep to Nova Scotia consulted Professor Cumming and Mr. Fred Fuller, both of whom the hon. gentleman knows well, and he also knows what side of politics they are on. In conversation with Professor Cumming, whom we all think well of in Nova Scotia, he stated to me in connection with the sale in Truro, that it was a good sale and that the quality of the sheep was good.

Mr. BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): I may point out to my hon. friend who brought up this question that it is not strictly a Department of Agriculture matter. We have not been doing this work or spending this money as a department, and at all events, I could not take personal responsibility for every detail of that work. I will say, further, that the grant of money under which this work was carried on, was made to the Dominion Sheep Breeders' Association of Canada for the express purpose of doing something to stimulate the sheep industry in Canada which I think my hon. friend will agree with me, is worthy of stimulation. When this money was granted to the Sheep Breeders' Association, it was suggested that as they could not deal with the whole of Canada with the comparatively small amount that was given, they should commence with the far West and the far East, because in Nova Scotia there was great need for stimulating the industry which would mean so much for that province. I do not suppose the hon. member has anything to cavil with as to that. Then, in reference to any political question that may be brought in, I would point out to my hon. friend that the president of the Dominion Sheep Breeders' Association to whom this money is entrusted is Colonel

McRae, a very well known and prominent Liberal so that I do not think the hon. member can make any criticism along political lines. The suggestions made in connection with this work were that it should be taken up by the purchase and sale of a certain number of rams and grade ewes, to be distributed and sold in such parts of Nova Scotia as would receive the most profit from the stimulation of this industry. I am not prepared at the present time to follow the details of the speech of my hon. friend. I think that a great deal of matter can be procured through the Dominion Sheep Breeders' Association, and although it is not my particular responsibility, and although I am satisfied that good work has been done, I shall take the opportunity of getting the hon. member such details as will convince him that things are not exactly as he thinks they are. In the meantime, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. MACDONALD: Before the debate is adjourned, I would like to say to the minister who apparently wants to get some data with regard to this subject, that the issue was raised by the gentleman whose letter I read. I want to remind him that it was well understood that the late Minister of Agriculture and the late Government contemplated instituting experimental sheep farms in eastern Nova Scotia, and that the viewpoint of the men engaged in the sheep industry in our province was that that would be the best method to encourage the sheep raising industry and develop it in Nova Scotia. I think the Minister of Agriculture would have done better in the expenditure of the money he had at his disposal, if he had inaugurated a system of experimental sheep farms in eastern Nova Scotia, so that the leading farmers in my county who are interested in the question will know the facts. I would like to press upon the minister the necessity of taking into consideration the proposition to inaugurate these experimental farms, with any future expenditure he may have at his control for this purpose, instead of spending money in purchasing sheep of the character described here and bringing them to our province to sell.

Mr. BORDEN: I think there ought to be a very great future for the sheep raising industry in the province of Nova Scotia. I do not know any province in Canada that is in some respects better suited to sustain that industry than is the province whence my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) and I come. As to the letter which has been brought to the attention of the House, my hon. friend takes it for granted that the sheep are exactly of the quality and character described in the letter he has read.

Mr. MACDONALD: I have got a good witness.

Mr. BORDEN: I suppose, in respect to sheep as in respect to other animals and things, there may be a legitimate difference of opinion, and for the moment, notwithstanding the authority that has been quoted, and for which I have every respect, I am not prepared in the absence of further information that may be brought before the House to absolutely acquiesce in the opinion which is set forth in that letter. At all events, what my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has done is to place the grant in the hands of a representative association, to entrust to them the expenditure of this money for a very useful and proper purpose, and I do not know to what association or body of men in Canada the expenditure of that money could be more properly left than to the Dominion Sheep Breeders' Association. I do not profess to be acquainted with the personnel of that association, but I understand that it is constituted of men who have paid a great deal of attention to sheep breeding, and it might naturally be supposed to be competent to make a selection of stock for the purposes of the industry, whether in the eastern provinces or in the West. As has been remarked by the Minister of Agriculture, the gentleman who is at the head of that association is not only very prominently associated with this particular industry, but is very closely affiliated with the party represented by the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. That being the case, it certainly cannot be laid as a political sin at the door of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, to select an association the most representative in his knowledge, and to entrust to it, without regard to political conditions of any kind, the expenditure of a sum of money for a very useful purpose. Further information, however, may be given later by my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. NESBITT: I would suggest to the hon. the Minister of Agriculture that a very much better plan to adopt of buying sheep or cattle would be to have some man in his own department, who is an expert in such matters, do the buying. The members of the Dominion Sheep Breeders' Association are only men, and they want to make money out of it themselves, and the same with the other breeders' associations.

Mr. RHODES: I do not wish to enter into a general discussion on the question of sheep, because I do not know anything about it, but in as much as the arrangement effected for the distribution of sheep in the province of Nova Scotia has been criticised by a gentleman whom the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) claims

is a man of authority, I can only say that we have in the county of Cumberland first-class sheep raisers. The firm of Logan Brothers have a reputation as expert sheep breeders, extending throughout the whole Dominion of Canada which is second to none, and their sheep obtain as high prices as those of any breeders in the whole Dominion. When the gentlemen who had to do with the purchasing of first-class sheep for the purpose of that industry, came to the county of Cumberland, they consulted with Mr. Stanley Logan, who is at the head of this co-partnership, and they purchased the very best sheep he had in his flock, and I may say for the benefit of the hon. member for Pictou, that Mr. Logan is one of the strongest Liberals in the county. He is a cousin of the late member. He is the local president of the Sheep Breeders' Association of Cumberland, and the sheep that were purchased from other breeders were purchased after consulting with Mr. Logan. Another man from whom I know sheep were purchased was Mr. Barry Baker of Minudie, a member of one of the most historic Liberal families in the county of Cumberland. By far the larger quantity of sheep in the county of Cumberland, which were secured by the Sheep Breeders' Association, were purchased from Liberals. I make mention of this circumstance merely to assure my hon. friend from Pictou that the matter of these sheep sales in the province of Nova Scotia was not a matter of politics, but the whole purpose was to benefit the sheep breeders of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have the honour to represent a county which is perhaps one of the best sheep raising counties in the Dominion of Canada; at least it is a county where probably the highest bred sheep in Canada are to be found. I understand the money for the purpose of fostering the sheep industry in Nova Scotia has been expended under the direction of the Sheep Breeders' Association, and the name of Colonel McCrae as president of that association was mentioned by the Minister of Agriculture. Colonel McCrae lives in the city of Guelph where I live, and I do not think I know of any better all-round stock man than himself in the Dominion of Canada. If the sheep in question were purchased on the judgment of Mr. McCrae, I am quite satisfied they were well purchased.

Mr. RHODES: Colonel McCrae was all over the province of Nova Scotia, and these sheep were purchased after having been personally inspected by him.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I think he is a man who would make a square deal, but it seems to me the sheep in this case were sold for a very small sum.

Mr. RHODES.

Mr. MACDONALD: Different kind of sheep altogether.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I understand that they were purchased for about $30 and sold for about $7.

Mr. RHODES: The farmers of the county of Pictou are particularly shrewd men. I am not trying to insinuate that they got their heads together when these sales took place, but I am inclined to think that the sheep sold were as good as any that were sold elsewhere.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Colonel McCrae's reputation as a stockman stands very high indeed. If there is any real intention on the part of the Government to foster the sheep industry in the province of Nova Scotia or any part of the Dominion of Canada, their opportunity came a year ago last September when the reciprocity pact was before the people of Canada. It is well known that the sheep industry in Canada is not a paying industry at the present time except in the case of a few who engage in raising fancy sheep, sheep of very high grade for export to the American market, and a great many of these men happen to reside in the county of Wellington, which I have the honour to represent. If my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture would devote his time to getting free entry of sheep into the United States, he would be doing something for the benefit of the sheep industry of Canada. The United States market for Canadian sheep is a paying market. The shipping point for my county is the city of Buffalo. There we sell our sheep, and there we pay our duty to get them in. It seems that if we could get anything in the nature of free entry to the United States, we might put the sheep industry upon a paying basis. It is a singular fact that twenty-five years ago, there were six times as many farmers raising sheep in Canada as there are to-day. They have practically gone out of it, there are only a few here and there, and, under present conditions, I think, there will not be much fostering of the sheep industry in Nova Scotia or any other part of the Dominion of Canada unless you gain access to the American market. All our big sales in the county of Wellington are made to the middle and western states of the United States. Large owners come over, and certainly they pay very handsome prices,—far higher than the prices paid in the case of Nova Scotia instanced by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). As I understood the letter that was read, one clause in it stated that, as a Conservative, the writer of the letter was ashamed of the sheep he had seen. I heard a Conservative

farmer say, some time after the election in September a year ago, that he had voted against reciprocity and that ever since he had been ashamed to look a sheep in the face. I think that if my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) would devote himself to getting a better market for the sheep we now have, he would do more to foster the sheep industry in Canada than by any specific or direct grant of money he may be able to make.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

DEEPENING OF EAST RIVER, N. S.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams relating to the deepening of the East River in the County of Pictou, and also of any reports of engineers in regard to the same, and all plans and other documents relating to the prosecution of the work.

He said: The object of this motion is to enable one to ascertain the present position of the Department of Public Works in regard to the deepening of the East river. This river flows into the harbour in Pictou, and along its banks are the important towns of New Glasgow and Trenton with some of the greatest industries in the province of Nova Scotia. Recognizing the importance of facilities by water for these industries and these towns, the late Government, some three years ago, entered upon the policy of deepening that river, in order to afford navigation from the Straits of Northumberland and the harbour of Pictou for large vessels up to New Glasgow and Trenton. To carry out that project they provided a specially constructed suction dredge which did effective work, so that at the end of the last season under that government a channel had been created, for a distance of six miles, at a depth of 22 feet at low water. There were one or two places along this channel where the material to be taken out was such as to require the action of another dredge. It was hoped that this dredge would be brought in early during the last season, in order that the work might be made effective as soon as possible. But, this special dredge was not brought in until a few weeks ago, so that the completion of the existing work was delayed and the work for the time being thrown away. During the past spring practically every man connected with the dredge, except the captain and the engineer, was dismissed—not because they had committed any particular sin or had been guilty of partisanship, but simply because they belonged to one political party—they were simply told to go. This, taken in conjunction with extraordinary delays in starting the dredge, meant that no work was done in this great project until late May or June. And even when the dredge did start it was manned with a crew of incompetent men, and so there were mistakes and breakdowns which interfered with operations, and very little work was accomplished during the season. The chief engineer, who was not dismissed, left the dredge in midsummer because of the impossibility of getting any practical work done by the incompetent men who had taken the places of the competent men who had been there for a number of years. So, for the last year, the work has been practically at a standstill. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Rogers) has been too short a time in the department, I know, to be seized of these facts and of the condition of affairs in relation to this project. But he will recall having met a delegation last winter of a number of his political friends who came here to see the then Minister of Public Works in regard to this improvement. It was expected that, as a result of the view taken by the Government at that time, we should have had some substantial progress with the work. It is not peculiarly difficult dredging work, and this deepening of the river is necessary in order to afford full advantage to the industries of these towns. The sum of $75,000 was placed in the estimates, but nothing has been done. Very elaborate and complete plans laying down the conditions under which all the facilities that would be necessary for these municipalities and industries had been drawn up under the late Government by engineers who had given the most complete attention to the work. Why these plans have not been carried out I am not aware. I have heard rumours that different engineers have been there and that propositions have been suggested by them which involve the construction of dams and other projects of that nature. We shall see as to that when the papers are brought down. I am making this motion early in the session in the hope that the minister will be able to bring the data down early. The things I complain of are these: First, the operation of the dredging during the past year has resulted in practically no work being done. Second, the bringing of a special dredge to do the work there at a season when it was impossible to work, was of course, nonsense; and, third, the fact that nothing has been done under the vote of last year which would indicate substantial progress. In addition to the Nova Scotia Steel Company the McNeil Bridge works and half a dozen other institutions of that character, there has lately been organized a large steel car company, called

the Eastern Car Company whose plant is in process of construction and which, it is hoped, will be in operation next year. This work of deepening the East river is expected to result in these great iron and steel industries being brought in touch with the ore supply of Newfoundland. There is no reason why this should not be done. The expenditure proposed is not very large, while the benefits to be derived from the expenditure is very great. I ask for these papers in order that I may see what this Government have been doing in the meantime. I know there were many reasons why the Department of Public Works was not doing very much for some time. The former minister worried about the navy so much that he worried himself out of his position. I do not suppose he took much interest in these things—certainly he did not seem to be taking much interest in the maritime provinces or in these large business propositions. I hope that the new Minister of Public Works will be more solicitous about the carrying through to completion of enterprises of this kind, so advantageous to the great industries of the country. I shall wait, with a great deal of interest for the reports and the plans, which I hope the minister will lay before the House to indicate what the engineers have decided to do in the matter.

Mr. STANFIELD: I would ask the hon. gentleman if Mr. Cantley, the general manager of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, has been dissastisfied with the work done during the last season?

Mr. MACDONALD: I cannot speak for him; I hold no brief for Mr. Cantley; but I know that a number of citizens in New Glascow do say that they are dissatisfied with it. My hon. friend seems to be taking a great interest in my county, but his information is so limited that I would advise him to go and commune with those who know something about the matter before he attempts to take part in this discussion. Speaking for a county with which I am thoroughly familiar, I say that that the delay of the Government to deal with this project is being condemned by business men of both political parties.

Mr. ROGERS: We have no objection whatever to bringing down all the papers, plans and documents to be found in the Department in connection with this matter. I am sorry that my hon. friend has some complaint to make in respect to the manner in which the work has been carried on but, referring to my hon. friend's statement in connection with the Nova Scotia Steel Company, I am informed on the best authority that the president of that company has expressed his entire satisfaction with the work carried on by the Department of Public Works during the past year. I fancy that the president of the Nova Scotia Steel Company, who is so directly interested with the carrying of this project, would have a full and complete knowledge of the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD: The president of the Nova Scotia Steel Company does not happen to be a resident of the county.

Mr. ROGERS: I am sure he is at least the general manager, and he is entirely satisfied with the work carried on. However, all the papers will be brought down, and I hope my hon. friend will find, as I am sure he will, that he has been very much mistaken in some of his statements in regard to this matter.

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Cantley may be satisfied with the plan finally decided upon by the engineer of the department, and I hope to be satisfied with it myself when I see it. But that is a different matter from being satisfied with the work the department is said to have carried on, and as the work has simply stood still during the last year, I know Mr. Cantley should not be satisfied with an action of that kind.

Motion agreed to.

OTTAWA RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. DEVLIN moved for:

A return showing the amount of money expended in improving the channel of the Ottawa river between the city of Hull and the village of Masson.

He said: I have moved for this return solely for the purpose of calling the attention of the Government to the fact that the channel in the Ottawa river between the city of Ottawa or the city of Hull, and the village of Masson is not fit for navigation. I would suggest that more dredging be done. Certain dredges are now working at a place called Blanch Shoals. The channel is altogether unprotected. In view of the importance of navigation on the Ottawa river and the fact that it is the only waterway between Ottawa, the capital city of Canada, where there are immense industries, and the city of Montreal, the channel should be placed in exactly the same condition as the channel of the St. Lawrence. It should be lighted by a system of buoys such as are placed in the channel of the St. Lawrence.

Mr. BORDEN: The Minister of Public Works left the House a moment ago. I will draw his attention to the observation of my hon. friend. Personally I have no knowledge of this matter.

ALAMEDA, SASK., POSTMASTER.

Mr. TURRIFF moved for:

A copy of all letters, telegrams, evidence taken, reports, &c., and of all correspondence between the Postmaster General and officers of his department, and James Gibson, ex-postmaster at Alameda, Sask., in connection with the instructions sent him to hand the office over to E. Cronk.

He said: This is one of a great number of dismissals of postmasters in my constituency. This is a particularly bad one and my object in discussing the matter for a few moments before the papers are brought down is to ask the Postmaster General if, when he learns some of the facts of the case, he will not issue instructions to his officers cancelling the instructions that have already been sent out, and permit the old postmaster to retain office until something has been proven against him. I shall read a letter which I have received from the old postmaster. As a matter of fact he may be postmaster still; the latest word I had from him, a couple of weeks ago, was that, although he had been instructed to hand over the post office, to his successor and had received word also from an inspector that he would be down at an early day to make the transfer, the inspector had not appeared when this letter was written and therefore the post office had not been transferred. Mr. Gibson, the postmaster, wrote me as follows:

Alameda, Sask., Nov. 11, 1912.

J. G. Turriff, Esq.:

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your kind letter of the 2nd inst. On or about the 1st of January, 1912, at a meeting of the Conservative Committee, of which Mr. J. R. Trumper is chairman, a resolution was passed to the effect that as long as the present postmaster was content (J. B. Gibson) to hold the office, he was not to be dismissed, but when a vacancy occurred E. Cronk should be recommended. On or about the 8th of September I received a letter from the Post Office Department at Ottawa that a complaint had been made that I had taken an active partizanship in the Dominion and provincial elections during my incumbency as postmaster, also stating if that was not true I was to fill out a form of declaration which was in the same letter to that effect, to wit, that I had not acted on any committee, had not canvassed for votes, had not bought any voter with money or liquor, or had not interrupted at any political meeting, and that I had only voted, the above to be declared before a Justice of the Peace. At the time a Justice of the Peace was not available, and the declaration was made before a notary public. On the 20th September I received a notice from W. P. Dorsett, of Redvers, Man., that he would be at Alameda on the 3rd of October to hold an investigation into my political conduct during my term of office as postmaster at Alameda. On the 29th September I got another letter from Mr. Dorsett stating that he would not be at Alameda until the 8th of October. On the 8th of October Mr. Dorsett held his investigation in I. R. Trumper's office. When I entered Mr. Trumper's office the only person there was Mr. Dorsett and Mr. Trumper. I asked Mr. Dorsett if he had the declaration I sent the department at Ottawa. He said he had not. He commenced his investigation by asking if I had taken an active part in the Dominion or Provincial election. I answered that I had not. I expected that Mr. Trumper would have had some one to prove the complaint that had been made. To my surprise, there was no one to do so. Mr. Dorsett asked me if I had any witnesses. I said I had not, and that it was hard to prove a negative. Mr. Dorsett insisted that I should bring in some one. I brought in R. I. Wood and Fred Strong, and both these men on being sworn by Mr. Dorsett said that they did not know that J. B. Gibson had taken any part, as complained, in the Dominion or provincial elections. Mr. Dorsett asked me if I had discussed reciprocity. My answer was no, not in a political sense. Mr. Dorsett then gave a lecture on the evils of postmaster discussing reciprocity, and tried to prove by I. R. Trumper that I had done so, but to any judicial mind it could not be done. At this time I said to my friends I would send in my resignation, but they would not allow me to do so. My friends got out a petition which was largely signed by men of both political opinions and sent to the department at Ottawa. I enclose the letter that came in answer to that petition, also a copy of a letter I sent to the Postmaster General on the 31st of October. Mr. Trumper tried to have a petition, but could not get one name on it. Since the complaint went in to the department and was acted on I submit it should have been taken up in a proper manner. In order to have me dismissed it was not necessary to formulate a complaint, and had I been guilty I would have sent in my resignation at once. If you can get a look at the petition it will speak for itself. I do not look for a reinstatement, but I do ask for an impartial investigation. If my friends Trumper & Co. had only a little patience in the natural course of events, they could have had the post office at Alameda with all that pertains to it without any friction; but the man of 74 quarter sections of land thought otherwise, and his word is law, no matter who goes under in Alameda.

I am yours very truly,
JAMES B. GIBSON.

N.B.—I have always looked on Andrew Broder as one of my friends. Perhaps if you would see, he might say a word for the old man.

I beg your forbearance for troubling you with so long a letter. I am still in the office and may be until the 1st of the month. I do not know when the transfer will take place.

Now, Friend Turriff, I am afraid I weary you, but just a few lines more. Cronk is putting up a building, but Cronk has not one dollar, and every one in Alameda knows that it is Trumper that is financing this

thing of a new post office for Alameda. It is he and he only that will reap the benefit or he would not touch it with his little fingers.

J. B. G.

He encloses this affidavit which I shall read.

Canada,
Province of Saskatchewan.

To Wit:

I, James B. Gibson, of the town of Alameda, in the province of Saskatchewan, Dominion of Canada, do solemnly declare that the statements contained in the annexed letter to John G. Turriff, Esq., M.P., of date 11th November, 1912, are true, and I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.

JAMES B. GIBSON.

Declared before me at Alameda, in the province of Saskatchewan, this 11th day of November, 1912.

J. P. GORDON,
A Commissioner for Oaths.

That letter and that affidavit set out the facts of the case very fairly and very fully. I happen to know the conditions at Alameda very well. I lived at Alameda for many years. It was through my recommendation that Mr. Gibson was appointed postmaster there three or four years ago. I venture to say that the Postmaster General cannot produce one bit of evidence that James B. Gibson has in any way been delinquent to his duties as postmaster. He has conducted the post office in a thoroughly capable manner, satisfactory to everybody in the town and vicinity. That is proven by the resolution which was passed by the Alameda Conservative Association in January last, in which they stated that so long as Mr. Gibson wished to retain the office he should be left free to do so, but that if it should become vacant they were going to recommend that Mr. Cronk be appointed postmaster. When I point out this and the conditions that are thoroughly well known in Alameda, and should be known by anybody who made an investigation, I am sure that you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Postmaster General, and every hon. member of this House will agree with me that a great injustice, a most inhuman thing, is being done. Mr. Gibson is a man of eighty years of age.

Mr. PELLETIER : Does the hon. gentleman say that he has been dismissed ?

Mr. TURRIFF : He has received instructions from the Postmaster General to hand the office over to his successor, and he has a letter—I have it here—from the inspector of my hon. friend the Postmaster General saying that he will be down at an early date to make the transfer. My object in bringing the question up is to secure from the Postmaster General a promise that this will not be done, or, if it has been done, that it will be cancelled and that Mr. Gibson shall be reinstated until a proper investigation is held. If my hon. friend will hold an investigation, a proper investigation, not an investigation by some tool who is sent there for the purpose of manufacturing evidence, a man who refuses to take down the evidence, and does not take a word of evidence while he is questioning a witness or the postmaster, I am satisfied that the result will show Mr. Gibson to be innocent of any charge that may have been made against him. Why does the investigator not take down any evidence ?—because he does not want to put the evidence before the Postmaster General. He is afraid that the Postmaster General might exercise some common sense in the matter and might refuse to dismiss the postmaster when there is no evidence agains him. But, having refused to take down the evidence, he presents his report without one tittle of evidence to support it, and then my hon. friend the Postmaster General, or his department—I do not suggest that it personally came before the hon. gentleman—sends out word that this man is to be dismissed and a new man put in his place. As I said a moment ago, this man is over eighty years of age, although he is hale and hearty and quite capable of carrying on the work of the post office.

Let me give some of the circumstances under which I came to recommend him as postmaster of Alameda some years ago. Ten years ago, when my friend, Mr. Gibson, had attained the allotted span of life, three score years and ten, he was a well-to-do farmer with 480 acres of good land, a good house, implements and everything in good shape. He sold his farm at a good price and moved into the town of Alameda with his wife who is almost as old as he is. Like many a good man with a big heart in his bosom, he went security for another man doing business in the town. Unfortunately, they had a few years of bad crops and on top of that fire swept the town and this man whom he had gone security for was burned out. He was not able to collect his accounts; the result was that he lost every dollar that he had, and my friend, Mr. Gibson, had to pay out thousands of dollars to make good the bond that he had given. He lost every dollar he had. When, a few years ago, the question came up of appointing a postmaster in Alameda, I recommended that Mr. Gibson should be appointed, not because he had any political claim on the office—there were a dozen men in Alameda who had a better claim on me than had Mr. Gibson—but because I remembered the circumstances. He was a man then 75 years of age, he had lost all his money, he had nothing left and there they were, he and his wife, both old people. I recommended that

he should be made postmaster, he was made postmaster, he has continued in the office ever since and has given the utmost satisfaction to Liberals and Conservatives alike. There was never a question raised against Mr. Gibson and when they circulated a petition in his favour it was signed by Liberals and Conservatives alike. When the other party, who wanted to get a tenant for the building he was going to put up wanted to have another man appointed postmaster, he tried to circulate a petition but nobody in the town would sign it. I leave it to the Postmaster General if under the circumstances the old postmaster should not have been left in charge of that office. It is not a big office, but there is enough in it to do Mr. James B. Gibson for the balance of his life. Think of turning a man of that age out in the middle of December, at the beginning of the rigorous winter we have in the West, turning him out practically without an hour's notice, when he committed no fault and had done nothing to deserve dismissal. If the Postmaster General can show that Mr. Gibson has done anything to deserve dismissal if he can show that he was a partisan in the election, if he can show that he did not conduct his office properly, then you will not hear one single word of complaint from me. But there is nothing against Mr. Gibson. The Conservative Association unanimously decided that he should not be disturbed in office, and in the face of that a partisan is appointed to make an investigation, and that partisan refused to take down evidence and makes an absolutely false report on the strength of which the Postmaster General sent instructions that Mr. Gibson should be dismissed and the office handed over to Mr. E. Cronk.

Mr. CARVELL: Is Mr. Cronk in favour of reciprocity?

Mr. TURRIFF: No, Mr. Cronk voted against reciprocity.

Mr. CARVELL: They ought to be glad to get an investigation in your part of the country. In my county they fire them without investigation.

Mr. TURRIFF: But this investigation was worse than no investigation at all; it was simply put up as an excuse. If the Postmaster General wants to get the facts let him send a man of repute and standing, and there are many Conservatives of repute and standing in Alameda, and let him hold an investigation and if he can find any man who says that the post office of Alameda has not been properly conducted ever since Mr. James B. Gibson has been in charge of it, then I will have nothing further to say.

Mr. PELLETIER: Would the hon. member read the letter he has referred to as coming from the Postmaster General so that I may recall these facts to my memory?

Mr. TURRIFF: The letters are very short and they do not throw much light on anything. This is the entire correspondence so far as I know:

Revers, Sask., September 28, 1912

James B. Gibson, Esq.,
Alameda, Sask.

Dear Sir,—Re investigation. Owing to circumstances over which I have no control it will be necessary to adjourn this investigation until Tuesday the 8th day of October, at the same hour.

Yours truly,
W. E. DORSETT.

Post Office Inspector's Office,
Moosejaw, Sask.,
22nd October, 1912.

Dear Sir,—I beg to inform you that I am in receipt of authority from the department to transfer the Alameda post office to Mr. Edward Cronk, and I will go to Alameda at the earliest possible date to effect the transfer.

Yours truly,
F. M. MacNAUGHTON.
P. O. Inspector.

Postmaster,
Alameda, Sask.

Ottawa, 15th October, 1912

Dear Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 9th instant, on the subject of the postmastership of Alameda, Sask., and to say, in reply, that due note has been taken of your observations in the matter.

Yours very truly,
HECTOR B. VERRET,
Asst. Deputy Postmaster General.

Post Office Department, Canada
Ottawa, Oct. 18th 1912.

Sir,—I am directed to acknowledge receipt of your communication of the 15th inst., enclosing a petition, expressing satisfaction with the management of the Alameda post office and recommending that no change may be made in that office, and to say, in reply, that a new appointment has already been made to the postmastership of Alameda.

I am Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Wm. SMITH.
Secretary.

R. J. Wood, Esq.,
Alameda, Sask.

I am not anxious to criticise the Postmaster General personally in respect to this case. He may be deserving of criticism, but if he is I do not know it. He may be cognizant of all these facts and he may know nothing of them, and I think it is very unlikely that he knew all the conditions as they existed in Alameda. So far as I am personally concerned, it would be very much to my political interest if I did not say a word about this in the House or elsewhere, and I will tell you why. At Alameda during the election in July last, there was the biggest Conservative majority for the Conservative

candidate in the Souris district that was put up in any part of my constituency, and I doubt if there was such a big Conservative majority in any poll in the province of Saskatchewan. That majority was composed of nine-tenths of the men who passed the resolution in the Conservative Association recommending that no change should be made in the post office. I know Alameda well, having lived there for many years, and you will find as stalwart Conservatives there as in any place in Canada and nine-tenths of them are honourable men and men of high class and men of good standing. I want to tell the Postmaster General that if this dismissal takes place on the lines on which it has gone so far, if this man is dismissed without a fair and proper investigation, then when the next election is held, I do not care whether it is local or Dominion, the majority of 94 that the Conservatives have put up in Alameda will be wiped out and will go right over to the Liberals because the Conservatives of Alameda are not the class of men that will stand for that sort of crooked work that has been going on—pretending to hold an investigation that is no investigation, an investigation that is a farce. Imagine a man holding an investigation refusing to take evidence and on the strength of such an investigation this old official being turned out in the month of December. Mr. Gibson is 80 years old and they were depending on the salary from the post office which would have been plenty for them to the end of their days. But this is not the worst feature of it, although God knows it is bad enough. This man is one of the defenders of his country; this man is one of the men who turned out with the volunteers of the sixties, and he has been writing to me pointing out that out of 30,000 men who turned out over two-thirds of them have now passed away, and he wants to know if the other one-third are to be allowed to die before they get the $100 which was voted them by this Parliament. Here is a man who turned out to fight for his country, and this is the inhuman treatment that his country is handing out to him, not I think with the consent of my hon. friend the Postmaster General, but I hope, now that he knows the circumstances, he will wire this afternoon that if Mr. Gibson has been dismissed he shall be reinstated and then he can hold an investigation. I do not ask my hon. friend to reinstate Mr. Gibson without holding an investigation, but I do not want my friend Mr. Gibson dismissed without one. My friend the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Reid) dismisses cripples. I heard it stated the other day that my friend the Postmaster General invaded the sepulchre and dug up graves of four or five years standing in order to find some one to dismiss. I do not object to him doing that, but I object to him coming into my constituency and dismissing an innocent man under the guise of an investigation, which is no investigation at all. In view of the facts of this case, I simply ask my hon. friend, if the man has been dismissed, that he be reinstated, and then let him hold an investigation as full an investigation as he likes, and if he can find one jot or tittle of evidence against this man to justify his dismissal, then by all means let him be dismissed. The reason I am speaking of this matter now before I have the papers, is because I happen to know the facts of the case, and I want my hon. friend the Postmaster General to take action now and not wait until the papers are brought down. When that is done it will probably be too late. I want to tell my hon. friend also that, where the post offices are worth anything, the postmasters all along the line of railway are dismissed either without an investigation or with simply a farce of an investigation. The time has come when this must be stopped. I do not object to the Government when they come into power dismissing a certain number of men, because, seeing that we were in power for a number of years, there were possibly men who should be dismissed. In this particular case, however, I do not believe my hon. friend knew the facts, because I cannot think that any man in authority who knew the facts, would be so absolutely lost to all sense of honour or decency as to perpetrate such an outrage on any man, and especially to dismiss an old man over eighty years of age, who has done nothing to deserve dismissal, and to turn him out without a dollar in the month of December, to face such a winter as we have in the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. PELLETIER: It is very strange to hear some of the remarks which have fallen from the lips of my hon. friend from Assiniboia, and to be told in this House that postmasters in Saskatchewan are dismissed all along the line, when I receive complaints daily from that province that I am not dismissing enough postmasters.

Mr. TURRIFF: My hon. friend misunderstood me. I said they had been dismissed all along the line when the post offices were worth anything. The little fellows are left.

Mr. PELLETIER: Well, that is something, is it not? I was told in the House during the last days of last session that I had dismissed all the postmasters in one county from first to last. I was surprised to hear this, and on looking up the files, I found that the hon. member for that county had, to say the least, made a very great

mistake indeed. I am not going to go into that matter any further, but the hon. gentleman who made that statement is within hearing of me now, and I think he will remember making it.

Mr. EMMERSON: You must have got into the habit of doing it in your sleep.

Mr. PELLETIER: I think the man who said it was asleep.

This is a good occasion also to refer to the very drastic action which was taken by the Postmaster General in dismissing a dead man. This matter has been reported several times in the press which has been called in this House the 'reptile press.' I have not considered the matter worth while, but, since the opportunity is given me, I may say that the dismissal of a man who has been dead for four years, cannot be very injurious to his corpse, but I am told that it is an awful crime. The facts, however, are these. The dead man had been replaced by a relative of his, who took care that the department did not know that the postmaster was dead, so that he could enjoy the benefits of office in place of the dead man, and the post office inspector, whose duty it was to attend to these matters, was so delinquent in his duty as not to hear about it, and so the department was deceived for four years, thinking it had to deal with a certain postmaster who had been in his grave for four years. When I heard about this, I thought the name of the man who was dead should be erased from the postal guide, and so I have been told I dismissed a man who has been dead for four years. This will give you, Mr. Speaker, an idea of the fairness of certain criticisms published in certain newspapers in this country.

An hon. MEMBER: Was not some complaint made against him for being a partisan?

Mr. PELLETIER: No, but the man who had assumed the office had been a partisan.

An hon. MEMBER: Did the Postmaster General dismiss the real occupant?

Mr. PELLETIER: The real occupant was dead. I do not think this matter is worth while taking up the time of the House. The facts put before the House by my hon. friend from Assiniboia are serious facts, and I can only say, as he himself said, that many of these matters have to be attended to in the department, and, anybody will understand the number of postmasters now in this country is growing very fast. It is over fourteen thousand at present. I suppose my hon. friends on the other side of the House will not expect me to remember the facts concerning every postmastership in the country. The letters which my hon. friend has read being signed by officers of the department, the hon. gentleman, no doubt feels that there is a great deal in what he has stated. He has asked me to send orders this afternoon, by telegraph, that the postmaster be not dismissed. With all due respect to my hon. friend, and while I desire to act in deference to his wishes, I must say that I take it for granted that the officers of the department should have something to say about this matter. The hon. gentleman's remarks are on record in 'Hansard,' and I will give instructions at once that the officers shall look into the matter to-morrow morning. Let me recall something of what I said last session. My hon. friends on the other side must not be offended if I cannot bring to the House the files referred to in all the notices of motion or if I am not ready with the facts relating to any particular notice of motion when I have not been advised as to when the matter will be taken up. While I desire to treat my hon. friend with all courtesy, I cannot at the moment go into the facts of this case, my hon. friend not having given me notice that it would be brought up to-day. But I will give him all the satisfaction I can. Among the facts placed before the House by the hon. member are these—that this man has been a defender of this country, that he is an old man and that he has lost all his money. I feel confident that these facts have not been before me. I asked him to read the copy of the letter the postmaster sent and to keep the letter my hon friend sent to me. He has not read it.

Mr. TURRIFF: I have not got it. I have read everything except two or three letters from Mr. Gibson which were practically covered in the one I read.

Mr. PELLETIER: The letter of the end of September notified Mr. Gibson that the investigation would take place on October 8. Two months have elapsed since then, and the facts which my hon. friend has put to-day before the House might have been sent to me. Let me tell the hon. gentleman, I have refused in cases such as this is represented to be to dismiss postmasters. While I read in the press that I am doing this, that and the other, I may say that I have received from some electors letters of reproach because I do not make certain dismissals. If the facts given to the House had been presented to me—and though I am speaking without the papers in the case, I am confident that the facts never were before me—they would have been considered. And, as I have told the hon. member, the matter will be considered. I am some-

what surprised to hear that the gentleman sent to make the investigation is a disreputable man. I do not know him personally, but I must have had a suggestion for his appointment from somebody who was trustworthy and whom I consequently trusted. That this gentleman has acted in a dishonourable way in the investigation, I do not, for the moment, admit. I would like to go into the facts as requested by my hon. friend from Assiniboia and will do it without delay.

Mr. TURRIFF: With permission, I would say one word. Do I understand from the Postmaster General that, if the facts are as I have shown, and if there has been nothing against this old man he will be retained in his office?

Mr. PELLETIER: Certainly. If there has been, as the hon. gentleman says, a mock investigation, I desire to know it. When I gave instructions that the investigation should take place I intended that the investigation should be a serious one. I must say that I have had complaints before about mock investigations, and when I have gone into the matter have found that the assertions were not true and that the investigations were serious. But I do not wish to contradict my hon. friend without looking into the facts. I may say that I have refused in many instances, particularly in the West, to dismiss postmasters without investigation, and where I order an investigation it is with the idea that that investigation should be serious and fair.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If I may be permitted, I should like to ask a question. I noticed that in the discussion of this case it has been stated that the question was asked this postmaster whether he was in favour of reciprocity. I am also aware that that question has been put by the parties who are making the investigations in the province of Nova Scotia. Mr. Duchemin, who has been making investigations in the constituency I have the honor to represent, I am informed, invariably asks that; and when the postmaster admits that he was in favour of reciprocity, Mr. Duchemin looks much shocked as if the fact were a dreadful one. I would like to ask the Postmaster General, is it regarded as an offense by him or by the department for a postmaster to express views in favour of reciprocity.

Mr. STANFIELD: I would like to ask the hon. member for Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) a question which will throw light upon his own question. He says that the commissioner in Nova Scotia is putting the question to witnesses: Are you in favour of reciprocity? I would like to ask if the question put by Mr. Duchemin is not this: Did not you canvass or argue in favour of reciprocity?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not so informed. I understand that the question whether a postmaster is in favour of reciprocity or has expressed himself in favour of reciprocity is the one put by Mr. Duchemin. I have not been present at the investigations and speak only of what has been reported to me by those who were present. It seems that some inquiry of that kind was made in the case of Mr. Gibson, and, in order that we might know whether it was regarded as an offense or not, I would like an answer from the Postmaster General.

Mr. PELLETIER: The hon. member has put his question in a way which, I think, is not exactly fair to Mr. Duchemin. Last session accusations were made against Mr. Duchemin of doing a number of things which were unfair. I thought the statements were so serious that I sent Mr. Duchemin a copy of 'Hansard' in which they were reported and told him I considered them serious and wished an answer. He sent an answer which was perfectly satisfactory. The only answer I can give my hon. friend from Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) is that I do not think Mr. Duchemin has ever put any question to what a man believes or as to what his opinions are as to reciprocity. A man's opinion is his own property, but the difficulty is whether he has canvassed for reciprocity. I think there is some prejudice on the other side of the House on this matter, as Mr. Duchemin has been the investigator of some of these cases, but the explanation as given is absolutely satisfactory.

Mr. EMMERSON: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if, in the case of a Conservative being in favour of reciprocity, and voting accordingly he would be condemned to the guillotine?

Mr. PELLETIER: I do not consider the question a pressing one at this time, because I think that a Conservative in favour of reciprocity could not be found in this country.

Mr. EMMERSON: I may tell my hon. friend that I owe my seat in this House to those Conservatives who voted for reciprocity.

Mr. PELLETIER: I am sorry my hon. friend will not be returned in the next election.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

For a return showing the number of mail contracts cancelled in the county of Pictou

since the 1st of October, 1911; the names of the contractors, the prices paid to them, the reason for the cancellation in each case; and a copy of any investigations and reports had into the causes of such cancellations, the names of the new contractors and the prices paid to them in each case.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and documents, relating to the dismissal of Thomas J. Gray, as car inspector on the Intercolonial railway at Westville, county of Pictou.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a return showing the number of postmasters who have been dismissed in the county of Pictou since October 1, 1911; the names of the postmasters who have been appointed to succeed them; the causes of the dismissals and all complaints and correspondence with respect to same, and of all reports of investigation where investigations have been held.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all correspondence, negotiations, proposals in writing and other papers and documents in the possession of the Government, or any department thereof, relating to reciprocity in trade with the United States, bearing date between the 1st day of January, 1890, and the 31st day of December, 1891.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all Orders in Council passed since October 1 A.D. 1911, relating to the board of management of the Government railways of Canada, or of any other member thereof, or in any way affecting the same, or any official of the Intercolonial railway, as regards the duties to be performed or the powers to be exercised by the said board or any member thereof, or by any such official, together with a copy of all recommendations, letters, applications, instructions, or other correspondence, in any manner relating thereto or having regard to the said Orders in Council as to the management of the Intercolonial railway.—Mr. Emmerson.

For a copy of all correspondence, complaints, petitions, memoranda, notes of evidence, reports of investigations and other documents in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to the dismissal of John W. Davis, fishery officer, Guysborough, N. S.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of a certain Order in Council issued during the current year by which certain official reports formerly made to the board of management of the Intercolonial railway have been ordered in future to be made to Mr. F. P. Brady.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all papers, letters, complaints, telegrams, reports, and other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to the dismissal of John Milward, postmaster at Stormont, Guysborough county, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

Copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, tenders, bonds, agreements, contracts, and other documents in the possession of the Post Office Department relating to the letting of the contract for carrying the mails between Heatherton and Guysboro, in the year 1912; and also relating to any temporary agreement entered into prior to the date of letting such contract.—Mr. Sinclair.

Copy of all correspondence passing between the Government or any member thereof with respect to the east half of section 27 in township six (6) in range two (2) west of the third meridian.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Copy of all pay-lists, letters, documents, telegrams and other papers in connection with the expenditures made on Brule wharf in the county of Colchester during the last two years.—Mr. Macdonald.

Copy of all pay-lists, letters, documents, letters and other papers in connection with the expenditures at Cariboo Island in the county of Pictou.—Mr. Macdonald.

Copy of all pay lists, letters, documents, telegrams and other papers in connection with the expenditures at Skinner's cove in the county of Pictou.—Mr. Macdonald.

Return showing the names of all officials in the district of Sunbury and Queens, who have been dismissed or removed from office since September, 1911, the reason for such dismissal or removal, the evidence taken at any investigation held in regard to them, the reports upon such investigations, the name of any successor appointed in place of dismissed officials, and a copy of all letters, charges, complaints and recommendations in regard to the said removals or dismissals, or in regard to the appointment of their successors.—Mr. McLean (Queens).

Copy of all correspondence and other documents in the possession of the Department of Public Works relating to the proposed interprovincial bridge between Hawkesbury Ontario, and Grenville, Quebec.—Mr. Proulx.

Copy of all papers, documents, memoranda, letters, telegrams, and documents bearing on a request for a subsidy for a steam service between Bonaventure, Quebec, or any other part of Bonaventure county and Bathurst, New Brunswick, or any other part of Gloucester County, New Brunswick, and between New Richmond, Quebec, and Dalhousie, New Brunswick, and between Carleton and Miguasha, Quebec, and Dalhousie, New Brunswick, or Campbellton, New Brunswick, or both, as well as a copy of all replies made for such subsidies from October, 1911 to date.—Mr. Marcil.

Copy of all correspondence between the Minister of Railways or any other member of the Government, and any person regarding the acquisition by the Government of Canada of the Quebec Oriental railway, formerly the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway, and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway, or both.—Mr. Marcil.

Return showing all the new post offices opened in the county of Bonaventure, since October, 1911, up to date, and a copy of the correspondence in connection therewith, together with the names of such post offices and postmasters, and the location of such offices; and also a copy of all papers asking for such offices.—Mr. Marcil.

Copy of all petitions, correspondence, memoranda, reports and resolutions of county or other municipal councils of Bonaventure county, asking for or objecting to certain public works in Bonaventure county since October, 1911, with the Minister of Public Works, or any member of the present administration, and replies made thereto.—Mr. Marcil.

Copy of all petitions, correspondence, tions, reports, memoranda and other documents bearing on the appointment of a general foreman, or other permanent or tempo-

rary officials of the Department of Public Works in the county of Bonaventure since October, 1911, up to date, with the names, residences, duties and salaries of such appointees.—Mr. Marcil.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions, complaints, memoranda, reports and investigations regarding the service performed by the steamer 'Canada,' owned by the Interprovincial Navigation Company of Fraserville, Quebec, since October, 1911, up to date, and also of all documents bearing on the present contract with the Department of Trade and Commerce, or the renewal or extension thereof.—Mr. Marcil.

For a copy of all correspondence, complaints, recommendations, telegrams and reports bearing on the railway mail service in Bonaventure county from October, 1911, up to date, and on the appointment and dismissals of officers in such connection, with the names, residences, salaries and duties, as well as of all documents bearing on the suspension of the railway mail service during the period mentioned, as well as a copy of all documents referring to agreements made to meet such a contingency during the coming winter.—Mr. Marcil.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, and petitions for and against the dismissal of Dr. George Pinault, as medical health officer of the Micmac Indian reserve, at Ste. Anne de Restigouche, Bonaventure county, Quebec, and of all documents relating to the appointment of a successor, with the name, residence, salary and duties of the new appointee.—Mr. Marcil.

For a copy of all documents relating to the transferring of P. E. Amiot, resident engineer of the Department of Public Works, Bonaventure, Quebec, to the district of Chicoutimi and Saguenay, and the appointment in his stead, in Bonaventure county, of Charles E. Tache, of Chicoutimi, as resident engineer, with a copy of all the instructions given to the latter and his duties, residence and salary.—Mr. Marcil.

For a copy of all correspondence, complaints, petitions, memoranda, notes of evidence, reports of investigations and other documents in the possession of the Department of Inland Revenue regarding the dismissal of J. Fabien Bugeaud, Bonaventure, Quebec, assistant inspector of weights and measures in the Quebec district, and the appointment of his successor or successors, with the names, residence, salaries and duties; also of all documents relating to A. B. Caldwell, New Carlisle, Quebec, joint assistant inspector with J. Fabien Bugeaud, and the duties assigned to him, together with a copy of all recommendations for said new appointment.—Mr. Marcil.

For a return showing the detail and number of dismissals from public offices in the Department of Marine and Fisheries to this date in the county of Bonaventure, the names of the dismissed occupants, the reasons for their dismissal, the complaints against such officials and a copy of all correspondence with respect to the same and of all reports of investigations where such were held; as well as a list of the new appointments made by the department, with names, residences, salaries and duties, and a copy of all recommendations of such appointments.—Mr. Marcil.

Mr. PELLETIER.

For a return showing the names of postmasters who have been dismissed in the county of Bonaventure since October 1, 1911; the names of the postmasters who have been appointed to succeed them; the causes of the dismissals and a copy of all complaints and correspondence with respect to same, and a copy of all reports of investigations where such have been held, with the reasons given for not holding any such investigation, when not held.—Mr. Marcil.

For a copy of all reports made by officials of the Department of Railways and Canals on the Quebec and Oriental railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway, together with a statement of the subsidies paid such railways since October, 1911, up to date, and a copy of all correspondence in that connection.—Mr. Marcil.

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, reports, letters, and instructions regarding smelt and salmon fishing in the Restigouche river and the Baie des Chaleurs since October, 1911, up to date, together with copy of instructions issued to officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in that connection.—Mr. Marcil.

For a return showing the number of mail contracts cancelled in the county of Bonaventure since the 1st October, 1911; the names of the contractors, the prices paid to them, the reasons for the cancellation in each case; and a copy of any investigations and reports had into the causes of such cancellations, the names of the new contractors and the prices paid to them in each case.—Mr. Marcil.

Copy of the different freight tariffs in force on the line of railways from Matapedia, Quebec, to New Carlisle, Quebec, and from New Carlisle to Gascon's Quebec, and vice versa, and of any requests that have been received in regard to the change in the same; and also a copy of any requests, petitions, letters, or other documents complaining of the said tariff.—Mr. Marcil.

Copy of the report or reports made by C. E. Tache, resident engineer of Bonaventure county, Quebec, on public works existing or asked for in that constituency since October, 1911, up to date.—Mr. Marcil.

Copy of all complaints, letters, papers, reports, and of all documents bearing on the investigation held at Port Daniel West, Quebec, into the conduct of Edmund Pea, as overseer or guardian of the lobster hatchery at that place.—Mr. Marcil.

Copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, complaints and reports, bearing on the delay in the payment of census enumerators in the county of Bonaventure in connection with the last census, together with the names, residences, amounts, and dates of payment.—Mr. Marcil.

Copy of all correspondence, reports, and documents, bearing on the claim of C. R. Scoles, of New Carlisle, Quebec, to a balance of subsidy voted to the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway, since October, 1911, to date.—Mr. Marcil.

Return showing all public officers removed by the present Government in the district of St. Jacques, Montreal, together with the names and duties of such persons, the reasons of their dismissal, the nature of the complaints brought against them, and a copy of all correspondence relating thereto,

and of reports of inquiries in the cases where such have been held.—Mr. Lapointe (Montreal).

Copy of all papers, documents, reports, correspondence, &c., relating to the dismissal of Patrick Decoste, an employee on the ferry steamer Scotia between Mulgrave and Point Tupper on the Intercolonial railway.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

Copy of all correspondence, Orders in Council and all other papers or documents in any way relating to the dismissal of Alexander Marion, from the position of postmaster at Rockland, Ontario.—Mr. Murphy.

Copy of all correspondence, Orders in Council, and all other papers and documents in any way relating to the dismissal of Robert Dow from the Immigration Branch of the Department of the Interior at Ottawa.—Mr. Murphy.

Copy of all correspondence, Orders in Council, and all other papers and documents in any way relating to the dismissal of Emerie Thivierge, from the position of fisheries inspector for the counties of Prescott and Russell.—Mr. Murphy.

Copy of all correspondence, Orders in Council and all other papers or documents in any way relating to the dismissal of James McCartin, from the position of inspector of the concrete work forming part of the contract for the construction of the Plaza at the city of Ottawa.—Mr. Murphy.

Copy of all correspondence, Orders in Council and all other papers or documents in any way relating to the dismissal of Duncan McArthur, from the Annuities Branch, while the said branch was attached to the Department of Trade and Commerce. —Mr. Murphy.

Copy of each commission issued by the Government since October 10, 1911, directing an investigation to be held; and also for a copy of the evidence taken and the report made in each case that has been concluded.—Mr. Murphy.

For a return showing the detail and number of dismissals from public offices by th present Government to this date in th riding of Wright, giving the names of the dismissed occupants, the reasons for their dismissal, the complaints against such officials, and a copy of all correspondence with respect to the same, with all reports of investigations where such were held.—Mr Devlin.

Copy of all letters, telegrams, &c., exchanged between the member for Bellechasse county and the Minister of Agriculture and the Postmaster General, concerning the apointment of an additional physician at the Quarantine Station of Grosse Ile. —Mr. Lemieux.

Copy of the evidence taken and the report made by each commissioner appointed since November 1, 1911, to conduct an investigation into charges of offensive partisanship made against postmasters in the county of Russell. —Mr. Murphy.

Copy of all correspondence, Orders in Council and all other papers or documents in any way relating to the dismissal of James Murphy from the position of postmaster at Tweed, Ontario.—Mr. Murphy.

Copy of all corespondence, Orders in Council and all other papers or documents in any way relating to the dismissal of John Maher, from the service of the Customs Department at Montreal.—Mr. Murphy.

Copy of the Recommendation to Council, the Order in Coucil, all correspondence with the Government or any member thereof, and of all letters, documents and papers in any way connected with the dismissal of Charles Arthur Bowman from the Engineering Branch of the Department of Railways and Canals.—Mr. Clarke.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, and petitions for and against the dismissal of James W. Bannon, preventive officer of customs at St. Agnes de Dundee, county of Huntingdon, also a copy of the report of investigation and evidence, if any, submitted to investigating commissioner.—Mr. Robb.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents, respecting the removal of Joseph L. Robichaud, lighthouse keeper at Miscou, county of Gloucester, and the appointment of his successor; also of all correspondence respecting the engagement of the engineer of the fog alarm system attached to that station, and the certificates required by the Minister of Marine, showing the competence of that engineer; with the names of the new keeper and of the said engineer and their ages.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams addressed by the Conservative candidate in the county of Gloucester at the election of 21st September, 1911, to the Minister of Public Works from the day that he took his oath of office, on October 10, 1911, up to the 31st December, of the same year, on the subject of public works then under construction in the said county.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a return showing the foremen employed at the various public works in the county of Gloucester on the 21st of September, 1911, who have been dismissed since by the present administration, containing their names, reasons of dismissal, nature of the charges made against them, also a copy of all correspondence connected with the same and reports of inquiries, in cases where such inquiries have been instituted.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all corespondence, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents concerning an alleged defalcation in the accounts of Joseph J. Melanson, clerk in the customs office at Bathurst, county of Gloucester, which caused an inquiry to be held on the 23rd of October last by the provincial inspector of customs, with the name of the accuser.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a return showing the quantity by cubic yards of dredging made in the harbour of Bathurst by the dredge 'Restigouche' during the months of May, June, July, August, September, October and November of the year 1911, and during the same months in the year 1912.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a return showing all the postmasters dismissed by the present Government in the county of Gloucester, the names of such persons, the reasons for their dismissal, nature of the charges made against them; also a copy of all correspondence connected with it, and reports of investigations in cases where such investigations were instituted.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents con-

cerning the dismissal of Frederick F. Doucet, keeper of the lighthouse at the entrance of the harbour of Caraquet, county of Gloucester, and the nomination of his successor.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports and other documents concerning the dismissal of Donald J. Hachey, Collector of Customs at Bathurst, county of Gloucester, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a return showing all appointments to office under the Dominion Government in the constituency of Edmonton from October 10, 1911, to November 21, 1912, with a statement of the salaries in each case together with a copy of all correspondence, recommendations to Council, Orders in Council, and all other papers or documents in any way connected with such appointments—Mr. Oliver.

For a return showing all the employees of the Dominion Government in the constituency of Edmonton dismissed between 10th of October, 1911, and 21st of November, 1912, the salary being paid to each employee at the time of his dismissal, together with a copy of all correspondence, recommendations to Council, Orders in Council, and all other papers or documents in any way connected with such dismissals.—Mr. Oliver.

For a return showing the detail and number of dismissals from public offices by the present Government to this date in the riding of Mackenzie, together with the names of the dismissed occupants, the reasons for their dismissal, the complaints against such officials, and a copy of all correspondence with respect to the same, and of all reports of investigations, where any such were held.—Mr. Cash.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS BY MEMBERS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I wish to make one observation with reference to the Order Paper with which we have been dealing this afternoon. I notice that the very healthy rule which is followed in the British House of Commons of allowing a member to make only a certain number of motions in one day seems to be sadly neglected in our case.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 5, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Hazen.

Mr. BORDEN.

THE NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 21) to authorize measures for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire. He said: Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House upon so important a subject as that which I propose to discuss, I shall speak in no controversial spirit. If a portion of my remarks may necessarily controvert opinions which have been expressed by hon. gentlemen on either side of the House, let it be understood that I do so, not by way of criticism, but purely for the purpose of giving frankly to the House the reasons which have led the Government to adopt the course which I shall now out line.

It is not necessary to dwell upon the increasing power and influence of Canada within the Empire, due to its remarkable growth and expansion, and to the wonderful and rapid development of its resources during the past quarter of a century. With this increasing power and influence there has necessarily come by sure and gradual steps a certain development in our relations with the United Kingdom and the other dominions. The evolution of the constitutional relations within the Empire during the past half century has not been less marked than its material progress. In this constitutional development, we are necessarily confronted with the problem of combining co-operation with autonomy. It seems most essential that there should be such co-operation in defence and in trade as will give to the whole Empire an effective organization in these matters of vital concern. On the other hand, each dominion must preserve in all important respects the autonomous government which it now possesses. Responsibility for the Empire's defence upon the high seas, in which is to be found the only effective guarantee of its existence, and which has hitherto been assumed by the United Kingdom, has necessarily carried with it responsibility for and control of foreign policy. With the enormous increase of naval power which has been undertaken by all great nations in recent years, this tremendous responsibility has cast an almost impossible burden upon the British islands, which for nearly a thousand years have exercised so profound an influence upon the world's history. That burden is so great that the day has come when either the existence of this Empire will be imperilled or the young and mighty dominions must join with the motherland to make secure the common safety and the common heritage of all. When Great Britain no longer assumes sole responsibility for defence upon the high seas, she can no longer undertake to assume sole responsibility for and sole con-

trol of foreign policy which is closely, vitally, and constantly associated with that defence in which the dominions participate. It has been declared in the past, and even during recent years, that responsibility for foreign policy could not be shared by Great Britain with the dominions. In my humble opinion, adherence to such a position could have but one and that a most disastrous result. During my recent visit to the British islands, I ventured on many public occasions to propound the principle that the great dominions, sharing in the defence of the Empire upon the high seas, must necessarily be entitled to share also in the responsibility for and in the control of foreign policy. No declaration that I made was greeted more heartily and enthusiastically than this. It is satisfactory to know that to-day not only His Majesty's ministers but also the leaders of the opposite political party in Great Britain have explicitly accepted this principle and have affirmed their conviction that the means by which it can be constitutionally accomplished must be sought, discovered and utilized without delay.

Before proceeding to declare and explain the proposals of the Government, I desire to call attention to certain remarks which I addressed to this House just two years ago in replying to inquiries as to the course we would pursue after attaining power. These remarks were as follows:

It may be fairly asked what we would do if we were in power to-day with regard to a great question of this kind. It seems to me that our plain course and duty would be this: The Government of this country are able to ascertain and to know, if they take the proper action for that purpose, whether the conditions which face the Empire at this time in respect of naval defence are grave. If we were in power we would endeavour to find that out, to get a plain, unvarnished answer to that question, and if the answer to that question, based upon the assurance of the Government of the Mother Country and the report of the naval experts of the Admiralty were such—and I think it would be such—as to demand instant and effective action by this country, then I would appeal to Parliament for immediate and effective aid, and if Parliament did not give immediate and effective aid I would appeal from Parliament to the people of the country.

Then, Sir, as to the permanent policy, I think the people have a right to be consulted. I do not know whether I have made my position clear but I have done so according to my humble capacity. I think the question of Canada's co-operation upon a permanent basis in Imperial defence involves very large and wide considerations. If Canada and the other dominions of the Empire are to take their part as nations of this Empire in the defence of the Empire as a whole, shall it be that we, contributing to that defence of the whole Empire, shall have absolutely as citizens of this country, no voice whatever in the councils of the Empire? I do not think that such would be a tolerable condition. I do not believe the people of Canada would for one moment submit to such a condition. Shall members of this House, representative men, representing 221 constituencies of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, shall no one of them have the same voice with regard to those vast Imperial issues that the humblest taxpayer in the British isles has at this moment? It does not seem to me that such a condition would make for the integrity of the Empire, for the closer co-operation of the Empire. Regard must be had to these far reaching considerations, a permanent policy would have to be worked out, and when that permanent policy has been worked out and explained to the people of Canada, to every citizen in this country, then it would be the duty of any government to go to the people of Canada to receive their mandate and accept and act upon their approval or disapproval of that policy.

The present Government assumed office on the 10th of October, 1911, and met Parliament on the 17th day of November following. It is hardly necessary to point out that there was no opportunity until after the close of the session to visit Great Britain or to consult the Admiralty in any effective way. Shortly after the session closed, I went to England accompanied by some of my colleagues, and for several weeks we had the opportunity from time to time of conferring with the British Government and of consulting with the technical and expert advisers of the Admiralty respecting the whole question of naval defence, and especially the conditions which confront the Empire at present and in the early future. I desire to express my warm appreciation of the manner in which we were received by His Majesty's Government, who took us most fully into their confidence on the great questions of foreign policy and of defence, and who accorded to us all relevant information at their disposal. A portion of this necessarily is of a very confidential character which cannot be made public; but an important part will be communicated to the House in a document which I shall lay on the table this afternoon.

In considering the power of the British Empire to maintain that predominance upon the sea which is essential to its safety and to its very existence, it is clear that reference to the other naval forces of the world cannot be excluded. Such references and comparisons are frequently made by all the great powers, and they do not imply anything unfriendly in intention or in spirit to other nations. Indeed, a most distinct reference to the naval power of Great Britain has been set forth in the preamble to the naval law of one great empire which in recent years has sprung to the front with amazing rapidity in the development of its naval forces.

I now proceed to submit to the House

the information which we have received from His Majesty's Government. It is in the form of a memorandum, as follows:

From the Secretary of State for the Colonies to His Royal Highness the Governor General.

Downing Street, 25th October, 1912.

SIR,—1. I have the honour to transmit to Your Royal Highness the accompanying copy of a memorandum relating to the requirements of the naval defence of the Empire.

2. This document has been prepared by the Admiralty on the instructions of His Majesty's Government in compliance with the request of Mr. Borden with a view to presentation to the Dominion Parliament if, and when, the Dominion ministers deem it necessary.

I have, &c.,
L. HARCOURT.

MEMORANDUM.

Prepared by the Board of Admiralty on the General Naval Situation and communicated to the Government of Canada by His Majesty's Government.

1. The Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada has invited His Majesty's Government through the Board of Admiralty to prepare a statement of the present and immediately prospective requirements of the naval defence of the Empire for presentation to the Canadian Parliament if the Dominion Cabinet deem it necessary.

The Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty are prepared to comply and to supplement, in a form which can be made public, the confidential communications and conversations which have passed between the Admiralty and ministers of the Dominion Parliament during the recent visit to the United Kingdom.

The Admiralty set the greatest store by the important material, and still more important moral, assistance which it is within the power of Canada to give to maintaining British naval supremacy on the high seas, but they think it necessary to disclaim any intention, however indirect, of putting pressure upon Canadian public opinion, or of seeking to influence the Dominion Parliament in a decision which clearly belongs solely to Canada.

The Admiralty therefore confine themselves in this statement exclusively to facts, and it is for the Dominion Government and Parliament to draw their own conclusions therefrom.

2. The power of the British Empire to maintain the superiority on the sea, which is essential to its security, must obviously be measured from time to time by reference to the other naval forces of the world, and such a comparison does not imply anything unfriendly in intention or in spirit to any other power or group of powers. From this point of view the development of the German fleet during the last fifteen years is the most striking feature of the naval situation today. That development has been authorized by five successive legislative enactments, viz., the Fleet Laws of 1898, 1900, 1906, 1908, and 1912. These laws cover the period up to 1920.

Whereas in 1898 the German fleet consisted of:—

9 battleships (excluding coast defence vessels),
3 large cruisers,
28 small cruisers,
113 torpedo boats, and
25,000 men.

maintained at an annual cost of 6,000,000*l.*, the full fleet of 1920 will consist of:—

41 battleships,
20 large cruisers,
40 small cruisers,
144 torpedo boats,
72 submarines, and
101,500 men,

estimated to be maintained at an annual cost of 23,000,000*l.* These figures, however, give no real idea of the advance, for the size and cost of ships has risen continually during the period, and, apart from increasing their total numbers, Germany has systematically replaced old and small ships, which counted as units in her earlier fleet, by the most powerfull and costly modern vessels. Neither does the money provided by the estimates for the completed law represent the increase in cost properly attributable to the German navy, for many charges borne on British naval funds are otherwise defrayed in Germany; and the German navy comprises such a large proportion of new ships that the cost of maintenance and repair is considerably less than in navies which have been longer established.

3. The naval expansion of Germany has not been provoked by British naval increases. The German Government have repeatedly declared that their naval policy has not been influenced by British action, and the following figures speak for themselves:—

In 1905 Great Britain was building 4 capital ships, and Germany 2.

In 1906 Great Britain reduced to 3 capital ships, and Germany increased to 3.

In 1907 Great Britain built 3 capital ships, and Germany built 3.

In 1908 Great Britain further reduced to 2 capital ships, and Germany further increased to 4.

It was not until the efforts of Great Britain to procure the abatement or retardation of naval rivalry had failed for 3 successive years that the Admiralty were forced in 1909, upon a general review of the naval situation, to ask Parliament to take exceptional measures to secure against all possible hazards the safety of the Empire. In that year, 8 capital ships were laid down in Great Britain, and 2 others were provided by the Commonwealth of Australia and the Dominion of New Zealand respectively—a total of 10.

4. In the spring of the present year the fifth Germany navy law was assented to by the Reichstag. The main feature of that law is not the increase in the new construction of capital ships, though that is important, but rather the increase in the striking force of ships of all classes which will be immediately available at all seasons of the year.

A third squadron of 8 battleships will be created and maintained in full commission as

part of the active battle fleet. Whereas, according to the unamended law, the active battle fleet consisted of 17 battleships, 4 battle or large armoured cruisers, and 12 small cruisers, it will in the near future consist of 25 battleships, 8 battle or large armoured cruisers, and 18 small cruisers; and whereas at present, owing to the system of recruitment which prevails in Germany, the German fleet is less fully mobile during the winter than during the summer months, it will, through the operation of this law, not only be increased in strength, but rendered much more readily available. Ninety-nine torpedo boat destroyers, instead of 66, will be maintained in full commission out of a total of 144; 72 new submarines will be built within the currency of the new law, and of these it is apparently proposed to maintain 54 with full permanent crews. Taking a general view, the effect of the law will be that nearly four-fifths of the entire German navy will be maintained in full permanent commission; that is to say, instantly and constantly ready for war.

So great a change and development in the German fleet involves, of course, important additions to their personnel. In 1898 the officers and men of the German navy amounted to 25,000. To-day that figure has reached 66,000. The new law adds 15,000 officers and men, and makes a total in 1920 of 101,500.

The new construction under the law prescribes the building of 3 additional battleships—1 to be begun next year, 1 in 1916—and 2 small cruisers, of which the date has not yet been fixed. The date of the third battleship has not been fixed. It has been presumed to be later than the six years which are in view. The cost of these increases in men and in material during the next six years is estimated at 10,500,000*l* spread over that period above the previous estimates.

The facts set forth above were laid before the House of Commons on the 22nd July, 1912 by the First Lord of the Admiralty.

5. The effect of the new German navy law is to produce a remarkable expansion of strength and readiness. The number of battleships and large armoured cruisers which will be kept constantly ready and in full commission will be raised by the law from 21, the present figure, to 33—an addition of 12, or an increase of about 57 per cent.

The new fleet will, in the beginning, include about 20 battleships and large cruisers of the older type, but gradually as new vessels are built the fighting power of the fleet will rise until in the end it will consist completely of modern vessels.

The complete organization of the German fleet, as described by the latest law, will be 5 battle squadrons and a fleet flagship, comprising 41 battleships in all, each attended by a battle or armoured cruiser squadron, complete with small cruisers and auxiliaries of all kinds and accompanied by numerous flotillas of destroyers and submarines.

This full development will only be realised step by step; but already in 1914 2 squadrons will, according to Admiralty information, be entirely composed of what are called dreadnoughts, and the third will be made up of good ships like the 'Deutschlands' and the 'Braunschweigs,' together with 5 dreadnought battle cruisers.

This great fleet is not dispersed all over the world for duties of commerce protection or in discharge of Colonial responsibilities; nor are its composition and character adapted to those purposes. It is concentrated and kept concentrated in close proximity to the German and British coasts.

Attention must be drawn to the explicit declaration of the tactical objects for which the German fleet exists as set forth in the preamble to the naval law of 1900 as follows:—

"In order to protect German trade and commerce under existing conditions, only one thing will suffice, namely, Germany must possess a battle fleet of such strength that even for the most powerful naval adversary a war would involve such risks as to make that power's own supremacy doubtful. For this purpose it is not absolutely necessary that the German fleet should be as strong as that of the greatest naval power, for, as a rule, a great naval power will not be in a position to concentrate all its forces against us."

6. It is now necessary to look forward to the situation in 1915.

In Home Waters.

In the spring of the year 1915—

Great Britain will have 25 dreadnought battleships and 2 'Lord Nelsons.'

Germany will have 17 dreadnought battleships.

Great Britain will have 6 battle cruisers.

Germany will have 6 battle cruisers.

These margins in new ships are sober and moderate. They do not err on the side of excess. The reason they suffice for the present is that Great Britain possesses a good superiority in battleships, and especially armoured cruisers, of the pre-dreadnought era.

The reserve of strength will steadily diminish every year, actually, because the ships of which it is composed grow old, and relatively, because the new ships are more powerful. It will diminish more rapidly if new construction in Germany is increased or accelerated. As this process continues, greater exertions will be required by the British Empire.

Mediterranean Station.

Four battle cruisers and four armoured cruisers will be required to support British interests in the Mediterranean during the years 1913 and 1914. During those years the navies of Austria and Italy will gradually increase in strength, until in 1915 they will each possess a formidable fleet of 4 and 6 dreadnought battleships respectively, together with strong battleships of the pre-dreadnought types and other units, such as cruisers, torpedo-craft, &c. It is evident, therefore, that in the year 1915 our squadron of 4 battle cruisers and 4 armoured cruisers will not suffice to fulfil our requirements, and its whole composition must be re-considered.

Overseas.

It has been necessary within the past decade to concentrate the fleet mainly in home waters.

In 1902 there were 160 British vessels on the overseas stations against 76 to-day.

7. Naval supremacy is of two kinds: general and local. General naval supremacy con-

sists in the power to defeat in battle and drive from the seas the strongest hostile navy or combination of hostile navies wherever they may be found. Local superiority consists in the power to send in good time to, or maintain permanently in some distant theatre forces adequate to defeat the enemy or hold him in check until the main decision has been obtained in the decisive theatre. It is the general naval supremacy of Great Britain which is the primary safeguard of the security and interests of the great dominions of the Crown, and which for all these years has been the deterrent upon any possible designs prejudicial to or inconsiderate of their policy and safety.

The rapid expansion of Canadian sea-borne trade, and the immense value of Canadian cargoes always afloat in British and Canadian bottoms, here require consideration. On the basis of the figures supplied by the Board of Trade to the Imperial Conference of 1911, the annual value of the overseas trade of the Dominion of Canada in 1909-10 was not less than £72,000,000, and the tonnage of Canadian vessels was 718,000 tons, and these proportions have already increased and are still increasing. For the whole of this trade wherever it may be about the distant waters of the world, as well as for the maintenance of her communications, both with Europe and Asia, Canada is dependent, and has always depended upon the Imperial navy, without corresponding contribution or cost.

Further, at the present time and in the immediate future Great Britain still has the power, by making special arrangements and mobilizing a portion of the reserves, to send, without courting disaster at home, an effective fleet of battleships and cruisers to unite with the Royal Australian navy and the British squadrons in China and the Pacific for the defence of British Columbia, Australia and New Zealand. And these communities are also protected and their interests safeguarded by the power and authority of Great Britain so long as her naval strength is unbroken.

8. This power, both specific and general, will be diminished with the growth not only of the German navy, but by the simultaneous building by many powers of great modern ships of war.

Whereas, in the present year, Great Britain possesses 18 battleships and battle-cruisers of the dreadnought class against 19 of that class possessed by the other powers of Europe, and will possess in 1913, 24 to 21, the figures in 1914 will be 31 to 33; and in the year 1915, 35 to 51.

The existence of a number of navies all comprising ships of high quality must be considered in so far as it affects the possibilities of adverse combinations being suddenly formed. Larger margins of superiority at home would, among other things, restore a greater freedom to the movements of the British squadrons in every sea, and directly promote the security of the Dominions.

Anything which increases our margin in the newest ships diminishes the strain and augments our security and our chances of being left unmolested.

9. Whatever may be the decision of Canada at the present juncture, Great Britain will not in any circumstances fail in her duty to the overseas dominions of the Crown.

Mr. BORDEN.

She has before now successfully made head alone and unaided against the most formidable combinations and she has not lost her capacity by a wise policy and strenuous exertions to watch over and preserve the vital interests of the Empire.

The Admiralty are assured that His Majesty's Government will not hesitate to ask the House of Commons for whatever provision the circumstances of each year may require. But the aid which Canada could give at the present time is not to be measured only in ships or money. Any action on the part of Canada to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy, and thus widen the margin of our common safety, would be recognized everywhere as a most significant witness to the united strength of the Empire, and to the renewed resolve of the overseas dominions to take their part in maintaining its integrity.

10. The Prime Minister of the Dominion having inquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective, we have no hesitation in answering after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

In this twentieth century of Christianity, in this age which boasts of its civilization, the increasing tendency of the nations to arm themselves against each other is not only regrettable, but depressing and alarming. May the day soon approach when international differences will be settled by appeal to a tribunal established by international authority, and so constituted that its decrees will unfailingly command respect and obedience. But while war is still the supreme arbiter between the nations, we to whose care this vast heritage has been committed must never forget that we are the trustees of its security.

Do Canadians sufficiently realize the disparity between the naval risks of our Empire and those of any other nation? The armies of continental Europe number their men by the million, not by the thousand. They are highly equipped and organized; the whole population have undergone military training, and any one of these countries is absolutely secure against invasion from Great Britain, which could not send an expeditionary force of more than one hundred and fifty thousand men, at the highest estimate. Such a force would be outnumbered twenty to one by any of the great European powers. This Empire is not a great military power, and it has based its security in the past as in the present almost entirely on the strength of the navy. A crushing defeat upon the high seas would render the British islands or any of the dominions subject to invasion by any great military power. The loss of such a decisive battle by Great Britain would practically destroy the United Kingdom, shatter the British Empire to its foundation, and

change profoundly the destiny of its component parts. The advantages which Great Britain could gain from defeating the naval forces of any other power would be non-existent except in so far as the result would insure the safety of the Empire. On the other hand, there are practically no limits to the ambitions which might be indulged in by other powers if the British navy were once destroyed or disabled. There is, therefore, grave cause for concern when once the naval supremacy of the Empire seems on the point of being successfully challenged.

The great outstanding fact which arrests our attention in considering the existing conditions of naval power is this: Twelve years ago the British navy and the British flag were predominant in every ocean of the world and along the shores of every continent. To-day they are predominant nowhere except in the North Sea. The paramount duty of ensuring safety in home waters has been fulfilled by withdrawing or reducing squadrons in every part of the world, and by concentrating nearly all the effective naval forces in close proximity to the British islands. In 1902 there were fifty-five British warships on the Mediterranean station; to-day there are nineteen. There were fourteen on the North America and West Indies station; to-day there are three. There were three on the southeast coast of South Africa; to-day there is one. There were sixteen on the Cape of Good Hope station; to-day there are three. There were eight on the Pacific station; to-day there are two. There were forty-two on the China station; to-day there are thirty-one. There were twelve on the Australian station; to-day there are eight. There were ten on the East Indies station; to-day there are nine. Or, to sum up, in 1902 there were one hundred and sixty ships on foreign and colonial stations against seventy-six to-day.

Do not imagine that this result has been brought about by any reduction in expenditure, for the case is precisely the reverse. Great Britain's total naval expenditure in 1902 was less than $152,000,000. For the present fiscal year it will exceed $220,000,000. Why, then, has the naval force of the Empire been so enormously reduced throughout the world, while at the same time the expenditure has increased by nearly fifty per cent? For the simple reason that the increasing strength of other navies, and especially of the German navy, has compelled Great Britain not only to increase her fleet, but to concentrate it in the vicinity of the British islands; and there has been, of course, a substantial increase of strength in home waters. In short, the strain of meeting changed conditions has been so heavy and unceasing that, in spite of largely increased expenditure and every possible exertion, the Admiralty have been compelled by pressure of circumstances to withdraw or diminish forces throughout the world which in time of peril safeguarded the security and integrity of the King's dominions and in time of peace were a living and visible symbol of the tie that unites all the subjects of the Crown.

It is neither necessary nor desirable in this place to debate or discuss the probability or imminence of war. The real test of our action is the existence or non-existence of absolute security. We cannot afford to be satisfied with anything less than that, for the risks are too great. It should never be forgotten that without war, without the firing of a shot or the striking of a blow, our naval supremacy may disappear, and with it the sole guarantee of the Empire's continued existence. I especially desire to emphasize this consideration; for all history, and especially modern history, conveys to us many grave warnings that the issue of great events may be determined, and often is determined, not by actual war resulting in victory or defeat, but by the mere existence of unmistakable and pronounced naval or military superiority on either side.

The fact that trade routes, vital to the Empire's continued existence, are inadequately defended and protected, by reason of necessary concentration in home waters, is exceedingly impressive and even startling. Even during the present year the battleships of the British Mediterranean fleet based on Malta have been withdrawn and based on Gibraltar in order that they might become more easily available if necessary for aid in home waters. The Atlantic fleet based on Gibraltar has been withdrawn to the vicinity of the British Islands for the same reason. Under such conditions the British flag is not predominant in the Mediterranean, and, with every available exertion on the part of the whole Empire, it will be impossible to regain the necessary position of strength in that great highway before 1915 or 1916. Austria-Hungary, with only one hundred and forty miles of sea coast, and with absolutely no colonial possessions, is building in the Mediterranean a formidable fleet of dreadnoughts which will attain its full strength in about three years, and which will be supported by strong battleships of the pre-dreadnought type, and by cruisers, torpedo craft, and other necessary auxiliaries. The fleet of Italy in the same theatre will be even more powerful and more formidable.

The withdrawal of the British flag and the British navy from so many parts of the world for the purpose of concentration in home waters

has been necessary but unfortunate. Our navy was once dominant everywhere, and the white ensign was the token of naval supremacy in all the seas. Is it not time that the former conditions should in some measure be restored? Upon our own coasts, both Atlantic and Pacific, powerful squadrons were maintained twelve years ago. To-day the flag is not shown on either seaboard. I am assured that the aid which we propose will enable such special arrangements to be consummated that, without courting disaster at home, an effective fleet of battleships and cruisers can be established in the Pacific, and a powerful squadron can periodically visit our Atlantic seaboard, to assert once more the naval strength of the Empire along these coasts. I do not forget, however, that it is the general naval supremacy of the Empire which primarily safeguards the overseas dominions. New Zealand's battleship is ranged in line with the other British battleships in the North Sea because there New Zealand's interests may be best guarded by protecting the very heart of the Empire.

In presenting our proposals, it will be borne in mind that we are not undertaking or beginning a system of regular and periodical contributions. I agree with the resolution of this House in 1909, that the payment of such contributions would not be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

Upon the information which I have disclosed to the House, the situation is in my opinion sufficiently grave to demand immediate action. We have asked His Majesty's Government in what form temporary and immediate aid can best be given by Canada at this juncture. The answer has been unhesitating and unequivocal. Let me again quote it:

> We have no hesitation in answering after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

Upon inquiry as to the cost of such a battleship, we are informed by the Admiralty that it is approximately £2,350,000 including armament and first outfit of ordnance stores and ammunition. The total cost of three such battleships, which when launched will be the most powerful in the world, would be approximately $35,000,000, and we ask the people of Canada through their Parliament to grant that sum to His Majesty the King of Great Britain and Ireland and of the overseas dominions, in order to increase the effective naval forces of the Empire, to safeguard our shores and our seaborne commerce, and to make secure the common heritage of all who owe allegiance to the King.

These ships will be at the disposal of His Majesty the King for the common defence of the Empire. They will be maintained and controlled as part of the Royal navy; and we have the assurance that if at any time in the future it should be the will of the Canadian people to establish a Canadian unit of the Royal navy, these vessels can be recalled by the Canadian Government to form part of that unit. in which case, of course, they would be maintained by Canada and not by Great Britain. In that event, there would necessarily be reasonable notice of such recall; and, indeed, Canada would not desire or suggest the sudden withdrawal of so powerful a contingent from any important theatre in which the naval forces of the Empire might be exposed to severe and sudden attack. In the meantime, I am assured that special arrangements will be made to give Canadians the opportunity of serving as officers on these ships.

Without intending or desiring to indulge in controversial discussion, I may be permitted to allude to British naval organization. Obviously, one could not make a very complete or thorough study of so great an organization in a few weeks, or even a few months; but during recent years, and especially during the past summer, I have had occasion to learn something of its methods, its character, and its efficiency, and good reason to conclude that it is undoubtedly the most thorough and effective in the world. There have been proposals, to which I shall no more than allude, that we should build up a great naval organization in Canada. In my humble opinion, nothing of an efficient character could be built up in this country within a quarter or perhaps half a century. Even then it would be but a poor and weak substitute for that splendid organization which the Empire already possesses, and which has been evolved and built up through centuries of the most searching experience and of the highest endeavour. Is there really any need that we should undertake the hazardous and costly experiment of building up a naval organization especially restricted to this Dominion, when upon just and self-respecting terms we can take such part as we desire in naval defence through the existing naval organization of the Empire, and in that way fully and effectively avail ourselves of the men and the resources at the command of Canada ?

Where shall these ships be built ? They will be built under Admiralty supervision in the United Kingdom, for the reason that at present there are no adequate facilities for constructing them in Canada. The

plant required for the construction of a dreadnought battleship is enormous, and it would be impossible at present to maintain shipbuilding in this country on such a scale. In any case, only the hull could be built in Canada; because the machinery, the armour, and the guns would necessarily be constructed or manufactured in the United Kingdom. The additional cost of construction in Canada would be about $12,000,000 for the three ships, and it would be impossible to estimate the delay. No one is more eager than myself for the development of shipbuilding industries in Canada, but we cannot, upon any business or economic considerations, begin with the construction of dreadnoughts; and especially we could not do so when these ships are urgently required within two or three years at the outside, for rendering aid upon which may depend the Empire's future existence.

According to my conception, the effective development of shipbuilding industries in Canada must commence with small beginnings and in a businesslike way. I have discussed this subject with the Admiralty, and they thoroughly realize that it is not to the Empire's advantage that all shipbuilding facilities should be concentrated in the United Kingdom. I am assured, therefore, that the Admiralty are prepared in the early future to give orders for the construction in Canada of small cruisers, oil-tank vessels, and auxiliary craft of various kinds. The plant required is relatively small as compared with that which is necessary for a dreadnought battleship, and such an undertaking would have a much more secure and permanent basis from a business standpoint. For the purpose of stimulating so important and necessary an industry, we have expressed our willingness to bear a portion of the increased cost for a time at least. I see no reason why all vessels required in the future for our Government service should not be built in Canada, even at some additional cost. In connection with the development of shipbuilding, I should not be surprised to see the establishment of a higher class of engineering works, which would produce articles now imported and not presently manufactured in Canada. Therefore, although the sum which we propose to devote for necessary naval aid at this critical juncture is to be expended in Great Britain, yet we believe that this step will result, under the conditions which I have described, in very marked development of more than one industry in Canada, and that, even from a purely economic and material standpoint, the step has much to commend it.

These ships will constitute an aid brought by the Canadian people to His Majesty the King as a token of their determination to maintain the integrity of the Empire and to assist in repelling any danger which may threaten its security. It is most appropriate that the opportunity should have come when the Crown is represented in Canada by His Royal Highness the Governor General, who has rendered such valuable and eminent service to the State, and who takes so deep and splendid an interest in all that concerns the welfare and safety of every portion of His Majesty's Dominions. Canada is sending these ships to range themselves in the battle line of the Empire with those of the Mother Country, of Australia, and of New Zealand. They will be the three most powerful battleships in the world, and they will bear historic names associated with this country. Thus, every Canadian will realize, in seeing or reading of these ships, that they are a gift in which he has participated, and that, by their presence in the battle line of the Empire, he has freely taken a direct and distinct share in maintaining the Empire's safety.

No modern nation possessing a great seaborne commerce can afford to neglect its interest upon the high seas. Heaven forbid that in this country we should aid or abet any warlike or aggresive tendencies. This Empire will never undertake any war of aggression, and all the influences of Canada will assuredly be arrayed against any such course; but we know that war has come many times within the past fifty years without warning, like a thunderbolt from a clear sky, and thereby the power, the influence, and the destiny of more than one nation have been profoundly affected. A naval war especially may come with startling suddenness, for these tremendous engines of war are always ready and prepared for battle. The security, indeed the very existence, of this Empire depends on sea power. When we are obliged to abdicate the seas, it may even be without war, but in the face of overwhelming force, the Empire's arteries will no longer pulsate, the blood will cease to flow in its veins and dissolution will be at hand.

But if we should neglect a duty which I conceive we owe to ourselves, and if irreparable disaster should ensue, what would be our future destiny? Obviously, as an independent nation or as an important part of the great neighbouring republic. What, then, would be our responsibilities, and what the burden upon us for a protection on the high seas much less powerful and less effective than that which we enjoy to-day? Take the case of one nation whose territory, resources, population and wealth may fairly be compared with those of Canada. The naval estimates of Argentina for four years, from 1909 to 1912 inclusive, amounted to $35,000,000. In addition

to this, the Parliament of Argentina voted during the same four years for special naval and military purposes more than $40,000,000. No information is available as to the exact proportion of the last mentioned sum which was appropriated for naval purposes, but it is understood that the greater portion was for naval construction. It is safe, therefore, to estimate that during the past four years Argentina has expended for naval purposes not less than sixty-five to seventy million dollars. The federal and state expenditure of the United States comprises a total annual outlay for armament of between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000, or at the rate of $2.75 per head. A similar expenditure by Canada would mean an annual outlay of some $20,000,000 or $25,000,000, or between eighty and one hundred million dollars during the same period.

It is apparent, therefore, that the aid which we propose to bring at this juncture is of a moderate and reasonable character. For forty-five years as a confederation we have enjoyed the protection of the British navy without the cost of a dollar, and I venture to submit my firm conviction that this assistance freely tendered by the people of Canada through their parliament is due to their own self-respect.

So far as official estimates are available, the expenditure of Great Britain in naval and military defence for the provinces which now constitute Canada, during the nineteenth century, was not less than $400,000,000. Even since the inception of our confederation, and since Canada has attained the status of a great Dominion, the amount so expended by Great Britain for the naval and military defence of Canada vastly exceeds the sum which we are now asking parliament to appropriate. From 1870 to 1890 the proportionate cost of North Atlantic squadrons which guarded our coasts was from $125,000,000 to $150,000,000. From 1853 to 1903 Great Britain's expenditure on military defence in Canada runs closely up to one hundred million dollars.

Has the protection of the flag and the prestige of the Empire meant anything for us during all that period? Hundreds of illustrations are at hand, but let me give just two. During a period of disorder in a distant country, a Canadian citizen was unjustifiably arrested and fifty lashes were laid on his back. Appeal was made to Great Britain, and with what result? A public apology was made to him, and fifty pounds were paid for every lash. In time of dangerous riot and wild terror in a foreign city a Canadian religious community remained unafraid. 'Why did you not fear?' they were asked, and unhesitatingly came the answer, 'The Union Jack floated above us.'

I have alluded to the difficulty of finding an acceptable basis upon which the great dominions, co-operating with the Mother Country in defence, can receive and assert an adequate voice in the control and moulding of foreign policy. We were brought closely in touch with both subjects when we met the British ministers in the Committee of Imperial Defence. That committee is peculiarly constituted, but in my judgment is very effective. It consists of the Prime Minister of Great Britain and of such persons as he may summon to attend it. Practically all the members of the Cabinet from time to time attend its deliberations, and usually the more important members of the Cabinet are present. In addition, the naval and military experts and technical officers of the various departments concerned are in attendance. A very large portion of the committee's work is carried on by sub-committees, which are often composed in part of persons who are not members of the general committee itself, and who are selected for their special knowledge of the subjects to be considered and reported upon. The amount of work which has thus been performed, during the past five or six years in particular, is astonishing, and I have no doubt that it has contributed largely to the future safety of the whole Empire in time of peril. The committee is not technically or constitutionally responsible to the House of Commons, and thus it is not supposed to concern itself with policy. As so many important members of the Cabinet are summoned to attend the committee, its conclusions are usually accepted by the Cabinet, and thus command the support of a majority of the House of Commons. While the committee does not control policy in any way, and could not undertake to do so, as it is not responsible to Parliament, it is necessarily obliged constantly to consider foreign policy and foreign relations, for the obvious reason that defence, and especially naval defence, is inseparably connected with such consideration.

I am assured by His Majesty's Government that, pending a final solution of the question of voice and influence, they would welcome the presence in London of a Canadian minister during the whole or a portion of each year. Such minister would be regularly summoned to all meetings of the Committee of Imperial Defence, and would be regarded as one of its permanent members. No important step in foreign policy would be undertaken without consultation with such a representative of Canada. This seems a very marked advance, both from our standpoint and from that of the United Kingdom. It would give

to us an opportunity of consultation, and therefore an influence which hitherto we have not possessed. The conclusions and declarations of Great Britain in respect to foreign relations could not fail to be strengthened by the knowledge that such consultation and co-operation with the overseas dominions had become an accomplished fact.

No thoughtful man can fail to realize that very complex and difficult questions confront those who believe that we must find a basis of permanent co-operation in naval defence, and that any such basis must afford to the overseas dominions an adequate voice in the moulding and control of foreign policy. It would have been idle to expect, and indeed we did not expect, to reach in the few weeks at our disposal during the past summer a final solution of that problem, which is not less interesting than difficult, which touches most closely the future destiny of the Empire, and which is fraught with even graver significance for the British islands than for Canada. But I conceive that its solution is not impossible; and, however difficult the task may be, it is not the part of wisdom or of statesmanship to evade it. And so we invite the statesmen of Great Britain to study with us this, the real problem of Imperial existence.

The next ten or twenty years will be pregnant with great results for this Empire, and it is of infinite importance that questions of purely domestic concern, however urgent, shall not prevent any of us from rising " to the height of this great argument." But to-day, while the clouds are heavy and we hear the booming of the distant thunder, and see the lightning flashes above the horizon, we cannot and we will not wait and deliberate until any impending storm shall have burst upon us in fury and with disaster. Almost unaided, the motherland not for herself alone, but for us as well, is sustaining the burden of a vital Imperial duty, and confronting an overmastering necessity of national existence. Bringing the best assistance that we may in the urgency of the moment, we come thus to her aid, in token of our determination to protect and ensure the safety and integrity of this Empire, and of our resolve to defend on sea as well as on land our flag, our honour, and our heritage.

Mr. SPEAKER: I assume, in connection with this Bill, that the right hon. the Prime Minister has considered the question of a resolution which must either follow or precede the introduction of a Bill of this nature. I have not had time to examine the Bill; therefore I am not prepared at the moment, to say whether it should or should not be preceded by a resolution.

Mr. BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, the resolution which is necessary in connection with the Bill has been submitted to His Royal Highness the Governor General. His Royal Highness has been pleased to approve of the resolution, which is exactly in the same terms as the Bill, and to recommend it to the consideration of this House under the provisions of the British North America Act.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise with any intention of discussing now the very important measure which has been submitted to the House by my right hon. friend. Indeed, under the rules of the House as interpreted by you, Sir, there should be no discussion on the first reading of any Bill. With regard to the point of order which you have just stated, I think that my hon. friend is in order in stating that the details of the Bill should not be discussed until the resolution is brought down. The money consideration, important as it is, is not the chief consideration, and I have no fault to find with my hon. friend in introducing the Bill before bringing down the resolution.

I thoroughly appreciate, as I am sure will other hon. gentlemen, the very temperate manner in which my hon. friend has presented the measure which has just been laid before the House. We may not concur with him in all things; but that will be the subject of further discussion on another occasion. I am glad to tell him that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, though differing with him in other matters, share his devotion and loyalty to the British Empire.

An important feature of the speech delivered by my hon. friend is the memorandum which has been laid before the House; and the people of the country will be glad to know that we have not now to deal with any emergency, or any immediate danger, but with that new condition existing not only in Europe and in the British Empire, but all over the world —the tendency towards excessive armament.

I have no further observations to make at present, Mr. Speaker, but will defer any additional remarks until the second reading of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. HAZEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 22, respecting the harbour

commissioners of Montreal. He said: This Bill is an amendment to the Act constituting the harbour commissioners of Montreal. Some little friction has arisen in the past owing to the fact that that part of the St. Lawrence channel within the harbour of Montreal does not come under the jurisdiction of the harbour commissioners, but is under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. It is thought better to place the entire harbour of Montreal, including the ship channel, under the control of the harbour commissioners, and this Bill has been introduced after consultation with and with the approval of that body. There are a few other amendments embodied in the Bill of a more or less important character. The jurisdiction of the Montreal harbour commissioners originally extended for many miles down the St. Lawrence river. They had control not only over the harbour of Montreal, but over other harbours on the river below what now constitutes the limits of Montreal harbour. In order to avoid the possibility of any misunderstanding in the future, it has been thought advisable to so amend the Act that the jurisdiction of the present harbour commissioners will extend only over the harbour of Montreal. These are the principal features of the Bill.

Mr. MACDONALD: Before the motion is put, would the Minister of Marine and Fisheries tell the House whether any appointments have been made to fill the vacancies in the present Montreal Harbour Commission?

Mr. HAZEN: There are no vacancies in the present board. The members of the board have handed in their resignations, to become effective on the last day of the present month of December, and before that date commissioners will be appointed to fill the vacancies, and they will commence their duties on the first day of January next.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

HOURS OF LABOUR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. VERVILLE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 23, respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works. He said: This is a Bill somewhat similar to one presented by me in 1910, but withdrawn on account of certain objections having been raised. I hope that when it comes up for a second reading, it will receive the same support from the members of the Government that it did when they were in opposition.

Mr. HAZEN.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. EMMERSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. There appears in 'Hansard' of yesterday, at page 650, what is intended as an answer to certain questions I put to the ministers with respect to the Intercolonial railway management, and the rumour of a change in connection therewith. The last question put by me was as to whether any member of the Government, the Minister of Railways, or the Department of Railways, had authorized certain statements which had been made with respect to a proposal or intention to change the method of management of the Intercolonial railway. The answer furnished to the House by the minister and placed on 'Hansard' is:

> Not in so far as this department is concerned.

While the answer is in the negative with respect to the department, there is no answer on behalf of the Minister of Railways or of any member of the Government. As this is an important question, particularly in the eastern part of Canada, I think it is due to the House and to the country that we should be informed whether any authority was given for the statement that was alleged to have been made in connection with the proposed change.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member could scarcely, by any stretch of reasoning, convert that into a question of privilege. As an old parliamentarian, I assume it would be in order for him to ask a question.

Mr. EMMERSON: With all due deference, I want to conform myself to the rules. As a member of Parliament I thought I was entitled to have an answer to the question and I wanted to call the attention of the minister to the fact that neither of questions 3 and 4 had been answered.

Mr. COCHRANE: I may say to the hon. gentleman that if he will hold himself in peace for a while, he will probably know all about it.

Mr. EMMERSON: I do not think I am entitled to that treatment at the hands of the minister. It is within my rights as a member to courteously ask a question and to receive a courteous reply.

Mr. BORDEN: The hon. gentleman is altogether too sensitive. I did not hear any lack of courtesy in the reply.

Mr. COCHRANE: There was none intended.

Mr. BORDEN: The Minister of Railways informed the hon. member that the information will be furnished him in due course.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. BORDEN: I beg pardon; I heard the language myself. The minister said to possess himself in patience, and the information would be forthcoming in due course. That is what my hon. friend said. The difficulty is due to the defective hearing of my hon. friend, and not to any lack of courtesy on the part of the Minister of Railways.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The question in 'Hansard' was not put to the Minister of Railways, but to all members of the Government. The answer is not a full answer to the question; it relates only to the Department of Railways, while the question relates to the whole Government, and when my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) was asked to hold himself in patience, I do not think it was courteous to him.

Mr. COCHRANE: The answer was signed by the deputy minister, as nearly all answers are, and the information was correct: That Mr. Siddal had not been informed by the department or by the minister to that effect.

Mr. EMMERSON: The question is: Was he authorized by any member of the Government?

Mr. COCHRANE: That means by the minister of that department, does it not?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The difficulty is that my hon. friend has answered so far as his department is concerned; but that is all; the other ministers have not answered.

Mr. BORDEN: The Minister of Railways has certainly done his duty. If there is any fault, it is with the other members of the Government who have not done their duty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: When the minister told my hon. friend to hold himself in patience, he was not within his rights.

Mr. EMMERSON: The answer applies to the Department of Railways. The department state that they had not authorized such a statement, but I did not hear any answer with respect to the minister, or with respect to any other member of the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have this to say with regard to questions and answers submitted in the House, that both the English and, I think, the Canadian practice lays down a distinct rule that it is optional with the member who answers the question how he shall answer it. It is true that when the question is put, the member putting it is entitled as far as possible to a direct and correct answer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: And courteous.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes, courteous always, I believe; but what answer shall be given must be left to the judgment of the minister or of the member who gives the answer.

ALLEGED ERRONEOUS ANSWER.

Mr. OLIVER: In the answer given yesterday by the Minister of the Interior to a question by the hon. member from Regina (Mr. Martin), I think the minister will find that in the list of homestead inspectors holding office on September 21, those holding office in Alberta have been included as holding office in Saskatchewan. It may be that there is a corresponding error in the list of appointments. A correction may be necessary.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ST. CHARLES RIVER EMBANKMENT.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the Department of Public Works secured any tract of land at a point called La Canardière, along the embankment of St. Charles river, Quebec?
2. If so, when, at what cost, and for what purpose?

Mr. ROGERS: No.

TUG BOATS FOR GOVERNMENT DREDGE.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. Were tenders asked for tug boats to attend the Government dredge Cape Breton for the season of 1912?
2. If so, how many persons tendered, what are the names and addresses and the amount of each tender?
3. Was the lowest tender accepted? If not what was the reason for not accepting it?
4. Were any of the tenders accepted? If not, what was the reason?
5. What are the names of the tugs attending the Cape Breton for the season of 1912, and the names of the owners in each case, and the amount paid per day to each tug?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. J. W. Gordon, North Sydney, $29 and $30 per day; F. M. Kelly, North Sydney, $35 per day; D. Rudderham, North Sydney, $40 per day.
3. No. Mr. J. W. Gordon's tugs were not as suitable for the work required as the

others, and Mr. Rudderham's tug was worth twice as much as the others.

4. Yes.

5. E. M. Cates, owner F. M. Kelly, $35 per day, employed May 2nd to September 7th. Boonton, owner D. Rudderham, $40 per day.

THE CANADA-WEST INDIA TREATY.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

What are the tariff duties leviable in the British West India Islands which are parties to the Canadian-West India Trade treaty, upon all the articles mentioned in the schedules to the said treaty, and which may be imported from Canada under the preferential tariff rates set forth in said treaty or agreement?

The preparation of the answer to this question may entail a great deal of work, and possibly it might not be of very great use, so that I would be quite willing of the minister would place on the table of the House copies of the statistical memoranda which may have been furnished by either the West Indies Commissioners or his own department or any other department of the Government, and which are referred to in the proceedings of the Canada-West India Trade Conference and are not included in the publication.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto): They will be all laid on the table of the House.

Question dropped.

RAOUL DESCHAMPS.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is Mr. Raoul Deschamps in the employ of the Department of Public Works at Montreal? If so, what is his salary?

2. Has Mr. Raoul Deschamps any other employment in the office of Marine at Montreal?

3. If so, what are his duties and what is his salary?

Mr. HAZEN: The answer to the second question is no.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The first part can be dropped.

BOARDS OF CONCILIATION.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How many boards of conciliation and investigation, under the Industrial Disputes Investigation act, have been applied for since September 21, 1911?

2. How many applications were refused and by whom were these applications made?

3. What was the reason or reasons for refusal in each instance?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Twenty-six.

2. Six. (a) Industrial Workers of the World, being railway construction workers; (b) Order of Railroad Conductors and Brotherhood of Railroad Telegraphers, Canadian Pacific railway; (c) United Mine Workers of America, North Sydney, Nova Scotia; (d) United Mine Workers of America, Springhill, Nova Scotia; (e) Canadian Brotherhood of Railroad Employees, Canadian Pacific Railway Company; (f) Canadian Brotherhood of Railroad Employees, Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

3. None of these applications were brought within the provisions and intent of the Act.

TEMISCOUATA VETERANS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. How many applications to obtain the grant of $100 on account of the war of 1866-70 have come from the veterans in the county of Temiscouata?

2. How many have received this amount?

3. How many have been refused?

4. How many are there whose applications are still to be examined or suspended for more ample information?

5. Shall those who receive the grant have a right to the Service medal, if they have not one already, and has the minister given orders in consequence?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1, 2. 3 and 4. Applications are taken up in the order in which they have been received, and not by counties or regiments.

5. A person who has proved his title to a grant under the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act is entitled to the General Service Medal, and the same will be issued to him if applied for.

ESTEVAN HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. How many homestead inspectors were appointed to work in the Estevan land agency between September 21st, 1911, and July 11th 1912?

2. What are the names of the said homestead inspectors?

3. What salary is paid to each of the said inspectors?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. One.

2. Wm. Morrison.

3. $1,200 per annum.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has Mr. Robert Hendsbee, postmaster at Half Island Cove, Guysboro County, N. S., been dismissed?

2. If so, for what reason?

3. On whose complaint was the dismissal made?

4. Was there an investigation? If so, was Mr. Hendsbee notified, and what was the result?

Mr. PELLETIER: Charges of political partisanship having been made against the postmaster, a judical inquiry was ordered

by the Post Office Department; it was held and the commissioner reported that the charges had been proven. The postmaster was notified. As a result of the investigation, the postmaster was dismissed.

Mr. SINCLAIR :

1. Was an investigation held in the case of A. W. Salsman, postmaster at Middle Country Harbour, N.S?
2. If so, when and before whom was it held?
3. What are the names of the witnesses examined?
4. On whose complaint or request was such investigation instituted?
5. Did Mr. G. A. R. Rowlings recommend a man to take the place of Mr. Salsman as postmaster when the latter should be dismissed? If so, who?
6. Was the said recommendation acted upon? If not, why not?

Mr. PELLETIER :

1 and 2. Yes. Mr. H. P. Duchemin on the 22nd of August last.
3. H. Penton, M. Dixon, J. E. Mason, J. Hayne and Mr. Salsman.
4. On instructions of Post Office Department.
5 and 6. Under consideration.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has Mr. McCutcheon, postmaster, Sonora, Guysborough county, N.S., been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. On whose complaint was this dismissal made?
4. If for political partisanship what proof was before the department?
5. Was there an investigation? If so, before what officer and what was the result?
6. Who has been appointed in his place, and on whose recommendation?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. The postmaster was removed on representations which are considered as sufficient evidence that he had been an active political partisan, and consequently an investigation was not required.
6. Mr. C. Russell Burns, by order of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Who has been appointed postmaster at Tracadie Road, Guysborough county, N.S., in the place of John H. McPherson, deceased?
2. On whose recommendation was this appointment made?

Mr. PELLETIER: James Grant, by order of the Postmaster General.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has Elias Rowding, postmaster at Clementsport, Nova Scotia, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what cause?
3. At whose request?
4. Was there an investigation?
5. Was a petition received by the department asking for a change to be made?
6. If so, what are the names attached to said petition?
7. Who has been appointed to fill the vacancy caused by the dismissal of the said postmaster?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1, 2, 3 and 4. The postmaster was removed on representations which are considered as sufficient proof that the postmaster had been a political partisan, and, therefore, an investigation was not required.
5 and 6. No petition for the change was received.
7. Mrs. Ellen Ritchie.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What are the reasons for the dismissal of Gervais Carrier, postmaster of St. Gervais, county of Bellechasse?
2. At whose request was this dismissal made?
3. Was an inquiry held?
4. For how many years did he perform the duties of postmaster?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. Representations having been made, which were considered perfectly satisfactory, that the postmaster had been a political partisan, the Postmaster General directed his removal.
3. An inquiry was not required.
4. Since 1st June, 1878.

Mr CARROLL:

1. Has Miss Gertie Lewis been dismissed from the post office at Main-à-dieu, Cape Breton?
2. If so, what was the cause of her dismissal?
3. Who is the present incumbent of the post office there?
4. Were there any complaints made against Miss Lewis as such official?
5. If so, what were the complaints and by whom made?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1 and 2. It was found that the postmistress was unable to give the duties of the post office the necessary attention, owing to the fact that she was also employed as telegraph operator. The matter was made the subject of official enquiry, and, as the postmistress would not assure the department that she would keep the office open regularly and give the duties proper attention, a new appointment was made to the postmastership.
3. Miss Mary Scott.
4 and 5. See answer to Nos. 1 and 2.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What are the reasons for the dismissal of the postmaster of St. Ferdinand de Beaurivage, county of Levis?
2. By whom has he been replaced?

3. What are the additional expenses to the Post Office Department caused by this change?
4. Who requested this change?

Mr. PELLETIER: There is no post office named St. Ferdinand de Beaurivage in the county of Levis, or elsewhere in Canada.

Mr. CARROLL:

1. Has Mrs. Annie Gallivan been dismissed as keeper of the post office at Whitney Pier, Cape Breton?
2. If so, what was the cause of her dismissal?
3. Who is the present incumbent of the office there?
4. Were there any complaints made against Mrs. Gallivan as such official?
5. If so, what were the complaints and by whom made?

Mr. PELLETIER: In November, 1901, the post office inspector reported that the postmaster of Whitney Pier had removed his office to a new location, which was, however, more convenient than the former site, and that the postmaster stated also that the former office did not afford proper accommodation. The postmaster was, however, dismissed for changing the site of his office without official sanction, and another person was appointed in his stead. As it was clearly unjust to dismiss the postmaster for removing his office to a more suitable location, and one that was approved by the inspector, it has been deemed right to restore the office to its former location and reinstate Mr. Peter J. Carlin, the former postmaster.

FREE IMPORTATION OF HAY.

Mr. EMMERSON: Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to bring to the attention of the Government, and particularly of the Minister of Railways—who unfortunately is not in his seat, but I trust the Prime Minister will communicate my remarks to him—the following telegram:

December 4, 1912.

H. R. Emmerson, Ottawa.

Rumor says Minister of Railways granting Eastern counties free transportation for hay on account of shortage there. Hay growers here protest that present rates already give Quebec growers unfair advantage, but that free transportation even to all concerned would result in considerable loss and great injustice to growers and dealers in this and adjoining counties.

WM. FAWCETT,
ASHLEY GEORGE,
WM. CAMPBELL.

This is somewhat urgent, because if any action is taken in the direction indicated, it would no doubt be taken immediately. I present it simply as an expression of views of parties who are interested as growers of hay in the counties of Westmorland and Cumberland. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) would know the gentlemen who have signed that telegram, and he will realize that it is considered by them, at least, as a matter of some importance.

Mr. RHODES: As to information on that point, perhaps the hon. member for Westmorland would get in touch with the hon. member for Antigonish.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I would direct the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that I have had a couple of questions on the Order Paper since the 26th of November. These questions read:

1. Is it the intention of the Railway Department to allow free transportation of hay over the Intercolonial railway from the province of Quebec to the Eastern counties of Nova Scotia, or any of them?
2. What relief, if any, in the matter of freight rates on hay to be carried over the Intercolonial railway for the farmers of the Eastern counties of Nova Scotia is proposed?

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is anticipating a notice on the Order Paper.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I am merely directing the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that this and other questions bearing on the subject have not been answered and I would ask the Prime Minister to have them answered at the earliest possible moment. This is a matter of urgency, and——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is clearly out of order. Now that he has drawn attention to the matter, it is quite out of place to discuss it.

Mr. BORDEN: I understand the Minister of Railways has the matter under consideration, but I do not know if he has yet arrived at any conclusion. The hon. member will get an answer as soon as it is available.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): We would like to have an answer as soon as possible, because the farmers want to make other arangements if the decision of the Minister of Railways is not favourable.

CANADIAN NEWS FROM ENGLAND.

Mr. GRAHAM: I wish to refer to an item which concerns me particularly, and which will be interesting to the people of Canada and Great Britain, in the direction of letting them know what kind of news is often sent back and forth between the two countries. I hold in my hand a copy of the Canadian Mail of Saturday, November 23, which has a paragraph referring to the various by-elections held in Canada.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is the hon. member rising to a question of privilege? Otherwise he is out of order.

Mr. GRAHAM: It is a question of privilege, because it refers to myself, as I will show before I get through. It states:

It will be noted that the Conservatives have lost no seats and gained one, and the gain is put down as South Renfrew.

The falsity of this is self-evident.

THE DUKE OF CONNAUGHT DRY DOCK

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs to what I think is a matter of public importance in regard to his answer to a question which I placed on the Order Paper. It is in reference to the dry dock, the Duke of Connaught, which was recently brought to the port of Montreal. I asked as to the amount at which the dry dock had been valued for purposes of duty, and what amount of duty was paid. The answer was that no duty was paid on the dock, that she had been reported as a British built ship. I would ask my hon. friend the Minister of Customs if there is any correspondence upon the subject, and if he will be good enough to submit that correspondence to the House without its being especially moved for?

Mr. REID (Grenville): I have never had any correspondence on the matter, but I understand that a representative of the firm that owned the dry dock called at the department and discussed the matter with the Commissioner of Customs. The Commissioner of Customs informed me that this dry dock was registered in England as a vessel, and that it had arrived in at the port of Montreal and was registered there as a British vessel. The gentlemen who owned the dry dock claimed that it was not dutiable under the law.

Mr. HAZEN: I may say that the question of whether this dock should be registered as a ship or not came before my department. I asked the Department of Justice for an opinion on the matter, and I have the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice to the effect that this was a ship, and properly registered as such. I thought it strange that such was the case, but, on looking into the matter, I found that the English as well as the Canadian authorities hold this view. My hon. friend will remember one case which was within his own knowledge, namely, an action that arose between the Pilot Commissioners of St. John and the Cumberland Coal Company regarding certain barges that were loaded with coal, and then towed by tugs across the Bay of Fundy to St. John. The coal company paid pilotage on these barges. They then ceased to pay pilotage, and brought an action against the Pilot Commissioners of St. John to recover the money they had paid, claiming that these barges were not ships within the meaning of the Act. The Supreme Court of New Brunswick, Chief Justice Tuck, dissenting, decided in favour of the Cumberland Coal Company. The Supreme Court of Canada unanimously sustained the judgment of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick. The case then went to the Privy Council, and they reversed the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada and of the Supreme Court of New Brunswick, and, concurring with the view of Chief Justice Tuck, decided that these barges were ships, and liable to pay pilotage dues. The question as to what was a ship was fully discussed in that judgment. There are other cases in the English courts, and they are all to the effect that anything that is hollowed out so as to be able to float upon the water, to carry cargo, and that requires people on board it is a ship. They decided that in the pilotage case. Now, this dry dock is so constructed that at any time it could be taken up or down the St. Lawrence river. It is so constructed that it can be operated by machinery on board itself, and is built with the design that it can be towed down to the scene of a wreck; and, if the wrecked vessel cannot be propelled under its own steam, it can be put on the dry dock, and the dry dock, with the vessel on board, can be taken to a port where the vessel can be repaired. For instance, in the case of the Royal George, if it were found desirable to place her in the dry dock, and she was not able to proceed to Montreal under her own steam, the dock would be taken to the scene of the wreck, the Royal George would be placed upon it and then it would be taken back again, and so the ship could be repaired in Montreal. I was surprised to find that such was the decision, but I have the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice on file in my office, and I should be pleased to show it to my hon. friend at any time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps my hon. friend will be good enough to lay the opinion on the table.

Mr. HAZEN: I will be very happy to.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That matter is greatly—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order, as there is no question before the House. He can speak only with the permission of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have no doubt the House will give their permission.

Mr. HAZEN: I think my hon. friend is in error that this dock was registered in England as a ship. I think it was registered when it came here.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I was very much surprised to learn the way it was registered. The case to which my hon. friend refers, of the barges used by the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company, is, I think, not at all applicable to this case. There the sole question was as to whether or not these barges could be propelled without outside assistance. It was upon that question that the liability to pay pilotage dues turned. Nobody ever disputed that these barges were vessels, because they were used for carrying coal from one point of the Dominion to another, or in the coasting trade, but this is a very different structure. It is intended to be placed permanently in one locality, and is for the purpose of repairing vessels. It is not intended for transportation of merchandise or passengers from one part of Canada to another, and to me it is a great surprise that the Deputy Minister of Justice has expressed the opinion he has.

I want to speak in reference to another matter. When the question of subsidy of the Vickers-Maxim Company came before my department, in estimating the cost upon which a subsidy should be paid, it was expressly understood that duty on this dock would have to be paid. The Vickers-Maxim Company appealed to the late Minister of Finance, Mr. Fielding, and also to the late Minister of Customs, Mr. Templeman, for a remission of duty on the dock. They positively declined to make any such agreement, and therefore the duty was entered as a part of the cost when the subsidy was agreed upon. It is a matter of some four or five hundred thousand dollars, and if it is not right that that duty should be thrown off, it simply means that the treasury has been deprived of a vast amount of money, contrary to the understanding that was had with the late Minister of Customs and the late Minister of Finance, when the contract was entered into with respect to this dock.

Mr. HAZEN: I am very much surprised indeed to hear the statement made by the hon. gentleman, because the statement was made to me by a director of Vickers, Limited, was that they had a distinct understanding with the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs, to the effect that the dock would be admitted free of duty. I would also remind him of the fact that the point involved in the Cumberland Coal Company case was whether these barges were propelled by steam or not, and it was decided that they were propelled by steam, for the reason that they were propelled by a steam tug, and it was not necessary that the motive power should be on the barge.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is a very irregular procedure under the rules of the House. It seems to me that it has gone now to a sufficient length to justify me in asking that it be dropped.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Just a word as to the question of fact. Only a fortnight ago I was discussing the matter with the former Minister of Finance, and he informed me that he had distinctly declined to admit that the dock should be admitted free of duty

PRIVILEGE—Mr. RHODES.

Mr. E. N. RHODES (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the report of the proceedings of this House yesterday which appears in the Ottawa Citizen of this morning I find the following:

> Mr. Rhodes, of Nova Scotia, agreed that Colonel McCrae knew a good sheep when he saw one.

I have no objection to that part of the statement. So far as I know, it may be perfectly true. The report goes on:

> —And the whole industry, he thought, would go to ruin, unless access were gained to the United States market.

In view of the circumstance that within a comparatively short space of time 8,000 sheep have been brought into this country on the hoof from Montana, and that thousands of carcasses of New Zealand mutton are brought into British Columbia, I could hardly hold such views as are attributed to me by this paper. It is true the sheep brought into British Columbia are dead. But so is reciprocity. As a matter of fact, I think these remarks are more properly to be attributed to the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). In view of the overwhelming decision of the people of this country on the 21st of September, 1911, and of the circumstance that the hon. member for South Wellington, no doubt, realizes that he will be in opposition for many years, perhaps he felt that he might as well stand for reciprocity and be hung for a sheep as a lamb. I give an unqualified denial to this report, and state that my views are unalterably opposed to reciprocity.

DISMISSAL OF MR. JOHN RUTHERFORD.

Mr. TURRIFF: I would draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche) to the question I asked yesterday in regard to the dismissal of Mr. John Rutherford. Parts three and four of the question are not answered in 'Hansard' of to-day. It

will be sufficient if my hon. friend will give me an answer to these parts of the question.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS PROVIDENT FUND.

On motion of Mr. Borden, it was ordered that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend The Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway Employees' Provident Fund Act by providing that the board administering the fund may pay out of such fund the whole or any portion of the contribution thereto of any employee discharged from the service on or after April 1, 1907, on account of having been engaged in partisan work in connection with any Dominion or provincial election.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Mr. Hazen it was ordered that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Canada Shipping Act, Chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, and to provide (*a*) that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may give directions respecting the registration of wrecked ships and concerning the names of ships; and, (*b*) that the inspectors appointed under Part VII of the said Act, together with such other persons as the minister may appoint, shall form the board of steamboat inspection.

ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

On motion of Mr. Borden, it was ordered that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act, and to provide:

(a) That the Comptroller shall have the salary of a deputy head of a department.

(b) An increase to the salaries of officers and members of the force, the amounts not exceeding the following, namely:

Commissioner of police, per annum	$4,000 00
Each assistant commissioner, per annum	2,800 00
Each superintendent, per annum	2,200 00
Each inspector, per annum	1,600 00
Each surgeon, or veterinary surgeon, per annum	2,200 00
Each assistant surgeon, assistant veterinary surgeon, per annum	1,600 00
Three staff officers employed at headquarters; additional per annum	300 00
Eight staff sergeants, each per diem	2 50
Others, staff sergeants, each per diem	2 00
Other non-commissioned officers, per diem	1 75
Constables, per diem	1 25
Special constables and scouts, per diem	$2 50
Buglers, under eighteen years of age per diem	75
Working party of artisans and others specially employed, per diem	75

(c) That the Governor in Council may authorize extra pay and allowances to be paid to members of the force employed as detectives, and to those serving in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory.

REGULATION OF RADIOTELEGRAPHY.

On motion of Mr. Hazen it was ordered that the House go into Committee of the Whole to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide for the compulsory installation and inspection of radiotelegraph apparatus on certain ships, and for the general regulation of radiotelegraphy.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order for the second reading of Bill (No. 4) to amend the Bank Act.—Mr. Aikins.

Mr. GRAHAM: If I remember correctly, the Minister of Finance made a suggestion to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins) in reference to this, that it might get its first reading, and then be dropped if the minister has the same thing included in the Government Bill.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I spoke to the hon. member for Brandon, and he is agreeable to let the second reading stand until the Bank Bill is brought in.

DISMISSAL OF CUSTOMS OFFICERS.

Mr. MARCIL moved for:

Copy of all correspondence, complaints, petitions, memoranda, notes of evidence, letters, reports of investigations and other documents in the possession of the Department of Customs, relating to the dismissal of James S. Harvey, preventive officer, New Richmond, Quebec, W. L. Kempffer, preventive officer at Paspebiac, Quebec, J. Herbert Sweetman, preventive officer at Port Daniel, Quebec, J. B. Le Blanc, preventive officer, at Carleton, Quebec, J. Nadeau, preventive officer, Nouvelle, Quebec, as well as a copy of all recommendations made regarding the appointment of their various successors and the names, salaries, duties and residences, with a copy of their instructions.

Mr. BORDEN: The wording of this motion is somewhat unusual, as recommendations of this kind are often of a confidential character, and as such should not be brought down. Perhaps my hon. friend will make in his motion a slight amendment to that effect.

Mr. MARCIL: I certainly think we are entitled to any information obtainable regarding recommendations made in respect of appointments. If there are private and confidential communications made, possibly we would not be entitled to have them.

Mr. BORDEN: I would suggest that this motion be transferred to those subject to discussion. I have been told over and over again that recommendations of a confidential character should not be brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This seems to be brought up now for the first time.

Mr. SPEAKER: If this is a motion subject to discussion, it should be transferred to the debatable notices of motion.

Mr. MARCIL: Any documents on the public file would of course be brought down; any private recommendation would, I presume, not be on the public file. It is with that understanding that I make the motion.

Mr. BORDEN: That is satisfactory.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED NOTICES OF MOTION.

Return showing the number of appeals made to the Governor in Council during the twelve months preceding November 25, 1912, against orders of the Board of Railway Commissioners, the particulars of each appeal, and the decision rendered by the Governor in Council in each case.—Mr. Graham.

Copy of the original instructions, including maps, specifications, profiles, &c., furnished the engineers on the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway between Winnipeg and Quebec by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission and approved by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Also of all instructions, including specifications and profiles, issued by the chief engineer of the Transcontinental Commission or by the chairman, since October 31, 1911, which in any vary, amend, or depart from the original instruction above mentioned. Also, of all correspondence between the Minister of Railways or any official of his department and the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission, or the chief engineer, concerning the departure from the original instructions, either as to the grades, curves and bridges or other permanent structures. Also a copy of all correspondence between the Minister of Railways or any member of the Government and any official of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company referring to change of original instructions as regards grades, curves or permanent structures on the said line between Winnipeg and Quebec; and also of all correspondence between the chairman of the Transcontinental Commission or the chief engineer and any official of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, or any member of its engineering staff, concerning the proposed change of grades, curves, or other permanent structures on the line of the Transcontinental between Winnipeg and the city of Quebec.—Mr. Graham.

Copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams, instructions, minutes of evidence taken and had on any inquiry, investigation had, held or taken and of all other papers and documents relating to the dismissal of George H. Cochrane, collector of Customs at the port of Moncton, New Brunswick; together with a copy of all letters and other correspondence between the hon. Minister of Customs, and the member representing the county of Westmorland, New Brunswick, in this House, and of all letters, papers, telegrams, recommendations, appointments, or other papers and documents relating to the appointment of a collector of customs to succeed the said George H. Cochrane.—Mr. Emmerson.

Copy of all papers, including surveys, tenders, and every other record, or document in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals or any other department of the Government, relating to the building of a line of railways from Estmere, county of Victoria, province of Nova Scotia, to the town of Baddeck in the same county.—Mr. McKenzie.

Copy of the contract entered into between the Department of Railways and Canals and W. H. Weller for St. Peters canal improvements, and for a copy of all correspondence between the contractor or any other person, firm or corporation and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals relating to the dumping of material removed by the contractor. —Mr. Kyte.

Copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents relating to the establishment of rural mail delivery routes in the county of Pictou since the 1st October, 1911, with a statement of all routes applied for, of routes established and of those refused, and the reason for their refusal.—Mr. Macdonald.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, December 6, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. RHODES.

Mr. E. N. RHODES (Cumberland): Mr. Speaker, I desire, as a matter of privilege, to discuss for a few moments the case of the dismissal of one Lemuel Bent, late collector of customs in the town of Oxford, in the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member can take up such a discussion as a matter of privilege. A matter of privilege is something that affects the member himself or his privilege in this House.

Mr. RHODES: If I may be permitted to state the ground on which I believe my

case of privilege rests, I shall then be glad to accept your ruling.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I desire to point out that there is a notice of motion on the Order Paper standing in my name, for the production of the papers relating to this case. I would suggest that any remarks the hon. member (Mr. Rhodes) may have to make be postponed until the motion is under discussion.

Mr. RHODES: I think that the rule, Mr. Speaker—if I may discuss the question of privilege as a matter of law——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member may state it.

Mr. RHODES: I think the rule is laid down very clearly in Bourinot that:

—libels or reflections upon members individually have also been considered as breaches of privilege which may be censured or punished by the House; but it is distinctly laid down by all the authorities: 'To constitute a breach of privilege such libels must concern the character or conduct of members in that capacity.'

I maintain that certain newspapers have reflected upon my capacity as a member of this House by virtue of the language they have used with respect to me, on the ground that I made the recommendation upon which this man was dismissed from office. If you prefer, Sir, I will read certain extracts from the press, which, I think, will afford ample foundation for my right to discuss this question as a matter of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member can properly discuss the question of privilege. The regular course would be to have the article read, and on that found a resolution for the consideration of the House. That would be the natural course. I think if the hon. gentleman contented himself with referring to the statement without any argument, and applying it, he would be within his rights. But to initiate a discussion of it would be, in my judgment, irregular.

Mr. RHODES: It was not my intention to refer to the matter further than to justify my action. And I must justify my action, otherwise assertions which have been made concerning me by the newspapers would be justified. So that, unless I am in a position to give reasons why I, as a member of this House, exercise a well known right to nominate men for positions and to recommend dismissals, I say, if, in the exercise of that right I am free to be criticised by the press in any language they please to use, there is no protection at all for a member of Parliament in this country.

Mr. SPEAKER: If it were confined strictly to that right without enlarging by way of discussion and comparison, I think the hon. member would be quite within his rights. But to discuss the matter, I think, would be irregular.

Mr. RHODES: I beg to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it was not my intention to deal with this matter further than to justify my stand as a member and to show that the assertions in the press are unfounded and untrue and are not just criticisms of my actions as a member of this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think, with regard to that, the hon. member possesses certain rights in this House; I do not understand that any person has questioned those rights if the language of which he complains directly challenges those rights or questions them; I think the hon. member would be within his rights in bringing it up as a question of privilege. But I do not understand that his right is questioned. There may be something else in connection with it which might be enlarged upon.

Mr. RHODES: As I understand it, you do not question my right to refer to this subject as a matter of privilege, but are only concerned about the manner in which I do it.

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. RHODES: That being the case, I submit that you should wait until I have made some remarks upon it.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. GRAHAM: That might be too late.

Mr. RHODES: I may say that this is a case which has obtained more or less notoriety, and—

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member would be out of order in pursuing the line he seems to indicate. I think, perhaps, he would be well advised, for the present, to avoid violating the rule of the House.

Mr. RHODES: May I be permitted to quote the article in the public press upon which I base a question of privilege?

Mr. SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr. RHODES: I wish to refer to it in a moment, but to say one introductory word. Let me quote, for instance, one paragraph of a letter that has appeared in the public press. It goes on in the first place—I do not wish to deal with it at length—to

compare my attitude as a representative of the county of Cumberland with the attitude of those who had previously the honour of representing that county, and who, it says, would not have been guilty of such an act as mine. It proceeds:

No, but it was left for the present member of Parliament to be a party to one of the most brutal acts of political partisanship ever heard of in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. RHODES: There is an old adage, that only two classes of persons can judge half-finished work. That old maxim would be too mild to apply to hon. gentlemen opposite if they are prepared to pronounce judgment before they hear the other side of the case. (Reading):

Edward M. Rhodes, M.P., we are ashamed of you.

I may say that some of the headings of editorials in various newspapers throughout the country read as follows:

Ghoulish Spoilsmen; Sordid Story; Pathetic Story; Most Brutal Act of Partisanship;

And so on. Surely, Mr. Speaker, in view of the criticism of the newspapers, I have the right to justify my action in this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER: Any article which complains of the hon. gentleman's conduct to the extent of interfering with his personal liberty or rights in the House could be read, and the hon. member could move to have the writer of the article appear before the bar of the House and explain his conduct. It would then be for the House to deal with the writer as in its judgment it should determine. I do not think it would be within the right of the hon. member to bring up the matter as a question of privilege, which he could only do by making comparisons or entering into lines of argument which would practically involve a discussion.

Mr. RHODES: I wish to bow to your ruling, Mr. Speaker; but I am not sure that I understand whether I am permitted to justify my action in the matter. The rule of the English Parliament is clear, in such a case a man can be brought before the bar of the House, but that I do not propose, as I do not think it would be desirable.

Mr. SPEAKER: The usual course in this House with regard to such articles, as I understand it, is, if some statement is made about a member which is untrue, for him to read the article or statement, and absolutely deny its correctness. But if the article or statement affects his privileges as a member of the House, the person complained of must be dealt with in such manner as the House may in its judgment see fit after the question of privilege is stated. To outline the rights of members as to what they may deal with or how they may deal with it, could only be done by comparisons and arguments, which would not be permissible under a question of privilege.

Mr. RHODES: My idea is not to make comparisons, but to justify by actual facts and circumstances my contention that I acted properly in the matter. This criticism is unfounded and untrue, but my assertion to that effect is not going to satisfy this House or the country. I would very gladly discuss this question on the motion which appears on the Order Paper, but I waited four hours in this House on the occasion of the motion being brought up, but the hon. gentleman who was to move it was not here and I could not speak. He has himself stated to me that it is not his purpose to speak upon the motion.

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend can, of course, speak on the motion when it comes up. The question of privilege along the lines suggested by my hon. friend has hitherto had very wide limits in this House—much wider, perhaps, than those that have been referred to to-day. But as there seems to be some doubt in your mind, Mr. Speaker, as to how far my hon. friend would be permitted to go, I would suggest that he withdraw his proposal; and as it is possible the motion alluded to may be reached to-day or on Monday, he will have an opportunity of speaking upon it. Otherwise my hon. friend can submit to you the authorities on which he bases his claim with regard to the privilege, and you, Mr. Speaker, can take them into consideration. In many instances in my own experience in the past, a member of the House, without any question being raised, has gone quite as far as my hon. friend proposes to go to-day; but I am not disposed to contend that the practice has not gone too far. However, it would perhaps be better to adopt in this matter the course which I have suggested.

Mr. SPEAKER: I was about to say that when the motion on the Order Paper would be reached, whether the hon. member who proposes it intends to discuss it or not, it is quite within the right of any member of the House, as I understand it, to discuss the motion if he so desires.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am quite content, if it should happen that I am not in my seat when this motion is reached, that the hon. member for Cumberland should make the motion in my name. It was not my intention to discuss this motion, but possibly I may be inclined to

change my mind. I would prefer, if the hon. gentleman would allow the papers to be brought down, to discuss the matter at a later date. It is now quite an old subject, and I do not think the hon. gentleman would suffer anything in the estimation of his fellow members or the country by postponing this matter for a few days, until the papers have been produced.

THE ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act, and to provide:—

(a) That the comptroller shall have the salary of a deputy head of a department.

(b) An increase to the salaries of officers and members of the force, the amounts not exceeding the following, viz.:—

Commissioner of police, per annum...	$4,000 00
Each assistant commissioner, per annum..	2,800 00
Each superintendent, per annum.. ..	2,200 00
Each inspector, per annum..	1,600 00
Each surgeon, or veterinary surgeon, per annum..	2,200 00
Each assistant surgeon, or assistant veterinary surgeon, per annum.. ..	1,600 00
Three staff officers, employed at headquarters, additional per annum ..	300 00
Eight staff sergeants, each per diem..	2 50
Others, staff sergeants, each per diem.	2 00
Other non-commissioned officers, per diem..	1 75
Constables, per diem..	1 25
Special constables and scouts, per diem..	2 50
Buglers, under eighteen years of age, per diem..	0 75
Working party of artisans and others specially employed, per diem..	0 75

(c) That the Governor in Council may authorize extra pay and allowances to be paid to members of the force employed as detectives and to those serving in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory.

Mr. BORDEN: The proposed resolution recommends certain increases in the pay of officers, non-commissioned officers, and men of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. The present rates are those authorized by the Act of 1905. Last year the pay of the force was increased within the limits of the present statute, and there can be no additional increase without statutory authority.

The cost of living, particularly in Western Canada, has very greatly increased during the past seven years, and that fact has been recognized by the late administration in certain allowances and increases made from time to time in the salaries and remuneration of the Civil Service. It has been found during the present year that recruiting carried on during the spring and early summer in the provinces of Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia has been very difficult indeed, owing to the lack of inducement to men of the proper qualification to join the corps, which at the time is about 50 under strength. Under the present regulations the men engage at 80 or 90 cents a day, and their pay cannot be increased to more than $1 a day. The proposals which are embodied in the resolution, as compared with the existing rates of payment, will be seen from the following table:

	Proposed Maximum.	Present Maximum.
Commissioner of police, per annum	$4,000 00	$3,000 00
Each assistant commissioner, per annum.. ..	2,800 00	2,000 00
Each superintendent, per annum..	2,200 00	1,800 00
Each inspector, per annum	1,600 00	1,400 00
Each surgeon, or veterinary surgeon, per annum	2,200 00	1,800 00
Each assistant surgeon, or assistant veterinary surgeon, per annum ..	1,600 00	.....
Three staff officers, employed at headquarters, additional per annum.	300 00	.....
Eight staff sergeants, each per diem	2 50	1 75
Others, staff sergeants, each per diem	2 00	1 75
Other non-commissioned officers, per diem	1 75	1 25
Constables, per diem. ..	1 25	1 00
Special constables and scouts, per diem.. ..	2 50	1 50
Buglers, under eighteen years of age, per diem.	75	50
Working party of artisans and others specially employed, per diem.	75	75

It is also proposed by the terms of this resolution that the Governor in Council may authorize extra pay and allowances to be paid to men of the force employed as detectives, and to those stationed in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory. It was found necessary, as my right hon. friend will no doubt remember, to employ in the capacity of detectives, members of the corps who seem to possess special qualifications for that purpose. I am informed by the comptroller that the experience of the past has been that men adapted for this purpose are selected and trained, and that, after having been trained for a certain length of time so as to be really valuable in connection with the detection of crime, they are offered very much higher remuneration elsewhere than they can get in the force, and they make application for discharge or refuse to re-enlist, and their services are lost. It is thought that by making a special provision of this kind,

their services can be retained and the retention of the services of men of that type is regarded as eminently necessary for the force.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The explanation of my right hon. friend is quite sufficient. The House, I am quite sure, will view with great favour the present increases in the allowances now paid to the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. If there is a corps, if there is any body of men in this country, who are deserving of all the encouragement which the country can give them, is it certainly the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, and, so far as I am concerned, I will support with great pleasure the proposition now made by my right hon. friend. I do not know if there are any other features about it that will require discussion, but that will come on the second reading of the Bill. Is it the intention to increase the number of police or to keep it at the present strength?

Mr. BORDEN: The comptroller has recommended to me that the force be brought up to its full strength. I do not remember at the moment if there is any recommendation for an increase, but I shall give that information on the second reading of the Bill, or in committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would suggest that if there is a special report from the comptroller, the Prime Minister should bring it down at the second reading of the Bill.

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

Mr. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 24) to amend the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS PROVIDENT FUND.

On motion of Mr. Cochrane, House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act by providing that the board administering the fund may pay out of such fund the whole or any portion of the contribution thereto of any employee discharged from the service on or after April 1, 1907, on account of having been engaged in partisan work in connection with any Dominion or provincial election.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think the minister ought to tell us how many of those employees there are, and how much of a draft there will be on the fund?

Mr. BORDEN.

Mr. EMMERSON: At the same time, I think the minister should explain the meaning of the phraseology used, 'on account of having been engaged in partisan work in connection with any Dominion or provincial election,' and explain if any employees who were entitled to the benefits of this Act were dismissed because of participation in provincial elections. My recollection is that the doctrine was laid down, not merely by hon. members on this side of the House, but by the right hon. the Prime Minister as well, that dismissals would not and should not occur because of participation in provincial elections, and that employees of the Government and of the railway service would subject themselves only to the displeasure of the Government in cases where they interfered with, or took part offensively in Dominion elections.

Mr. PELLETIER: If my hon. friend will kindly read the resolution proposed by Mr. Lake, and adopted unanimously by the House, he will see that it covers the cases of both federal and provincial elections. It is stated very clearly.

Mr. EMMERSON: I do not recall the resolution referred to. My object in rising is to have the minister state how many employees there are who have been subjected to dismissal because of participation in provincial elections. I am entirely in accord with the principle involved in the resolution, and later I may ask the minister as to whether his attention has been invited to some other amendments which are sought by the employees of the railway, and particularly to applications which have been made by employees who come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act, but who wish to be transferred, or to be placed in a position in which they can elect to come under the provisions of the Provident Fund Act, rather than rely upon any benefits that might accrue to them under the Civil Service Act. I have had communications from those who are now, and have been in the employ of the railway a great many years. They are entitled to come under the provisions of the Civil Service Act. Under the Provident Fund Act, all such are excluded from participating in its benefits. I know of one particularly, who seeks to have an amendment of the Act to enable him to come under the provisions of the Provident Fund Act rather than those of the Civil Service Act. I have a long document which has been addressed to the members of the Dominion Parliament, and I presume every hon. member has received a copy of it. It sets forth some amendments that are sought by employees of the railway. I presume that the minister has certainly received such a document, and possibly he may enlighten the House

at this moment as to whether these applications and representations have had consideration at his hands, and as to whether he has reached a conclusion with respect to them.

Mr. COCHRANE: The House will remember that last session, on being asked by an hon. member if it was my intention to have the employees who had been dismissed for this cause paid what money they had contributed to this provident fund, I said yes. It was suggested that such a course did not need an amendment to the Act, but, on submitting the matter to the Justice Department, I found that it was impossible to do so without an amendment of the Act. In answer to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), I have not got the information he seeks to-day, but I will have it on the second reading. It is a very proper thing to have. With reference to what my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) has said, I cannot agree with him. Under the Civil Service Act this is an offence, but not under the agreement which the board of management has with the men; and if it applies in one case it should apply in the other, because a man who takes part in a federal election is very apt to participate in a provincial election as well. No distinction has been made. I think I can say in all these cases we have had an understanding with the representatives of the different departments that we should notify them of an investigation and when it would take place, in order that they might have a representative present, and I think I can produce evidence in most cases that they feel that fair treatment has been extended to them. I shall be very glad to give any further information, either now or on the second reading. With reference to the document to which my hon. friend has referred, I do not remember getting a copy, though it is possible I did receive one. The question has been brought to my notice of employees who are in the Civil Service, and who want to be transferred. I think I can say that this is a matter on which there is a difference of opinion. I have not gone into it fully enough to express an opinion of my own as to what would be fair and right in the matter.

Mr. EMMERSON: On the second reading of the Bill I will invite the attention of the minister to the particular representations which have been made to me with regard to the amendments sought for by employees of the railway.

Mr. COCHRANE: Perhaps the hon. member will draw my attention to what they are, so that I can be prepared.

Mr. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I would like to ask the minister if there is any authority in his department to pay back the contributions of any employee of the road who may have been discharged for some reason apart from the reason given in this resolution. There may be, but I am not familiar with it. I would also like to ask the minister if it would be possible for him, before he presents the Bill for a second reading, to give the House a list of the men who are to come within the operation of this law, with the amounts that may be due to each one.

Mr. COCHRANE: I promised the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) that I would do that. In reference to the first question of my hon. friend, I do not think there is any such provision, but I do not think it would be right to do what he suggests. Any other offence which might be committed would be against the agreement and against the efficiency in the management of the road. This is on a different basis, and harder to control.

Mr. EMMERSON: In this case the man is the victim of circumstances.

Mr. COCHRANE: Perhaps I would put it that way.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The remarks made by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton remind me of a situation which occurred at Halifax some years ago, by reason of the removal of the machine shop to Moncton, and which occurred during the period in which my hon. friend from South Renfrew, was administering the affairs of the Railway Department. When the machine shop was removed to Moncton I think it was not possible to place immediately there, all the men who were thrown out of employment at Halifax. I have in my mind a case the facts of which were related to me only a few weeks ago by a friend of one of the parties who was employed in the machine shop at Halifax. He had been in the employ of the Intercolonial railway for either twenty-two or thirty-two years—I forget which. When the machine shop was removed to Moncton, he was not offered employment there; but about twelve months subsequently to that he was offered employment at Moncton. In the meanwhile he had obtained a position with another railway in Nova Scotia. I think that under the regulations of the Provident Fund Act he would have been entitled to his pension in another year from the time he was discharged. When I heard these facts, it struck me as being a rather hard case, and I was rather impressed with the idea that there should be some way of paying to this particular person a proportion of the pension to which he would have been entitled under the Act had he completed his full term of employment. This is probably the first time that this particu-

lar case has come to the minister's attention. I realize that you could not make a general rule or statute upon matters of that kind, but this is a case which particularly deserves consideration. Possibly there may be a great many others in the same situation at Halifax by reason of the removal, of the machine shops to Moncton.

Mr. COCHRANE: I do not know the particular case the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) is speaking of, but if he would write me and give me particulars, I would be very glad to go into it and see if there cannot be some way provided by which justice may be done.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do I understand that the Department of Justice has given an opinion that political partisanship is not one of the offences disentitling a person under this Act?

Mr. COCHRANE: It is an offence against the Supply Act, but not against the agreement between the board of management and the men.

Mr. MACDONALD: I remember that we had a discussion about that last year. The law in regard to it is laid down in the Provident Act, in section 19, which says:

> Employees who are discharged from the service, for any cause other than those mentioned in paragraph (b) of section 17, after they have been three or more years contributors to the fund, may be paid out of the fund the total amount of their contributions to the fund.

Under the law as it reads to-day men cannot get that money who are discharged on account of wilful default, misconduct, negligence in the performance of their duty, drunkenness, fraud or dishonesty. It would seem that the Act was sufficiently broad to have permitted the minister or the board to have paid out money to the parties who were discharged on account of political partisanship. I may say that certain of these men expected that the minister's assurance to my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) on the subject last winter would be carried out, and I assumed that possibly the Department of Justice had found legal difficulty in the way. The language of section 19 of this Act is so very broad and general, applying to all classes of employees, except those who are discharged for certain specific offences, of which political partisanship is not one, that when these men were not paid, I thought that the Department of Justice had raised some difficulty on the subject. What I would like to know from the minister is whether he has found any difficulty on that account.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax).

Mr. COCHRANE: Other than political partisanship?

Mr. MACDONALD: The statute says that everybody who is dismissed from the service, except those who are discharged because they were guilty of wilful default, misconduct, negligence in the performance of duty, drunkenness, fraud, or dishonesty, should be allowed their money.

Mr. COCHRANE: What other things would there be?

Mr. MACDONALD: Political partisanship apparently would not disentitle a man to the money, and therefore I do not see why there should be any necessity for this Act. I would like to know what the Department of Justice thinks about it.

Mr. COCHRANE: I cannot argue it from a legal standpoint.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister told us last year that these men would be paid, and I assured the unfortunate men who were dismissed in my county that they would be paid when the minister said so.

Mr. COCHRANE: Well, I intend to carry that out.

Mr. MACDONALD: The minister has not carried it out, but he has come to Parliament to give him authority to carry it out.

Mr. COCHRANE: Yes.

Mr. MACDONALD: It would appear to me on the face of this statute that the minister does not need any additional law in order to permit it to be done, and I want to know if the Department of Justice have advised him that he requires legislation of this kind.

Mr. COCHRANE: They so advise.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the minister be good enough, before the second reading, to bring down the opinion of the Department of Justice? because I would like to know what it is. This proposed Act is one which applies to a great number of those employed upon the Intercolonial railway, and any opinion given by the Department of Justice as to its meaning and effect is one which the House and the people in these constituencies affected should be fully advised about.

Mr. COCHRANE: I will do that.

Mr. MACDONALD: I, myself, with all deference, would have thought that the Act was sufficiently wide to have permitted this to be done.

Mr. EMMERSON: Arising out of the case to which attention has been called by

my hon. friend from Halifax, there are one or two other cases that I know are before the minister at this present moment that certainly are very much akin to the one cited by my hon. friend from Halifax. Difficulties have arisen with respect to the meaning of the words 'continuous employment.' There are two particular cases within my knowledge—one that of the mechanical superintendent of the Prince Edward Island railway, and another with respect to an engine-man or machinist in the province of Nova Scotia. Mr. Poole, the mechanical superintendent of the Prince Edward Island railway, was originally employed on that railway, and at the request of the manager of the road, went on board one of the Government steamers plying between Pictou and the island. He was there engaged under the direction of the Government and in the interest of the Government, and after they ceased to require his services there, he returned to his former employment. In other words, he was loaned by the Railway Department to another department of the Government, not at his own request, but in the interest of the Government service, and he did as he was instructed. His services were dispensed with recently; I do not know whether it was for political partisanship or for any other cause; that makes no difference. But in the computation of his time, on which was based his annual retiring allowance, this period of his services, at the instance and request of the Railway Department in behalf of another department of the Government, was not allowed. In the other case, that of Robert McDonald, who I understand was in the employ of the Intercolonial railway at Truro, and who was particularly expert in the handling of the steam shovel, he was directed by Mr. Schrieber, the chief engineer of the Department of Railways to go to another part of the Dominion in the public service, and was kept and employed there by the Government and in their interests, and, after he had performed the work for which it was considered he was best adapted, he was recalled to his original employment. It became a question as to the computation of the time which he had served within the meaning of the Provident Fund Act and that period to which I have referred, was not allowed. I would ask the hon. Minister of Railways to make personal and particular inquiry into these two cases. There may be others of the same nature, but manifestly a very grave injustice has been done to these two gentlemen, because they have continuously served the railway, and they were employed under the direction of the railway. In my judgment, it does not matter whether they were kept at their original employment or not. The only question is, were they in the service of the railway? Undoubtedly they were, and I think that a very strong legal argument could be advanced, showing that they were entitled to have that time allowed them in the computation of the annual allowance which they would receive on their retirement.

Mr. COCHRANE: If the hon. gentlemen will let me have a memo. in reference to the matter, I will have it looked up.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I wish to draw the attention of the hon. minister for a moment to a case of dismissal in my district, that of Philip H. Ryan of Mulgrave. The difficulty arose from the fact that the investigator did not seem disposed to give Mr. Ryan a fair trial, refusing to allow him to call his witnesses. Mr. Duchemin, who carried on the investigations in that constituency, did not appear to have been guided by the usual rules of a judge or commissioner in endeavouring to try a case fairly. The consequence was that only one side was heard, and later on it became quite evident that the witness, on whose evidence Mr. Ryan had been dismissed, had not told the truth. This witness, whose name was Byers, was prosecuted for perjury, and was brought up after a preliminary investigation before the grand jury in the town of Guysborough. The grand jury did not find a true bill against him, but the evidence was so clear that Judge Meagher, one of the Supreme Court judges of Nova Scotia, who tried the case, took exception to the action of the grand jury, and instructed the prosecuting attorney to bring the matter before the next court that would meet in that locality. At that trial Mr. Ryan asked leave to produce two witnesses, and I will just quote, for the information of the minister, a paragraph from the evidence given by Mr. Ryan:

> At the investigation held on the 28th of June last, I reminded Byers of what did take place on the 14th day of June, A.D. 1911, but he still persisted in this statement. I offered to go for John P. Meagher and Edward Brennan to have them examined as witnesses. I offered this to Mr. Duchemin. Did not allow me to get these witnesses. He said, never mind your witnesses. It would not have taken me over fifteen minutes to have got the two men.

Mr. COCHRANE: Is that a statement by Mr. Ryan?

Mr. SINCLAIR: It is a statement made by Mr. Ryan on oath before the judge at Guysborough. Now, on that evidence, which is believed by the people who have gone into the case to be false, Mr. Ryan was dismissed, and it is regarded in that locality as a case of very grave injustice. I would

ask the minister to produce the evidence taken before his investigator, Mr. Duchemin, before he asks for the second reading of this resolution, so that we may ascertain what report Mr. Duchemin made in regard to the investigation of this case. While I am on the subject, I may say that this is only one of a great many other cases in eastern Nova Scotia, where this man, appointed to investigate these cases, has not given the people who were being tried a fair hearing. The common practice has been to refuse the right of being represented by counsel. I did not myself ask to be permitted to be present at these investigations; but there are honourable gentlemen, barristers on this side of the House, one in particular that I know, of who did ask the right to be present at these investigations and to cross-examine witnesses, and who was refused the right to cross-examine witnesses on behalf of the accused. This right was refused, over and over again, by Mr. Duchemin. Of course, it is impossible to arrive at a fair result in these matters if the accused is not permitted to cross-examine witnesses. The people who testify are necessarily partisans. They go there to tell a story. It is especially necessary in such cases, if we are to be fair at all, that cross-examination be allowed. But it has been constantly refused. And not only that, but courts have been held by Mr. Duchemin in garrets and little bedrooms of hotels. People were excluded and evidence has been taken in the absence of the accused. I am able to prove these statements. I know of cases in which witnesses were examined when the accused were absent, though the accused were within one hundred yards of the place in which the investigations were held.

Mr. RHODES: In what cases was that done?

Mr. SINCLAIR: For one, in the case of John W. Davis, of Guysborough, fishery officer.

Mr. COCHRANE: That is not the point the hon. member was discussing.

Mr. SINCLAIR: No, I want to confine myself to the discussion of these railway matters. Not a great many men were dismissed from the Intercolonial railway in my constituency. In fact, there is only one railway station in the constituency, and only half a dozen men, or so, were dismissed. But I do not think any of them got a fair hearing in the examination. It is possible that partisanship may have been proved against some of them—that is a matter for the minister to decide after hearing both sides of the case. But he cannot give a fair decision on hearing only one side. And I submit that the examinations that have been held in the locality by Mr. Duchemin have not been fair. I wish again to press upon the minister the importance of producing evidence, especially in the case of Philip H. Ryan by Mr. Duchemin on which this man was discharged from the service. If, when the resolution is to be read the second time this evidence is before the House, we shall be able to see upon what report the dismissal took place.

Mr. MACDONALD: There is a phase of this question relating to the Department of Railways which is very important as a matter of principle. I do think the Minister of Railways has displayed far more judgment and a greater sense of responsibility as a minister of the Crown in dealing with these charges than either the Postmaster General or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Both of these latter gentlemen have been absolutely ruthless in their disregard of every principle of British fair play. I have no doubt that the Minister of Railways was dominated by some sense of the responsibility attaching to his office in dealing with employees who had vested rights in a fund. For, every employee of the Intercolonial railway, from the inception of his employment becomes interested in the management of his provident fund. He becomes a contributor to it, and by virtue of that fact he has rights of a legal character which would enable him, if this were a company railway and if he were unjustly dealt with, to go into the courts of law and seek a remedy. How far that remedy would be open to him against the Crown, and how far he could invoke the aid of the Exchequer Court in asking to have his dismissal inquired into, is a subject about which a great deal might be said as a matter of law. Whether that legal remedy exists in the case of an employee of the Government's railway or not, the minister ought to realize—and I hope he does realize—that his employees stand in a different position, by reason of their participation in this fund, from that of employees in other departments. I have repeatedly complained to the Minister of Railways by letter and otherwise of the conduct of Mr. Duchemin. Personally, I say that if a man has been guilty of offensive interference in an election, by all means let him be dismissed. There is no objection among hon. members on this side to the invoking of that principle. All we say is that if, in such a case, before you reach a conclusion when you hold an investigation, at least the minister should try to remember that we are not living in South America or in any uncivilized country, and that if there is any principle of British law that we are proud it is that when a man goes into

court he gets fair play. Now, that Mr. Duchemin has not dealt with the men before him with any sense of fair play, there can be no doubt whatever—the evidence is indisputable? Mr. Duchemin did not return to the minister last year evidence in the case of investigations which he held in my county. On my motion an Order of the House was passed that the minister should lay before Parliament all the papers connected with the investigation of charges against certain men on the score of partisanship. The minister brought down the preliminary papers and report by Mr. Duchemin upon which he—the minister—acted; but he did not bring down the evidence taken before Mr. Duchemin or anything to show what proceedings were had.

Mr. COCHRANE : Will the hon. member (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou) let me state one point which has a bearing upon that?

Mr. MACDONALD : Well ?

Mr. COCHRANE : Mr. Duchemin was not instructed to send in the evidence in detail, but to send a summing up giving the names of witnesses and the facts; and if this were not sufficient for me to form an opinion upon, I would ask him for a copy of the evidence.

Mr. MACDONALD: There I say, is where the minister went wrong.

Mr. COCHRANE : Perhaps I did.

Mr. MACDONALD : If the minister will follow me upon this point, I think he will agree that he did go wrong. He assented to the proposition that every employee of the Intercolonial railway was a contributor to the fund and that after he was in the employ for a certain time he acquired a vested right of a financial character, such a right that, if he were an employee of a company railway having a similar fund, he could invoke the protection of the courts against unfair treatment by his employers. I do not now discuss the question, whether he could do so in the case of the Crown. Yet the minister was willing in this case, to take away not only the financial rights of his employee but also his position upon a statement sent to the minister by an irresponsible gentleman like Mr. Duchemin.

Mr. LANCASTER : Who had tried the case.

Mr. MACDONALD : Had never tried it. My hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara had better attend to his Ontario dismissals.

Mr. LANCASTER : We will talk about them any time you like.

Mr. MACDONALD : I am speaking of that which is within my own knowledge. These parties had a vested right. In dealing with these matters the minister should have called for the evidence, and not have taken the ipse dixit of Mr. Duchemin. Such action would have been wrong in any case, but particularly so when he could not have known Mr. Duchemin very well himself but had to take a great deal with regard to him for granted. In view of the nature of the office of a minister of the Crown, it is a large undertaking to interfere with the legal and financial rights of an employee, and the minister was simply taking the statement of Mr. Duchemin as to his view of the matters coming before him. I venture to say the minister has gone wrong in every instance. Had the minister acted upon the full stenographic report in every case, I venture to say there would have been fewer men dismissed from the Intercolonial railway. As I have already said, the minister has acted with more fairness than some of his colleagues. But I venture to tell him that he should not have proceeded in any of these cases without having all the evidence before him. Perhaps my hon. friend gave us all the information he had before him; but the Order of the House in regard to the production of these papers was that he should produce the evidence itself, and not Mr. Duchemin's estimate of the purport or effect of the evidence. This Parliament is simply giving a mandamus to the minister, in the same manner as a court of law would direct an inferior court to produce all the documents connected with any particular case. But a court of law with superior jurisdiction would occupy a ridiculous position if the inferior court undertook to impose upon the rights of parties dealt with by sending up only a version or conception of the matter as given by the magistrate presiding over the inferior court.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that all employees of the Government railways have vested rights in this provident fund, and the minister should not deprive them of their rights without having before him the sworn testimony upon which he undertook to take action in the matter, and I think the minister should now, before this Bill goes through this House, obtain from this executioner, Mr. Duchemin, a stenographic copy of every case in which the minister has undertaken to deprive employees of their vested rights in that fund. Many men who, having reached middle age, are going down the hill of life, and who have lost their positions as a result of this ex parte tribunal presided over by Mr. Duchemin, have lessened their income every year in order to participate in that fund. It may be that political partisanship or political prejudice may be advanced as the reason why these men were dismissed from office, but it does seem to

me that it is a sad commentary upon the condition of affairs in this country that a man who is romoved from office cannot have placed on the public records the evidence upon which he was dismissed. My hon. friend has the right to exercise arbitrarily the power of dismissing these men, but he did not choose to do that; he sent out an official to make an investigation. Why could he not do it right? If there was evidence taken why should it not be produced, and why should not the minister, when the case comes before Parliament, be in a position to lay before the committee all the evidence taken in every case by this executioner, so it be may be ascertained whether or not the minister acted rightly in the matter?

The question in regard to Mr. Duchemin is one that needs no argument, and I am not going to elaborate on it. Other hon. gentleman on this side of the House can produce evidence on this point that cannot be disputed. I rose for the purpose of pointing out to the minister the position in which these men stood, to ask him to exercise some measure of discretion in the matter, and to bring before the House, in accordance with the orders that have been made from time to time, not Mr. Duchemin's conception of the evidence, but the sworn statements of witnesses taken before him. When dealing with legislation interfering with funds provided for men or women in their old age, the least this Parliament can demand is to have that evidence before them in its entirety.

Mr. EMMERSON: The hon. member for Pictou has touched upon a subject that seems to me so vital that upon it depends the future of the Provident Fund Act. My hon. friend might fairly have gone further in the matter. He has said that every man who was dismissed had a vested right in this fund, and that the action of the minister in dismissing him was in interference with that vested right. I submit that he interferes not only with the vested right of the employee who has been dismissed, but with the vested right of every other employee of the Intercolonial railway who may be a contributor to that fund. The dismissal of employees for political partisanship deeply affects the position of every other employee in the service, for the reason that this fund was based upon actuarial computation, and if the Minister of Railways were to make any large number of dismissals on the ground of partisanship, it might affect the very foundation of the fund itself. It must be borne in mind that the employees contribute to the fund upon a certain percentage, and for every dollar that they contribute the Government gives another dollar. If this fund is to be trifled with, if it is to be made the football of political parties, not only will the fund itself be affected, but every individual employee of the railway will be made to feel it. Every man as he enters the service begins contributing to this fund, and so long as he serves the railway he continues to do so, the amount thus accumulated being for his own protection in the future. If that fund is affected or interfered with by dismissals, the rights of the employees of the railway are undoubtedly placed in a false and unfair position.

Mr. FOWLER: Does my hon. friend contend that employees who participate in this fund, no matter how unworthy they may be, should not be dismissed?

Mr. EMMERSON: The statute does make provision with respect to dismissals, and very great care was taken in the enactment of this measure, that the number of political dismissals should be minimized to such a degree that they would be almost entirely obviated. There may be at times certain reasons why men should be dismissed, but that should be only in such cases as involve flagrant disregard of rules. I think that every dismissal should be enquired into so closely that disposition of the matter should not be left to irresponsible parties who may be appointed for the purpose of taking evidence. The evidence should come under the consideration of council, and, if not, certainly of the minister himself, and be closely scrutinized before any action is taken thereon.

Mr. RHODES: It is not my purpose this afternoon to discuss this Act in detail, or to enter into the general question of dismissals in the province of Nova Scotia, because I purpose to do that at a later stage, and at a more convenient time, but I deem it fair and just to this investigator, Mr. Duchemin, at least to have an impartial statement with reference to him and his conduct in these investigations placed upon the records of this House, especially in view of the statements of hon. gentlemen opposite from Nova Scotia during the last session and again to-day. I must say, in view of the information I have gleaned, having taken the pains to go into this matter myself, that I am surprised that hon. gentlemen opposite have the audacity to make the assertions with respect to Mr. Duchemin which I have heard them make again to-day in this House. In the first place, Mr. Duchemin is a member of the bar of Nova Scotia, and I am astounded to hear another member of the bar impugn his honour as a commissioner, irrespective of any evidence he might have as to the manner in which investigations have been conducted or are being conducted in Nova Scotia.

Dealing first with the case mentioned by the hon. member for Guysborough, that of John W. Davis, I must accept the statement of the hon. gentleman that evidence was taken by the commissioner in the absence of the accused; but I think, in justice to himself and in justice to Mr. Duchemin, it is his duty to bring evidence before the House to show why he makes that statement.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am prepared to furnish the evidence.

Mr. RHODES: The statement of the commissioner goes to show that Mr. Davis himself declined to give evidence in his own defence, and practically admitted that he had nothing to say in defence and that he was an active partisan.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Has my hon. friend a copy of the evidence taken in the case of J. W. Davis?

Mr. RHODES: I have not a copy of the evidence in that case, but I am quoting from an answer to a question put the hon. gentleman, which is a matter of record and which cannot be disputed. Furthermore, I have found out upon inquiry that the hon. member for Guysborough, has never been present at any one of these investigations in his county, and has never asked permission to be present or to cross-examine witnesses. Let me add that after the elections of 1896, when the Liberal Government came into power, investigations took place in Nova Scotia only in rare instances, and at that time no cross-examinations were allowed, and not one in twenty-five or fifty cases of dismissals in Nova Scotia was after inquiry, by investigators or otherwise, not a scintilla of evidence of any kind was given; but men were dismissed wholesale on the ipse dixit of members sitting in this House at that time, or merely on a letter from the defeated candidate. The member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), at that time a defeated candidate for that county, dismissed by a mere letter to the then Minister of Railways, the late Hon. A. G. Blair, two men working on a canal in his county, and that was the only record before this House of any cause why these men should be dismissed.

Mr. MACDONALD: What canal were they working on?

Mr. RHODES: It might not have been a canal, it might have been a lock or a bridge. But I will bring before the House the statement in 'Hansard' showing that these two men were dismissed by Mr. Blair on his mere letter, he being then only a defeated candidate. It matters not what work the men were engaged in. The hon. member for Pictou is a lawyer, I am glad to pay him the compliment of saying that he is one of the best advocates in Nova Scotia; and yet my hon. friend never came near any of the investigations being held by Mr. Duchemin in his own county or ever asked permission to cross-examine witnesses, not a single witness, in any one of these cases. Yet he comes here and complains of the manner in which Mr. Duchemin conducts investigations in his county. One of the difficulties in the matter of partisanship in Nova Scotia is that hon. gentlemen opposite have instituted a reign of terror over government officials in that province. They have had to carry the bags of hon. gentlemen opposite; they have had to be hewers of wood and drawers of water. I saw a case of that kind in my own constituency, where, as I went to walk on a platform at a joint meeting on nomination day, I met a gentleman employed by the Intercolonial railway carrying the bag of Mr. Logan, who was opposed to me, and the last words I heard him say were, 'Give it to the brute, Logan, give it to the brute.' That is the kind of partisanship we have in Nova Scotia. I do not blame the partisan, but I blame hon. gentlemen opposite for bringing up civil servants to expect that sort of thing, and to feel that they must be partisans.

In Pictou an investigation was held in the case of Neil Ross (one of the employees of the Intercolonial railway). It was brought out that this man only last year canvassed for his vote, a man of the name of Howard McCulloch, (one of the employees of the Intercolonial railway). He promised and gave the inducement to McCulloch that if he would vote for Mr. Macdonald, he would get his reward in the shape of a government job, and I have here a letter written by the hon. member for Pictou himself to McCulloch. I wish to pay the hon. member for Pictou the compliment of saying that this is written with his usual astuteness, because it does not bear any date, although I would hazard a guess, in the absence of any contradiction from the hon. gentlemen, that it was written very shortly before the last election. It says:

Macdonald & Ives
Barristers, Solicitors, &c.
E M. Macdonald, L.L.B., K.C., M.P.
W. B. Ives, L.L.B.
Pictou, Nova Scotia.

Howard McCulloch, Watervale.

Dear Mr. McCulloch,—Neil Ross has written to me in regard to you, and I desire to say that I should like very much if you would either write or come to see me at any time.

I am
Yours faithfully,
E. M. MACDONALD.

Just such a letter as I would expect the hon. gentleman would write.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. RHODES: I assume that hon. gentlemen opposite are applauding the astuteness with which this letter was written. It is just such a letter as I would expect the hon. member to write on the eve of an election, because if he had made it stronger I am afraid the hon. member would not be able to take part in the framing of such legislation as we have in this country with respect to the running of elections.

I want to say, standing in my place as a member of this House, that I believe Mr. Duchemin has conducted his investigations in Nova Scotia with absolute fairness and impartiality in each and every case.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Did you attend any of them?

Mr. RHODES: I did not.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Why did the hon. gentleman read that letter written by the hon. member for Pictou?

Mr. RHODES: I am satisfied to have hon. gentlemen take their view as to why I read it. I do not propose to furnish intelligence to the hon. gentlemen, but I think the reason is obvious.

Mr. MACDONALD: You have got a bad mind.

Mr. RHODES: Has the hon. member for Antigonish any fault to find with the manner in which investigations were conducted in his county by Mr. Duchemin?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Most decidedly I have.

Mr. RHODES: Very good, I ask the hon. gentleman to listen to this letter, which I propose to read:

Truro, N. S., Nov. 21, 1912.

H. P. Duchemin,
Commissioner of Enquiry,
Sidney, N. S.

Your letter of the 5th instant received last night on my arrival home from St. Louis, Mo., where I have been attending a convention of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Men.

You ask for my impression of the manner in which the inquiries of charges of political partisanship have been conducted and of the treatment accorded to the accused persons.

I was present at the following inquiries held by you:

William Landry, section foreman, Pomquet.

That is in the constituency of my hon. friend from Antigonish.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I was present.

Mr. RHODES (reading):

Charles Landry, sectionman, Pomquet.
William Fongere, sectionman, Pomquet.
John McInnes, foreman-carpenter, Antigonish.
R. McFarlane, section foreman, Antigonish.

All these investigations were in the constituency of the hon. member for Antigonish.

Colin McDonald, sectionman, James River.
William H. Williams, sectionman, James River.
H. H. Sartoris, section foreman, Pugwash.

I would ask hon. gentlemen to listen carefully to these words:

I consider that you were perfectly fair in your manner in conducting these inquiries, and the accused in all cases were given an opportunity by you to call any witness that chose to give evidence in their behalf.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Who said that?

Mr. RHODES: This letter was written by the general chairman of the Railway Maintenance of Way Lodge, and bears on the seal 'Maintenance of Way Lodge.'

An hon. MEMBER: He must be a good Conservative.

Mr. RHODES (reading):

They were also given an opportunity to go on the stand themselves and make a statement in their own defence.

With reference to the two inquiries held at West River in the case of Hugh Fraser and Neil Ross, I was absent in Ottawa at the time and I appointed H. A. McElhinney to represent the brotherhood, and I quote from his report: 'I consider that Hugh Fraser and Neil Ross were given every opportunity at the inquiry held by Mr. Duchemin at West River to clear themselves of the charges preferred against them of political partisanship.

I might state with reference to the inquiries, held at Pomquet, that Mr. William Chisholm, M.P., for Antigonish county was present and in the course of our conversation on the platform after the inquiry Mr. Chisholm said that he had no fault with the commissioner in the way in which he had conducted the inquiries.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I do not believe I ever made such a statement. Besides, I wrote a letter to Mr. Lowe in which I denounced the conduct of that investigation.

Mr. RHODES (reading):

I might also mention the case of Archie Stewart, section foreman at Linwood, whose inquiry was held previous to the inquiry above mentioned. I was not present at this inquiry and you had already sent in your report to the hon. Minister of Railways, but when I went to attend the inquiries at Pomquet Mr. Stewart brought to my notice the fact that some evidence had been taken that referred to a by-election held in Antigonish county in 1905, and when I brought this to your notice you readily agreed to write the hon. Minister of Railways to hold his decision until such time as you could re-open the case and rec-

tify any injustice that might have been done Mr. Stewart in that way. When you had done this he was exonerated from any charge.

Thanking you for past courtesy,

I am, yours respectfully,

GEO. M. MURRAY,
General Chairman,
Maintenance of Way Employees.

This bears the seal of the Maintenance of Way Employees Lodge. My hon. friend from Antigonish has referred to Mr. Lowe. I may say for the benefit of the committee that Mr. Lowe is president of the International Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, one of the largest labour organizations in America. I have here a copy of the letter written to the hon. member for Antigonish by Mr. Lowe, and hon. members will be able to learn just exactly the opinion of this man, who is a resident of St. Louis, and who perhaps does not know the member for Antigonish personally. He knows from the records, however, how men were dismissed in 1897, following the election of 1896, and I ask the careful attention of the committee to this letter.

Mr. Chisholm, M.P.,
Antigonish, N.S., Canada.

Dear Sir,—I see you are a poor loser. I wonder if you recollect in 1896 the events that occurred immediately thereafter. You criticise our brotherhood and say (speaking of Mr. Landry and his local dues):

'I do not know that I can advise him to pay, for it appears that the brotherhood affords no protection whatever to its men in this part of the country.'

Mr. CHISHOLM: Hear, hear.

Mr. RHODES: I must have the right letter. Mr. Lowe goes on to say:

You must either be stating what is wrong, knowingly, or you are living in ignorance of what is transpiring very near you, and what I am certain is common knowledge to every man of the Intercolonial railway, and to every member of our brotherhood. We are giving protection, and we have received protection and reinstatement for several members who had been charged with political partisanship. In every case where an investigation has been called for, it has been given, owing to representations made by Chairman Murray, of Truro, and myself to the present Minister of Railways, and the men reinstated have received from $80 to $100 pay for lost time; others have been reinstated as a matter of clemency on account of domestic matters, large families, &c., even where they had been foolishly active in politics. That much for your criticism, and it will give you a correct means of estimating its value.

Now, let me give you a few plain truths, that only for a lot of miserable politicians, there would be no need for any such investigations or any such dismissals; if you and others like you would keep your hands off the management of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways, instead of trying to work it for your personal and political advantage, there would be no need of any such conditions. What did you do to get investigations for the hundreds of men laid off after 1896? Compared with what the present Government has done in the way of dismissals and suspensions, they are almost white winged. In Quebec you almost made a clean sweep and in every other province several dismissals, but I never could get a single investigation, although I wore my heart and soul and almost my boots out, waiting on your then Minister of Railways, Mr. Blair.

That comes from an impartial man, who is the responsible head of one of the largest labour organizations on the continent of America, and whose sole object is to look after the welfare of those under him. He goes on to say:

You will see that your criticism of the organization comes with very bad grace and I trust the information I have given you may be of use to you. Before any investigation takes place, our general chairman is notified and he, or someone else, has an opportunity to be present. If these men who have gone to you because you are an M. P. had acted as they should and turned the case over to the chairman, whose duty it is to protect them, they would have shown more good judgment, but the curse of the Intercolonial is that so many of the employees, and I do not know whether it includes these men or not, try to work a political pull rather than assisting their organization, in working its machinery to adjust their grievances. I presume in this case, these men, instead of notifying their general chairman, rushed to yourself, who can do nothing to help them.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) A. B. LOWE,
President.

There is corroboration of the assertion I made some time ago that the difficulty in the province of Nova Scotia is not with respect to those poor Government employees, but arises from the system under which they have been brought. They were taught to tremble for their bread and butter, and were continually hovering about politicians until the regime which I am glad to say has been inaugurated by the present Minister of Railways.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Have you got the reply to that letter?

Mr. RHODES: No.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Have you got the letter to which that was a reply?

Mr. RHODES: No, I have not. But, I have another letter which I would like to read.

Mr. MACDONALD: I suppose everything is serene and seraphic down there since you came in?

Mr. RHODES: If you are satisfied, I am. Here is a copy of a letter written to Mr.

Duchemin by the Rev. Father D. L. McDonald Arisaig, in the constituency of Antigonish. I assume that the hon. gentleman who represents that constituency knows Father McDonald.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I know him quite well, and would be sorry to drag him into this conflict.

Mr. RHODES (reading):

Dear Mr. Duchemin,—I understand that you are expected in Antigonish again shortly. I should be pleased to see you when you come and glad to have you call at any time.

I wish to express to you my satisfaction at the fairness and impartiality with which you conducted your inquiry here last summer into the cases of Government officials.

I do not think that in the administration of the public service, any portion of the community should be discriminated against, because of the independent exercise of the franchise, or that any man should be dismissed from office without just cause, such as incompetency, neglect of duty, or offensiveness to the public.

I was glad to observe that this spirit of fairness was manifested by you and that every opportunity was given to hear both sides. Whatever conclusions may in each case have been justified by the evidence, I am satisfied that your investigation was fair and impartial.

Believe me, my dear sir, to be,
Yours truly,
(Sgd.) D. L. MACDONALD, P.P.

I do not propose to comment upon these letters at greater length, because they speak more eloquently with respect to the manner in which Mr. Duchemin has conducted his investigations in Nova Scotia than any words of mine could. But my mind goes back to a case in which the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) was interested, much of which goes to prove the statement which I made some time ago, that the trouble with the poor Government officials in Nova Scotia has been that they have been hounded by hon. gentlemen opposite who represent constituencies in that province. Now, here is a case where the hon. member for Guysborough was being driven around the county of Guysborough before the last election by a man who was earning his day's wages from the Government of the country, and, not only that, but the hon. gentleman himself was in the wagon with this official when he canvassed a voter, and said: 'If you vote for Sinclair, I will see that your sons get work with the Government.' These facts were proven in the investigation held before this same Mr. Duchemin. This is a sample, and it is well to have this House know how elections are conducted in Nova Scotia. This case was proved by the evidence of one Patrick Connolly, who, under oath, gave evidence before this same Mr. H. P Duchemin. I am sorry that the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) is out of his seat. He comes from New Brunswick, but I have the facts here in regard to a case in which an old man, over seventy years of age, who had been in the employ of the Government for over thirty-four years, was dismissed from office by him—why? Because his son, in the heat of an election campaign, driving along the road, had got up in his wagon and said 'Hurrah for Powell,' Mr. Powell being the candidate opposed to the hon. gentleman in the election. On that evidence alone that poor old man, who had been a faithful Government employee for thirty-four years, was dismissed. I refer to the case of James Sutherland, who was stationmaster at Aulac. I have no doubt that these instances will afford considerable evidence to this committee of the conditions under which we have had to fight in the province of Nova Scotia, and that they will in a very large measure explain why it was that the Conservative party has had such a comparatively small representation from that province for many years.

Mr. LANCASTER: Who dismissed that man?

Mr. RHODES: The hon. member for Westmorland, who at that time was Minister of Railways and Canals. Another extraordinary argument was presented by the hon. ex-Minister of Railways and Canals. He made a laboured effort extending over twenty minutes to show that all the men who paid into this provident fund were participants, and that, whether they were individually proceeded against by way of attempted dismissal or not, they were interested in the common fund, and that therefore any attempt at dismissal would do them an injury. As a matter of fact, the reverse is the case. If you dismissed half the men who have been drawing out of the fund, there would be only half the number remaining to participate in it, therefore, twice as much money for those remaining, I, for one, fail to see the virtue of the hon. gentleman's argument.

Some other matters came to my personal knowledge in my own constituency in which Mr. Duchemin is concerned. I took particular pains to inquire, in order to see how these cases were conducted. The men concerned had present the head of their organization, to see that they were fairly treated, witnesses were called in behalf of the defendant, and in each case the defendant was enabled to give evidence. I saw a transcription of the evidence in these cases, and I do not believe that a fairer or more just trial would be given to any person in a court of law.

Mr. MACDONALD: Why do you not let everybody else see the evidence beside yourself?

Mr. RHODES: The hon. gentleman can move for the papers.

Mr. MACDONALD: No, we cannot get them.

Mr. RHODES: Well, if the hon. gentleman cannot get the papers at all, does he mean to say, in view of the statement I have made, that Mr. Duchemin has unfairly conducted these inquiries?

Mr. MACDONALD: You will find that out before you get very much farther.

Mr. RHODES: I believe that the evidence I have given is more than ample to show that the investigations in Nova Scotia were being conducted fairly and impartially. I have a good deal more evidence, which only came to hand to-day, and I have been unable to digest it, but we will have an opportunity to refer to this question at a later date.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes) has indulged in a great deal of fireworks, and his hypercritical charge about the pernicious conditions existing in Nova Scotia is to us somewhat amusing. Who started this business of running the Intercolonial railway on political lines? It was the hon. gentlemen opposite, in the days when public officials on the Intercolonial railway, under a Conservative administration, handed out passes at every general and by-election for the transportation of their voters free of charge. One does not need to go into this, for everybody knows it. My hon. friend would like the House and the country to see that an absolutely ethereal condition of affairs had come into existence once the hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches had gone there, that all politics had been eliminated, and that there was a beautiful independence of view and action permeating their conduct of this railway, that nobody was being dismissed on account of politics, nobody accused on account of politics, but that since this high-minded administration had come into office, all of these difficulties had disappeared. All I can say is that I admire the assurance of my hon. friend, when he can stand up before this committee and make such a ridiculous and astounding statement. As to the evidence which he gave us of the great fairness of Mr. Duchemin, and as to the letter which he produced, and which he said I had written, as evidence to support anything about Mr. Duchemin or anything which my hon. friend said in regard to me, there is no lawyer in this House who would attach the slightest possible credence or weight to such evidence. When I tell you that that letter was stolen from the House of Mr. McCullough, for the purpose of creating the impression that Mr. Ross had done something wrong, and was brought before Mr. Duchemin, you have some idea of the just way in which these investigations before Mr. Duchemin have been carried on.

Mr. RHODES: You do not say that Mr. Duchemin stole it?

Mr. MACDONALD: Mr. Duchemin knew that the charge was made that the letter was stolen, and he also knew that, by any reading of the English language or any possible construction of any kind, there could be nothing distorted from that letter that would warrant any imputation against Mr. Ross.

Now, where has all this discussion arisen, and why all this flamboyant effusion on the part of my hon. friend? I rose to ask the Minister of Railways whether or not he would bring before this committee the evidence taken before this great jurist, Mr. Duchemin, in each and every case. I admitted frankly the right of the minister to dismiss men for partisanship where there was proper cause, and I have never raised that question in the House myself. What I said was that the men on the Intercolonial railway who had paid into the provident fund had vested rights of a financial character over and above the mere question of office holding, and that the minister should not take away those vested rights without having before him sworn testimony of a character that would warrant a judge in a similar case, where the employee belongs to a company, in deciding one way or the other upon that question. I said that the minister had not brought down in previous years under the order of Parliament the evidence taken before Mr. Duchemin. I asked him to bring it.

Mr. COCHRANE: I brought down all the evidence I had.

Mr. MACDONALD: I am not blaming the minister for not bringing what he had, but I claim that the minister should have made this man, Mr. Duchemin, produce the evidence and not his statement of it. The trouble with Mr. Duchemin in my county has been this, that on some evening a constable or some other official would arrive with a notification to some unfortunate sectionman or other individual to appear before Mr. Duchemin in some town the next day.

Mr. RHODES: Do you know of a case in your county or any other county where, when an adjournment was requested on the part of the accused, it was not granted?

Mr. MACDONALD: I may say to my hon. friend in reference to the men who were dismissed in my county, that Mr. Duchemin never had an investigation when I happened to be on hand. If he had given sufficient notice to the party charged, to give him time to communicate with me, I would have gone there; but I know, from the evidence of men upon whom I can safely rely, that he has refused to grant time to enable them to communicate with counsel, and has made the notice of his hearings so short that it was impossible for the party charged to get in communication with anybody who would conduct his defence upon proper lines.

Mr. RHODES: I think the hon. gentleman wishes to be absolutely fair. I am sure he will permit me to say that on the inquiries I made, I feel quite safe in replying that in no instance has an adjournment ever been refused when asked for.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend cannot possibly compass, with the means he has of getting information, all the doings or misdoings of this gentleman, Mr. Duchemin. That would be a task far too great for him to accomplish with the time at his disposal, and I am quite sure his information, while I have a right to accept it as being absolutely correct, as he states it is, could not have been of that extended character that would enable him to speak of what was done in each and every case. I make the statement upon the authority of men whose reputation is beyond question, that these men have received notice to appear in less than twenty-four hours, and it was impossible for them to communicate with counsel, or with gentlemen who would be able to appear for them, and that adjournments, in order that they could get counsel, were refused. I want to call the attention of the minister and of the committee to this fact. I said before to the minister that where he took the vested rights of an employee in a fund, he should not proceed except upon legal evidence, and that that evidence should be made a matter of record in his department, and should be available in Parliament in order to justify his action. That is the principle I contend for personally. It is one that cannot be denied, and I have a right to ask, before this House passes the Bill interfering with the constitution of this Act in any way, and in order to give the House an opportunity to consider what other amendments might be made, that we should have before us the cases, and the evidence upon which the cases were based, in which the minister has taken away the vested rights in a provident fund of the men employed on the Intercolonial

Mr. McLEAN (Queens, P.E.I.): When the Liberal party came into power in 1896, there was a statute upon the books which provided that a fund should be made for the employees of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island railways. A certain sum of money was retained from their monthly wages. At that time wholesale dismissals were made without any investigation, and these men were never paid any of the money which was in the Government's hands at the time they were dismissed. I have had since 1911 many applications from these men for the return of the moneys retained by the Government on their behalf. I would ask the Minister of Railways to amend this resolution in order to make it apply to the men who were summarily dismissed without any investigation in 1896 and 1897, and to provide that the money which is now, and was then in the hands of the Government, be returned to these men. It is hardly fair that the men who were summarily dismissed without investigation in 1896 and 1897 should not be in the same position as the employees who were dismissed in 1912. On the Prince Edward Island railway in 1896, a great number of section men were dismissed, who did not receive the benefit of an investigation; but on the contrary, the then acting Minister of Railways simply wrote a letter to the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island railway ordering that these men be dismissed without investigation, but simply on the statement of some irresponsible person in the county made to the Minister of Railways. I will read one of these letters:

> In acknowledging receipt of your letter of the 13th August, I wish to say that the names of the labourers to be placed upon sections 5 and 8 will be given to you by Mr. John F. Whear, who will also give you the names of the third men in each section for extra labour which you may require.
>
> With respect to the section labourers in Kings county, I have complaints regarding the section men on numbers 2 and 3 of the Georgetown branch of the Prince Edward Island railway, which I have every reason to believe are well founded, and which preclude their continuance in their present positions.

Could that happen to-day? Suppose one of the gentlemen who represents a constituency in Eastern Canada went to-day to Mr. Cochrane, the Minister of Railways, and said that he had reason to believe a man was guilty of partisanship, what would the minister tell him. Simply: 'Lay your complaint; that complaint will be laid before the investigating officer, and if the charges are proven, the man will be dismissed; if they are not proven, he will be retained in office.' That is what the minister would tell him, and what he has

always done since he took the oath of office. (Reading):

The names of these men in section 3 at present are: Philip H. Mooney, Frances McAree and John H. Bradley.

I desire them to be replaced by John P. Bradley, St. Teresa, Patrick Mooney, Peake's Station and Philip Maher of the same place.

The men I desire to be displaced are violent partisans and showed themselves to be such on election day, by acting in a way which renders it impossible to retain them.

Where did he get that information? Was it after an investigation on the sworn testimony of witnesses? No, simply founded on some representation as I said before by some irresponsible person. (Reading):

For section 2 I submit the names of Frank McCormick, Cardigan, Peter McLeod, Lorne Valley and Peter Goodwin, Baldwin Station.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) Acting Minister of Railways.

Now, I do not think that we should make fish of one and flesh of another in this matter. These claims should be paid if they are honest. I have no doubt in my own mind—and I think there is abundant evidence to prove—that there are thousands of dollars today in the hands of the Government paid in by these poor men who were summarily dismissed as this letter goes to show. I would ask the minister now, in view of these facts, to amend this resolution so as to make it apply to the Conservative workmen dismissed without cause in 1896. I think it nothing but fair that these men should get their hard-earned money back. They earned it, but it was retained by the Government as a fund similar to the provident fund. And there is no reason why these men should not be treated the same as the men dismissed for partisanship in 1912.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): When my hon. friend from Cumberland (Rhodes) turned to me in a dramatic way and threatened to put me in the witness box to prove that I had given a certificate of character to Mr. Duchemin, I felt a little embarrassed. I did not know what he had up his sleeve, but thought that whatever it was it must be something of importance.

Mr. RHODES: I have some more here.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): My hon. friend at last produced his evidence to prove that I had acknowledged the independence, impartiality and honesty of Commissioner Duchemin. It was in the form of a letter written by Mr. Murray. Now, this Mr. Murray, I believe, is an employee of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I understand he is employed in the yards in Truro.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I am so informed. At all events, I am told, this man, if not an employee of the Government, is a very strong Conservative. He says in his letter simply that I stated that I was satisfied with the way Mr. Duchemin conducted the investigation. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that I do not think I ever made such a statement. I do not say that Mr. Murray deliberately misstated the facts, but if he understood me to say anything like what he attributes to me, I am confident that the statement I made did not justify such understanding. I am convinced of that not only because I should not having been truthful in making such a statement regarding the conduct of Mr. Duchemin, whom I have observed very closely, but because of what I stated in letters written on the subject almost immediately after the occasion referred to by him. I wrote a letter to Mr. Lowe a few days after the investigation as follows:

A. B. Lowe, Esq.,
Pres. Inter. Brotherhood of M. of W. Employees
St. Louis, Mo.

Dear Mr. Lowe,—I beg to call your attention to the unfair treatment accorded to certain of the Intercolonial sectionmen in this county. An investigation was held, which judging by the sequel can only be called a farce. I was present at the hearing before Commissioner Duchemin at Pomquet. William Landry, section foreman, and Charles Landry, underman, were charged with political partisanship. There was no specific accusation. I heard the evidence, and there was not a particle of evidence elicited against either of these men to justify a finding of partisanship. What their politics is, or what part, if any, they took in elections, do not appear from any evidence given that day. The brotherhood have a right to require that when an investigation be held, the men will be judged by the facts there disclosed. It is a downright imposition on your brotherhood to dismiss men on such evidence as was taken at Pomquet. If those seeking the places of the dismissed have to be rewarded for their party service, why not have the railway authorties distribute the spoils without any sham pretence of respecting the contention of the brotherhood. It remains to be seen whether the brotherhood has a reason for its existence so far as protecting its members goes. As the representative for this county in the federal House, I stand for the men in this case, and protest against any farcical inquiries such as held before Commissioner Duchemin, and acted upon by the Minister of Railways.

I do not think there is anything in that letter to show that I had a great appreciation of the conduct or impartiality of Mr. Duchemin. But I have another letter written to Mr. Murary himself, and if I ever expressed myself to Mr. Murray in the way he said I did, this letter would certainly be inconsistent on my part. The letter says:

It is simply shameful how the Intercolonial railway sectionmen in this country, whose places were wanted by inferior men, have been treated.

Then I go on to refer to certain persons; but perhaps I should best consult the feelings of hon. members opposite by not reading these references at this time, but by going on with that part which refers to the conduct of Mr. Duchemin. Speaking of the investigation in the case of Mr. William R. Fougère, I go on to say:

William R. Fougère is the last man in the world who should be called a political partisan. I have known him personally since years, and in no sense whatever has he ever been known to intermeddle in political contests. But he is dismissed; and Mr. Duchemin, in the absence of any evidence, invokes the disconnected, and in its true sense, the harmless story of the half witted girl of Pomquet who gave no evidence whatever in the Fougere investigation, to justify his false report. Why put the country to the expense of investigation and the parties accused to the annoyance these inquiries involved, if these inquiries are not to be honestly conducted and the reports to be based on evidence such as one expects from judicial inquiries? It is an insult to the intelligence of the brotherhood the way the investigations have resulted in this country. It is beside the point to say that there is no miscarriage of justice for these men are all guilty and are well known in the communities in which they live to have forfeited the protection the brotherhood ought properly to afford to them. Grant the conditions are as stated, then the men should be dismissed without investigation, and the proper authorities should accept responsability therefor. But when that investigation is ordered and takes place, the decision of the commissioners should strictly follow the evidence given there and then at the investigation, and should not be influenced by outside representations.

I read these letters to show that Mr. Murray must have been entirely mistaken when he said that I expressed satisfaction with the way Mr. Duchemin conducted these investigations. I repeat that I have no recollection of having said what is attributed to me and do not believe I ever said it, a belief which I hold all the more strongly because of these letters. I have observed the conduct of Mr. Duchemin in these investigations, and am bound to say that it was not characterized by the judicial dignity and impartiality suitable to such occasions. I went down to attend the investigation in Pomquet. I had an idea that I should not be permitted to take part in the investigation, because I had heard of the conduct of Mr. Duchemin and knew of the way he had conducted an investigation at Tracadie a few days before this. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) asked my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) if he knew of cases where sufficient notice was not given. I can name one case which took place in Afton, the accused being Mr. John McDonnell. Mr. McDonnell was investigated in his absence by Mr. Duchemin. Another case is that of Mr. Hubert Myatte, of Tracadie. Mr. Duchemin sent notice by telegraph from Antigonish to the station master who sent it by the sectionman to warn Mr. Myatte to be on hand on the arrival of the train. The train came in about five or ten minutes after Mr. Myatte received the notice, so, of course, he had no opportunity to prepare a defence.

Mr. RHODES: If, in that case, adjournment was asked, was it refused?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I know nothing about that; I was not there. But the Inquiries Act, under amendment made last session, provides:

Reasonable and sufficient notice shall be given so that the party may be able to prepare for his defence either in person or by counsel.

So it provides that persons who are accused shall have the privilege of being represented by counsel. But here was a case where notice was given only five or ten minutes before the arrival of the train on which the investigator was who immediately afterwards opened his court and proceeded with the investigation. How could the accused get counsel?

Mr. LANCASTER: In the case the hon. gentleman has just mentioned, did the accused not ask for an adjournment for the purpose of doing these things he has complained of? Was it not an indication that he knew he was guilty, and did not want to waste time?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): He had no counsel to advise him as to what his rights were, and he was not given a chance to take advice. I am complaining of the manner in which Mr. Duchemin undertook to make his inquiries. I submit that he should have given reasonable notice to the party accused, so that he might have an opportunity of consulting counsel. At the investigation in Pomquet, held about the end of May last, I was refused the right to take any part in the examination. Commissioner Duchemin stated that he did not allow any solicitor to appear for the parties at these investigations, and that in the very teeth of the Act not only permitting counsel, but commanding the commissioner to hear the accused by counsel. I think he qualified his refusal to me of my right to appear by stating that only in the case of charges against officials in the Marine and Fisheries Department had he allowed counsel.

Mr. RHODES: I assume that the hon. member for Antigonish wishes to be fair

in this matter, and I would like to ask him if Mr. Duchemin did not state that he had refused in all cases to permit the engagement of counsel, as it tended to prolong the proceedings, but that the hon. gentleman was at liberty to sit beside the man accused and suggest to him any questions that might be asked of witnesses.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I do not remember the exact words Mr. Duchemin used, but I desire to be fair in the matter, and, if he did use words of that kind or express any such sentiment, I am willing that he shall have the benefit of them. But he absolutely refused to allow me to appear on behalf of the accused, and would not permit me to cross-examine any of the witnesses present. He knew I was there for that purpose and he stated distinctly and unequivocally that I could not cross-examine the witnesses or take part in the conduct of the investigations. Perhaps he did say, 'If you like you can whisper to your client,' surely he could not deny me that privilege, and I think I need not thank him very much for his kindness in that respect. I do not think my hon. friend from Cumberland can make a very great hero of him because he allowed me to whisper to my client if I desired to do so.

Let me call the attention of the Minister of Railways to an amendment to the Inquiries Act which was passed last year. Chapter 28 of the Dominion Statutes, 1912, amends the Inquiries Act, Chapter 104 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, by adding thereto Sections 11, 12 and 13. Section 12 says that 'the commissioner, whether appointed under Part 1 or Part 2 of said Act, may allow counsel, and shall allow any person against whom any charge is made . . . to be represented by counsel.' Section 13 provides that reasonable notice shall be given of the charge . . . alleged against him and he shall have been allowed full opportunity 'to be heard in person or by counsel.'

Commissioner Duchemin, in conducting his investigations, has openly defied the law under which he is supposed to act. The Minister of Railways intimated the other day that instructions had been given to the commissioners as to the manner in which these inquiries should be conducted, and I venture to say that the attention of Commissioner Duchemin, as well as of every other commissioner was called—or should have been called—to the Act under which he must proceed in cases of this kind. Mr. Duchemin, as a lawyer, must have been familiar with the provisions of this Act, although I do not think he can be styled an exceptionally good, impartial, and independent man simply because he is a lawyer. My hon. friend, supporting the contention that Mr. Duchemin was an exceptionally well qualified man, stated that he was a member of the bar; but I know that members of the bar are not all above reproach, and I am sorry that the conduct of Mr. Duchemin is such as I would not expect of any reputable, fair-minded, and conscientious lawyer. Certainly it is not such conduct as I would expect of any judge. Never in my experience have I seen such an instance of cold-blooded partisanship; such a desire to achieve the object which he seemed to have in mind. He seemed to be under the impression that his mission was to get those who came under his jurisdiction out of the way and make a place for others who were looking for the positions. The country owes nothing to Mr. Duchemin, but the Conservative party, perhaps, owe him a great deal, and if the Government are looking for a man who will go to any extremes to carry out their designs in this respect, they can find such a man in Commissioner Duchemin.

I was also present at the investigation at Arisaig, where charges made against the sub-collector of customs and the fishery officers, and others were invesitgated. I went there at the request of these persons, although I knew Commissioner Duchemin would not allow me to take any part in the investigation. I drove 26 or 28 miles to the place at which the investigation was being held, and told Mr. Duchemin I wished to appear for these persons. He very politely and courteously informed me that he did not allow counsel to take any part in the proceedings; that there was no counsel on the other side, and therefore he would not allow counsel to act for the accused. It was on that occasion, and not at Pomquet, that Mr. Duchemin stated: 'If you like you can sit alongside of your clients and suggest any questions you wish them to ask.' At the Pomquet investigation I was merely a spectator, although I took notes of the evidence.

Mr. RHODES: I do not wish to unduly interrupt the hon. gentleman, and I am prepared to do him the justice of believing that he wants to get at the facts. I have a letter here from Mr. Duchemin in reference to this case at Arisaig——

Mr. McKENZIE: Is that a subject for interruption?

Mr. RHODES: Who has the floor?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I have no objection to my hon. friend's asking a question, but I would like him to confine himself to that question, as I do not wish to have my remarks sandwiched with the production of letters at this stage.

Mr. RHODES: I desire to base a question upon the information contained in

this letter, but if the hon. gentleman would prefer, as it may be more or less lengthy, I will wait until he has concluded his remarks.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): The hon. member for Cumberland must have felt that the record of Mr. Duchemin was not the best, and that the conduct of his investigations required some defence at his hands. When testimonials from the chairman of the Ways and Maintenance Executive committee in Truro of the kind here in evidence are produced, hon. gentlemen know how much importance to attach to the statements submitted. If his report as to investigations elsewhere are not more correct than his reports respecting the inquiries at Pomquet and Harbour au Bouche, then I do not attach much importance to his statements. I was not personally present at the investigations at Harbour au Bouche, but am convinced from the information I have received that Mr. Duchemin was there not as a judge, but as a prosecutor—or persecutor. My hon. friend, in support of his contention that Mr. Duchemin is a fair minded man, produces a letter purporting to have been written by Father Daniel L. Macdonald of Arisaig. Father Macdonald will hardly thank my hon. friend for dragging his name into a matter of this kind for the purpose of justifying the conduct of Commissioner Duchemin for these investigations at Arisaig. The character of the work the Conservative party tried to accomplish down there, and the meanness of the whole thing is such that Father Daniel Macdonald would not—no, there is not a Tory in Arisaig district who would stand up and justify the things that have taken place and the manner in which the investigations were conducted. I would be very sorry to believe it of him or any clergyman.

Mr. RHODES: You do not deny Father Macdonald's letter?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I am not going to comment on what is in that letter of Father Macdonald's. I leave that as it is; the people down there can judge pretty well how much importance to attach to the defence which my hon. friend tries to make of Commissioner Duchemin by quoting Father Macdonald's letter.

The Bill which we have before us is designed to assist those who have been dismissed. I may say that as far as Antigonish is concerned, there was a veritable slaughter; in the Railway Department the heads were chopped off all over the county.

Mr. RHODES: Nonsense.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I know of no man who was investigated down there except Stewart and one other who was exonerated. I only know of two men who were investigated who did not get the knife. There are seven railway sections in Antigonish county. The first, the eastern section, is Harbour au Bouche. They decapitated two men there. The section foreman and two under men generally constitute the regular staff of a section. They decapitated two out of three of the section staff at Harbour au Bouche. The names are William R. Fougère and Allan Kinney. Then we come to Tracadie, where John Girouard was virtually dismissed. Conditions with regard to work were imposed on him so onerous that he was unable to do his work, and he resigned. He was forced out and to all intents and purposes dismissed.

Mr. COCHRANE: Was it the department that forced any work on him or was it the management?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): It was the management.

Mr. COCHRANE: Are they political?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Yes, it was a part of the scheme. This man happened to get his leg broken the winter before that; he was a little lame, and when he walked a great deal he was badly troubled with rheumatism. As a section foreman he lived in a certain part of the section and was able to attend to the work regularly, but the management required him to walk to the end of the section, a mile and a half to two miles off, before his work in the morning and after his work at night and the additional walking imposed on him, thus after the 21st of September, so effected him that he was obliged to resign. Everybody in that section knows that that was the means adopted to get clear of him, Hubert Myatte an underman on that section was also dismissed. The next section above Tracadie is Afton. There two-thirds of the men were dismissed. They were John Macdonell and J. W. Melanson. The case of Macdonell was investigated in his absence and Melanson's investigation was a farce. At the next section William Landry, Charles Landry and James Armstrong were all dismissed. James Armstrong had been seventeen years or thereabouts in the service. He had now passed the meridian of life; he has a large family with no means of supporting his family except his wages on the section. He served the road faithfully all that time and if he had been allowed to remain on for, I think, eight months longer, a comparatively short time anyway, he would have been enjoying a pension to-day—a pension which ought to be his inasmuch as he contributed the same from his earnings. As it was they cut him off, although he had a large family depending on the pittance he earned, and earned very hard, on

the section. William Fougère, at Harbour au Bouche, to whom I referred, is a man with eighteen children, the youngest three years of age, and that man was cut off having no other visible means of support, with absolutely no evidence against him whatever. I have the report of Mr. Duchemin in this case. I have not the evidence. I wrote for it, but did not get it. If the minister will get the evidence in Fougère's case he will find that there was no justification for his dismissal, and in order that Mr. Duchemin might be able to carry out the orders he received from his masters he goes so far as to say that the evidence of the wife of Mr. Fougère should not be believed. He says also that he does not believe the evidence of the sectionman, Fougère, himself. In any place where Mr. Duchemin and Mr. Fougère and his wife are known there will be no difficulty in accepting the word of Mrs. Fougère and her husband before that of Mr. Duchemin. Mr. Fougère has a reputation for truth and honesty in that section that the reflections of Mr. Duchemin cannot sully.

The next section is Antigonish. Mr. Wm. H. Landry was dismissed. Next in order comes Colin Macdonald, of James River, who was dismissed M. Henry Williams an under man there was not investigated. I have not heard what his fate was but I know he is not, nor was he ever, a partisan or a busy-body in politics or anything else. These are sectionmen, and who were put in their places? Is it any wonder that accidents are happening all along the Intercolonial railway, and that the road is considered to be in bad shape and travel dangerous? If that same thing has taken place all along the Intercolonial railway that has occurred in Antigonish, I do not wonder at it at all. They have dismissed two-thirds of the capable and efficient men and put inferior men on sections requiring the very best experienced men obtainable and naturally the result is that the road must suffer and be in a bad state of repair. How do they conform with the rules of the Intercolonial railway in regard to the character of the men they have put on the road? There is a rule that no man who is over 35 years of age may be employed unless he has been previously engaged in some other work on the Intercolonial railway when the age limit is 40. The majority of the men replacing those dismissed in Antigonish are over 40 years of age and inexperienced and they have been put there in violation of the rule and regulation of the Intercolonial railway. How can you expect faithful work, honest efficient work, where all the rules of the road are violated in that way? You can expect nothing but demoralization.

Mr. COCHRANE: How did they get on in 1896?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): That rule did not apply in 1896.

Mr. COCHRANE: They were dismissed.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): These men who replaced the dismissed were not men who were on previous to 1896. There is not one in Antigonish who was on previous to 1896. They are all new men with one or two exceptions.

Mr. COCHRANE: They were dismissed in 1896 wholesale and new men put on. Thus you are condemning the actions of your predecessors.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Not at all. There was no general dismissals after 1896. Let me call attention to the fact that there was no Provident Act in force then.

Mr. COCHRANE: I am speaking now of the efficiency of the road.

Mr. GRAHAM: The Provident Fund Act speaks of the age at which they can come on.

Mr. COCHRANE: He has not given an instance.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Over 75 per cent of those men have been replaced

---

Mr. COCHRANE: I shall afford an opportunity to the hon. gentleman to prove that statement.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I will prove every word to the hilt. I would go over the whole list in this House just now only it would take up too much time. Let me now refer to other dismissals. Two station masters in the county fell by the roadside. Joseph Benoit, one of the most intelligent men in the section, an absolutely respectable man, was selected by the returning officer to act as presiding officer on the occasion of the last two elections. A young man who stayed at his place was seen on election day driving along the road from the polling booth to the station with two other men who took the train to Antigonish. They were presumed to be voters, and no doubt they were. The charge against Joseph Benoit was that this boy who stayed at his house took his team and drove the two men to the poll. That was all the evidence of partisanship. There was no evidence that he attended any meetings or conventions, that he sought to influence a voter directly or indirectly, that he ever asked a man how he was going to vote, or suggested to him how he should vote, or that he should refrain from voting. There was no evidence of partisanship, and yet that man was dismissed. Another station master

was dismissed, and the principle cause of his dismissal was that in the community in which he resided, he was supposed to be an active supporter of his brother. That man happened to be guilty of the unpardonable political offence of being a brother of the member for Antigonish county and, therefore, he had to be dismissed, notwithstanding the fact that he had an excellent record as a capable, efficient and obliging public servant.

What is the principle upon which hon. gentlemen are going to act? My hon. friend from Pictou stated that the Minister of Railways had a pretty clean sheet, and he contrasted his conduct with that of the Postmaster General. I am bound to take issue with my hon. friend, because the Postmaster General dismissed employees right and left; he sought not excuses or explanations. He was more manly about it, at any rate. He did not put the country to the expense of a farcical investigation.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Meighen): Order. I think the hon. member must confine himself to dismissals in the Railway Department.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I am directing myself to that, but I wish to make a contrast. I wish to point out to the Minister of Railways how he should in view of the circumstances have acted in these matters. He should have the courage of the Postmaster General and dismiss employees without any cause whatever; anybody that is a Grit must go. That is the principle on which the Postmaster General acts. I believe that the Minister of Railways did not know all the facts in these cases. I am bound to say that I think he was disposed to act honestly in the matter, but he was imposed upon by Commissioner Duchemin. There is no question about that. Mr. Duchemin got and cheerfully took his instructions from the patronage committees in the various counties to which he went. In the county which I have the honour to represent, the patronage has been worked very strangely. The defeated candidate has no control over it at all. He was side-tracked. He was an upright honourable man, of absolute fairness and impartiality, a strong consistent, virile Tory of the Tories, who has been a Tory ever since I can remember, and who has rendered valiant service to the Tory party, for which they do not seem to show much gratitude. Yet he was side-tracked and someone else put in his place, and a committee was formed and this committee suggested to Mr. Duchemin how the investigations should be run. I have moved for the evidence in connection with these cases to which I have referred, and I propose to take up this question of dismissals later on. In the meantime I want to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to the fact that previous to 1896 there was no provident fund. The brotherhoods had practically no standing, in our part of the country at all events, but after 1896, after those dismissals to which my hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes) referred, the men organized and formed a brotherhood, and they got the Railway Department to agree to certain conditions under which the employees of the road should conduct themselves thereafter. Let me point out that previous to 1896, if there were dismissals, there was no rule of the road that required investigation.

Mr. COCHRANE: There is none now.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Under the regulations of the brotherhood no man is supposed to be dismissed unless for some cause. The brotherhood is supposed to protect its members, and how a man votes is not supposed to be a sufficient ground for dismissal. The brotherhood is supposed to protect its members against any high handed or tyrannical dealings.

Mr. LANCASTER: And the brotherhood is making no complaint.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Those men who were dismissed were members of the brotherhood and the brotherhood has been making complaint. The complaint is that they have not been able to reinstate their men. The reason that Mr. Lowe gave in his letter to me for this failure is not a good reason under the existing circumstances. The conditions are entirely different from what they were prior to 1896. These rules and regulations of the brotherhood did not exist until after Mr. Blair's time; it was under him that the regulation was made. The sectionmen who have been dismissed had vested rights; they had been contributing to the fund right along and they should not be deprived of the right to share in that fund without just cause. But what could they do? They were powerless to do anything; there is no court of appeal. How does Mr. Duchemin justify those dismissals? He says the accused men did not go on the stand and prove that they were innocent. Did any one in a British country ever hear of an accused person being required to go on the stand to vindicate his innocence in the first instance? Is it not time enough to require that when a case has been made out against him? If the Minister of Railways will take the trouble to read the evidence taken in the investigations which were conducted by Mr. Duchemin, he will find that in at least fifty per cent. of the cases there is no evidence to justify dismissal. Mr. Duchemin recognizes that himself; the only ground upon which he seeks to justify his recommendations is that the accused had an

opportunity to go on the stand and did not take advantage of it. I was surprised to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes) say that because a man does not go on the witness stand, it must be presumed that he is guilty. That is a doctrine never heard of in a British court of justice, and one which should not be tolerated in any British community.

Mr. G. W. KYTE, (Richmond, N. S.): The manner in which Mr. Duchemin has been conducting investigations in the province of Nova Scotia has come in for criticism this afternoon. I happened to be one of those who attended an investigation in the town of St. Peters, and I will briefly describe what took place. The official, whose conduct was under investigation was not very capable of defending himself or of putting questions to witnesses calculated to bring out the facts. Before the proceedings began I informed Mr. Duchemin that I was there for the purpose of representing the accused.

Mr. DAVIDSON: What case is that?

Mr. KYTE: The case of a man named McLeod.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Where did he live?

Mr. KYTE: At Lewis Cove Road. Mr. Duchemin said: 'I cannot permit you to take any part in this investigation.' I said: 'The Inquiries Act' provides that the accused may appear by counsel.' He replied: 'Hold your tongue.' That was the reply of this eminent jurist who was appointed for the purpose of conducting these judicial enquiries. A little later on I pointed out to him that he was not taking down evidence which was calculated to remove any suspicion of partisanship from the accused. He said: 'If you don't keep quiet, we will have to put you out.' Later on, I ventured to suggest that the accused was not getting fair play, whereupon he turned round to the official who was on trial, and said: 'Look here, if you are responsible for the presence of this man Kyte, it will be all the worse for you,' thus intimating very clearly that whatever chance the accused had of escaping the vengeance of the commissioner it was only by his attorney keeping strictly quiet and not interfering with the proceedings.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I understand that this official was the postmaster and that he had nothing to do with the Department of Railways and Canals whatever.

Mr. KYTE: We are discussing Mr. Duchemin's method of conducting investigations. Now, I will proceed to the case of an official in the Department of Railways and Canals. Mr. Angus McAskill, lock master of St. Peter's canal, was summoned to appear before Mr. Duchemin in April last. I was not present at that enquiry but I know a gentleman who was present and who took down the evidence. Mr. McAskill resides in the house provided by the department for the lockmaster. He has a son who is a medical practitioner in St. Peter's and he has another son, Frank McAskill, who was residing with the father. During the month of May of 1911 Dr. Bissett, with whom Dr. McAskill was practising in partnership, met a person by the name of George Murphy, who told him that his clothes were being held in Sydney on account of his not having money to pay his board. He asked Dr. Bissett if he would be good enough to loan him $4 to release his clothes. Dr. Bissett said that he did not have the money then but that he would get the money for him. Murphy called at Dr. Bissett's office, Dr. Bissett was not there, but Dr. McAskill was present and Murphy repeated to him what Dr. Bissett had told him. Dr. McAskill said: I have not the money in my pocket, but I will give you a note to my brother and he will get it for you. Murphy took the note to McAskill's house, entered the door of the office of the lockmaster, passed the note to Mr. McAskill and the lockmaster called his son and passed the note to him. The son went to his brother's room, brought down an envelope containing $3.50, Mr. McAskill passed it to young Murphy and Murphy went away. These are all the circumstances that were established at the enquiry. Mr. McAskill was asked by Mr. Duchemin as regards his own partisanship in the election and this is the evidence:

Angus McAskill sworn: I was appointed lockmaster October 4, 1910. I was not before in the employ of the Government. I have done no election work since I have been appointed. In the election of 1908 I was presiding officer in the poll at St. Peters, but was not an agent.

Mr. McAskill was not appointed lock master until 1909.

I did not exhibit a copy of the so-called Orange pamphlet in 1908. I never saw a copy of it. I do not know of any of these pamphlets having been used in 1908. I did not try to get George Stone to vote Liberal. He was a bridgeman. I did not ask him to get his son Jonas to vote right. I did not tell him that if he didn't get his son Jonas to vote right he would lose his job as bridgeman.

I didn't canvass George Murphy last local election. My son is a doctor. He had some money in his trunk upstairs in my house, and asked me to give it to George Murphy. I think it would be before last local election. I went to the trunk and got $3 and gave it to Murphy. I gave it to Murphy at the lockhouse. I don't know what it was for. He came to me to the lockhouse with a written order from my son for it. I didn't ask my son why he was giving the $3 to Murphy. I don't know Mrs. Capt. Micheau's son, John McDonald.

Had no transaction with regard to Orange pamphlets with him. I never heard tell of the so-called Orange pamphlets till now. Didn't know they were used in the election of 1908.

(Sgd.) ANGUS McASKILL.

Hearing adjourned till 11.30 a.m. April 10, 1912.

George Murphy was called and he swore as follows:

George Murphy sworn: I know Angus McAskill. I remember getting $3.50 from him last local election.

I may say that Mr. Duchemin elicited the fact that there was a local election in Nova Scotia in June, 1911:

It was his son, Dr. McAskill, gave me a note to go to him and get it. The local election was going on. Dr. Bissett called at our house, and left word there for me to go to Dr. McAskill and get $4. I went to Dr. McAskill and told him that Dr. Bissett had sent me for the money. He then gave me the note to his brother. I went down to the lock and gave the note to Angus McAskill, and he gave me the money. I only went to Dr. McAskill the once. He gave me the order right away.

his
(Sgd.) GEORGE x MURPHY.
mark.

Then, we have the statement of Fred. McAskill:

Fred. McAskill sworn: I am a doctor practicing at St. Peters. In may last—a few weeks before the local election—George Murphy came to me for treatment, and said that Dr. Bissett had sent him to get $4. I then wrote a note to my brother Frank, authorizing him to give the amount to Murphy. Instead of taking it to Frank, he took it to my father. The money was given to him. Afterwards, Dr. Bissett met me and asked me if I had given the $4 to Murphy. I told him that I had given him $3.50 and Dr. Bissett paid me the money back.

(Sgd.) FRED. McASKILL, M.D.

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the minutes of evidence taken at the hearing of the case of Angus McAskill, lockmaster at St. Peters, N.S.

(Sgd.) H. P. DUCHEMIN,
Commissioner of Inquiry.

Sydney, N.S., April 23, 1912.

There is the evidence bearing upon this circumstance.

Mr. DAVIDSON: In the case of Mr. McLeod, the postmaster to whom the hon. gentleman referred, was this man dismissed on the recommendation of Mr. Duchemin?

Mr. KYTE: I cannot say if he has been dismissed unless he has been within the last forty-eight hours.

Mr. DAVIDSON: As a matter of fact did not Mr. Duchemin find this man free from partisanship?

Mr. KYTE: I do not know.

Mr. DAVIDSON: It is very important.

Mr. KYTE: It is important for him and it would be as strange indeed as it is important if he has not been dismissed. This is Mr. Duchemin's report upon the McAskill case:

Sydney, N.S., April 23rd, 1912.

Hon. Frank Cochrane, M.P.,
Minister of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Canada.

Re Angus McAskill, Lockmaster,
St. Peter's, N.S.

Dear Sir,—On the 9th inst., I conducted an inquiry into the charges against Angus McAskill, lockmaster, at St. Peter's, in the county of Richmond.

George Stone, a bridgeman, in the employ of the Dominion Government, was spoken to by Mr. McAskill last Dominion election, as to the way Stone's son, Jonas, was going to vote. Mr. McAskill said: 'I understood that Jonas is going to vote against us.' That was about the last of August. Witness replied that he supposed Jonas would vote the same side as witness did.

George Murphy, a labourer, received $3.50 in an envelope from Mr. McAskill, just before last local election. He had received a note from Dr. McAskill, a son of the accused, which he took to the father, and the father procured the money, and gave it to him. This was in pursuance of a promise made by Dr. Bissett, one of the Liberal candidates, when he called at Murphy's house to canvass him some days previously.

Mr. McAskill admitted this, but said he did not know why the money was being advanced to Murphy. It was his son's money, and he was simply giving it to him because his son told him.

The son, Dr. McAskill, testified that he gave the money through his father, because Dr. Bissett had requested him to.

I have no doubt this money was paid Murphy to influence his vote in Dr. Bissett's favour, and I do not believe the statement which Mr. McAskill made, that he did not know why this money was being passed over to Murphy in such a mysterious and round-about manner on the very eve of the local election.

I am enclosing you the evidence which was taken in this matter.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) H. P. DUCHEMIN,
Commissioner of Inquiry.

Mr. COCHRANE: Will the hon. gentleman, before he sits down, read the evidence of the two men who were dismissed from the same positions in 1896 and 1897?

Mr. KYTE: There were no two men dismissed in 1896 or 1897. There was one man, the lockmaster, John D. Matheson, who was dismissed upon the evidence given before the commissioner who is now Judge Patterson of New Glasgow. The evidence is in the Railway Department and I shall be glad to discuss it if the hon. gentleman

brings it down. There is another significant fact showing Mr. Duchemin's eminent fairness in regard to this investigation. The evidence upon which Mr. McAskill was dismissed was that having relation to the handing of the $3.50 for his son to Murphy. Dr. McAskill and Murphy both swore that a few weeks afterwards Murphy paid back $2.50 of the $3.50 to Dr. McAskill, but Mr. Duchemin suppresses that important piece of evidence in his report to the minister. The only ground upon which Mr. Duchemin attempted to fasten a charge against Mr. McAskill was that the money was paid in this roundabout way for a corrupt purpose, but in the face of the evidence that the money was paid back a few weeks after, his interpretation of the circumstances falls to the ground. I have a statutory declaration from Dr. McAskill on the point. It is as follows:

In the matter of the dismissal of Angus McAskill, lockmaster at the St. Peter's canal, for political partisanship.

I, Fred. G. McAskill, of St. Peters, in the county of Richmond, province of Nova Scotia, do solemnly declare that I was examined as a witness at the investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, commissioner, into the charges of political partisanship alleged against Angus McAskill, lockmaster at the St. Peter's canal, at St. Peters aforesaid, on the (?) day of April, 1912. That I stated under oath as part of my evidence that two dollars and fifty cents of the three dollars and fifty cents given to George Murphy on my order to Frank McAskill about the last of May, 1911, was paid back to me by the said George Murphy in September, 1911. That George Murphy who was also examined as a witness at the same inquiry also testified that he paid me the two dollars and fifty cents on account of the three dollars and fifty cents advanced to him by me and that he made such payment in the month of September, 1911. And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true and of the same force and effect as if taken under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Taken and declared before me at St. Peters, in the county and province aforesaid, this 16th day of November, 1912.

ANGUS J. MACCUISH,
Commissioner of the Superior and County Courts in and for the County of Richmond.

F. G. McASKILL.

I saw Mr. Duchemin some time afterwards at St. Peters, and I pointed out to him that his report in the McAskill case was unfair, inasmuch as he had suppressed certain statements which would have thrown a very different light upon the circumstances to which he attached such considerable importance. Mr. Duchemin admitted to me that he did not report that portion of evidence to the minister, but he said: 'Dr. McAskill read over the evidence himself after it was taken down, and, as he did not call my attention to it or desire to have it written down, I thought he did not consider it important.' Now, you see the subterfuge to which Mr. Duchemin resorts. Mr. McAskill was not a lawyer, and knowing nothing about the value of testimony or the importance of having the whole of his testimony reported, signed the evidence, being glad to get away from this investigation, and as he did not ask to have this statement reported in the evidence, probably forgetting that the evidence was given, Mr. Duchemin thinks he is justified in having suppressed it, and having given a report to the minister which is not borne out by all the facts which were produced before him. I could give other instances to show Mr. Duchemin's partisanship, and his absolute unfitness to hold investigations of this nature.

Mr. COCHRANE: No, no.

Mr. KYTE: But inasmuch as they have reference to dismissals of officials in other departments of the Government, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee, because I know I would be called to order. I have upon the Order Paper motions to the number of forty having reference to dismissals of officials in the county of Richmond, and I beg to assure the hon. minister, and other hon. ministers here that they will have ample opportunity for discussing Mr. Duchemin's conduct in regard to those investigations.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

PATENT OF GEORGE FREDERICK BISHOPRIC.

Mr. STANFIELD moved second reading of Bill (No. 8), respecting a patent of George Frederick Bishopric —Mr Macdonell.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not wish to oppose the second reading of this Bill, but, if the hon. gentleman who moved it could give information as to the object of the measure, it would be better. If he is not in a position to explain at this time, I will waive any objection now, of course with the understanding that the information will be given in the committee stage. This matter of patents was discussed a great many times last year. Many Bills have been put through this House renewing patents contrary to the law, which patents ought not to be renewed. In fact, as I recollect it, so strongly was this brought out last year that some of these Bills were refused. It does seem to me that a man has no right to come to Parliament and get a patent renewed which has been allowed to lapse

through his own carlessness, and in a great many cases that is why they come here with these Bills. However, in the absence of the hon. member in whose name the Bill stands, I will not oppose it.

Mr. STANFIELD: I cannot give the explanation.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not oppose the second reading.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

DOMINION TRUST COMPANY.

Mr. STANFIELD moved second reading of Bill (No. 10), respecting the Dominion Trust Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): There are features of this Bill which will have to receive careful consideration, and, possibly, modification. But I think it proper to give it a second reading, and send it to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

NEW ORLEANS AND GRAND ISLE TRACTION, LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.

Mr. STANFIELD moved second reading of Bill (No. 11) respecting New Orleans and Grand Isle Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to New Orleans and Grand Isle Railway, Light and Power Company, Limited—Mr. Macdonell.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): In connection with this Bill, I would like to say what I said last session regarding another Bill. No company incorporated under the Companies' Act should be allowed to come to this Parliament and ask that its name be changed by Act of Parliament. I submit, they could go to the proper department here and, on petition, obtain the change in the name of the company that they desire. I do not think it is fair to encumber our statute book with legislation of this kind, nor do I think it fair that the time of Parliament should be taken up with such legislation. I intend to vote against this Bill.

Mr. STANFIELD: How would it do to let it stand until the minister is here?

Bill allowed to stand.

CANADIAN EXPLOSIVES LIMITED.

Mr. STANFIELD moved second reading of Bill (No. 9) respecting Canadian Explosives Limited.—Mr. Ames.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think this also is a case which should not receive much consideration from Parliament. If companies desire power to issue share warrants, an amendment should be made to our general statutes, so that Parliament should not be constantly receiving for consideration Bills of this character that take up our time and that should not be found in our statute books.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

RICHELIEU AND ONTARIO NAVIGATION CO.

Mr. STANFIELD moved second reading of Bill No. 20, respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. L'Esperance.

Mr. CARVELL: Before that goes through I would like to have some explanation as to the meaning of section 2 of this Bill. Section 1 provides for an increase in capital stock up to $15,000,000, and I presume there are good reasons why this legislation should be granted. Section 2 provides that the company may invest and deal with moneys of the company not immediately required in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as may seem expedient. This seems to be a very broad provision. They might have the money raised by the sale of bonds or stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company and use it for something entirely aside from the objects for which the company exists. I think the promoter should give some reason for this section of the proposed Bill.

Bill allowed to stand.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 7, respecting the Athabaska Northern Railway Company.—Mr. Turriff.

Bill No. 12, to incorporate the Great West Fire Insurance Company. — Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 16, respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company. — Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 17, to incorporate the Northern Empire Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Knowles.

Bill No. 18, respecting the Ontario-Michigan Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill No. 19, respecting the Ottawa Terminals Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 13, to incorporate the General Loan Company of Canada.—Mr. Knowles.

Bill No. 14, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 15, respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Currie.

GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS PROVIDENT FUND.

House in Committee on proposed resolution respecting the Intercolonial and

Prince Edward Island Railways Employees' Provident Fund Act.

Mr. STANFIELD: I did not intend to take part in this discussion, but the name of Mr. George R. Murray, of Truro, was referred to this afternoon in a manner not at all complimentary to him. Mr. Murray has been a citizen of Truro for a great many years, and I can assure hon. gentlemen we all think well of him. To my knowledge he has not been a partisan in any manner. I presume he voted for me, because he was an old Conservative—although I have never asked him how he voted—but I think it is unfair for hon. gentleman to make remarks about a man of his calibre. I am sure the citizens of Truro will all deeply resent the remarks made concerning Mr. Murray.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I had not intended to again take part in this debate, but the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) made a personal reference to me which I think demands my attention for a few moments. I think it would not be interesting to the House to compare the record of the hon. member for Cumberland with my own respecting the dismissal of officials, but if at any time he desires to discuss this matter from a personal standpoint, I will be prepared to meet him. The statement he made was that under the late Government the Nova Scotia Liberal members had inaugurated a reign of terror in regard to officials. By that I understand him to mean that the Liberal members were forcing officials to support them, and compelling them to do things in regard to elections which they should not do. As far as I am concerned, I take issue with my hon, friend, and I think I speak not only for myself but for my colleagues when I say that such was not the case. For my part I never encouraged officials to take an active part in elections. We all know that sometimes officials are indiscreet, and we are also aware that in the outside service there are a great many men who occupy comparatively unimportant positions, receiving perhaps fifty or one hundred dollars a year for their services. It could hardly be expected that men in such positions should refrain altogether from politics, or entirely avoid the activities of public life because they happened to hold an office of that kind. There have been occasions on which men have acted as agents for the candidates, and it would have been better had they not done so, but I think we ought to draw a distinction between officers who are getting a living wage from the Government and such officials as postmasters and small fishery officers, who get only a few dollars for their services and are not really in the employ of the Government except on intermittent occasions.

In my hon. friend's reference to myself, he did not mention the name of any official, but I easily recognized the subject of his allusion, because, as far as I remember, it was the only one case in which I did travel in the same carriage with an official during that election. It happened in this way. I was in the town of Guysboro—it is not a very large town—and it became necessary for me to go some four or five miles on a rainy morning to an adjoining district. There were no horses in the livery stables, and it was suggested that this official had a horse and wagon, and might take me to this place. A boy was sent for him, and he very kindly agreed to go. I understood it to be a business transaction, and as he was an official receiving only a small salary I thought it better that it should be a business transaction, so I paid him a couple of dollars for driving me four or five miles on a rainy morning. That is the whole story. The other statement made by him was that in my presence this official canvassed a man and promised him work if he would vote for the Liberal party. I am not aware that anything like that happened. I am quite certain I never heard the official promise him work if he would vote for the Liberal party. It is quite true that the official did drive me a short distance for which he received $2, and on this slight incident, which is the only one mentioned by my hon. friend, he bases the serious charge that we inaugurated a reign of terror in Nova Scotia and compelled officials to do things in elections that they should not do.

Mr. RHODES: Oh, no, that is only one case in a thousand.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think my hon. friend will find it difficult to get many cases. I am not disposed to shield an official who really does go wrong, but the principle was laid down by hon. gentlemen opposite in 1896 that we should not be too severe on officials of that class who are not paid a living wage by the Government and I wish to refer them back to their speeches of that day and to ask them now, if they were honest then to put those principles into practice. My hon. friend from East Simcoe in the debate of 1896 used the following language :

> There is a principle at stake in this matter and it is this, first to be just, even generous to all; and in the next place, if you have the advantage, if you have the power, use that power in a merciful manner.

I submit that the cases that have been referred to to-day do not conform to that rule. The hon. member for Cumberland said that in 1896 men were dismissed without investigation.

Mr. RHODES: Hear, hear.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am not aware of that but I will take my hon. friend's word for it and I will say it would be much more honourable and manly to dismiss officials without investigation than under a sham investigation like those conducted by Mr. Duchemin. If the Administration takes the ground that they will adopt the spoils system and displace the appointees of the former Government and put their friends in their places I can understand that but when they set up a court and employ a a man under an Act of Parliament to do justice to all sides and send him into the country and have him behave like this gentleman who is now conducting all these investigations, I say it is not creditable to the Administration.

The hon. member for Cumberland has undertaken to champion and defend all that has been done by Mr. Duchemin. He will have a busy time of it during the present session if he is going to defend everything that Mr. Duchemin did in Nova Scotia during the last year. I have in my desk a large number of statements and affidavits relating to the conduct of that gentleman, but as they do not refer to the Railway Department I shall not produce them to-night. Take, for example the case of Alexander McInnis, car inspector at Mulgrave, who was dismissed after a sham investigation by Mr. Duchemin. Here is Mr. McInnis' own statement:

Dismissal of a Car Inspector a Disgraceful Job.

Mr. Editor,—About two months ago the Government commissioner, Mr. Duchemin, investigated charges of partisanship which had been preferred against me. The witnesses were two, Tousant Bisbong, a noted political character in Mulgrave, who spent his days and nights during the last twelve months going about making himself a nuisance with his prate about the Government and Mr. Sinclair. The other was Allan McAskill, an elector of the county of Antigonish. Bisbong swore that I canvassed him, but his statement seemed so ridiculous to the commissioner that he was not shamefaced enough to regard it of consequence.

McAskill was examined in my presence and swore positively that I never tried to influence his vote in any way. This would be apparent to any person knowing me, particularly when he votes in another county and in which I was not directly interested. I was then told to retire and McAskill was subjected to further examination. He said again that I had never canvassed him. He was then asked if I had spoken to him in regard to the evidence he was going to give. He truthfully answered in the affirmative. He was then made to say that I had told him what to say and to 'say so over and over again.' On the strength of these words the Minister of Railways has dismissed me from the position of car inspector which I held for twelve years, always on night duty. I worked many a night in winter on my knees in snow and slush until to-day I am crippled with rheumatism. I stuck to my post always and there never was an accident of even the most trifling nature befell a train or car which I had made ready for the road, or which was due to neglect on my part. This was expressed to me by my foreman John Dunbar, Esq., yesterday when he brought the notice of my dismissal. Said he 'there never was an accident through any oversight of yours since you have been in the service.'

I stayed by my work hoping some day that I might be permitted to enjoy in my old age the miserable pittance to which I would be entitled under the Railway Pension Act, but this must be denied me by Mr. Cochrane because a low-minded mean fellow wanted my job.

Poor Allan McAskill was told by me to tell the truth and to stick to it. That was all. He bought a property from me and it was surmised that I must have tried to influence him. When men are placed at the mercy of the characters who engineered the investigation against me and others in Mulgrave and elsewhere and are then placed on trial before a man who assumes the position of judge and counsel for the prosecution, and no counsel for the defence allowed to be present, in a country which is under the British flag, one must be pardoned for saying that there is no other country under any flag which flies in the light of God's bright sun, in which such an outrage against humanity can be perpetrated.

British institutions may be all right when conducted by right minded agents, but what a farce they become when manipulated by the Tory combination at present ruling at Ottawa. Can such things be done in Russia? Assuredly no!

Yours truly,
ALEX. McINNIS,
Late Car Inspector.

Mulgrave, N.S., May 16, 1912.

It appears that the principal charge against him is in connection with his dealings with McAskill. When McInnis informed me what had taken place between himself and McAskill I asked him to put it in the shape of an affidavit and he sent me this affidavit:

Canada,
Province of Nova Scotia,
County of Guysborough, N.S.

I, the undersigned Alexander McInnis, car inspector, solemnly declare that I did not attempt to influence the vote of any person during or previous to the Dominion election in September last, and particularly do I solemnly declare that I did not attempt to influence Allan McAskill, in the interest of any candidate, to vote or not to vote in the county of Antigonish or any other county in the province of Nova Scotia.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing it to be of the same force and effect as if made unded oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me at Mulgrave, in the

county of Guysborough, this 29th day of February, A.D. 1912.
(Sgd.) WM. S. WYLDE, J.P.,
In and for the county of Guysborough.
(Sgd.) ALEX. McINNIS.

That affidavit is in the possession of the Minister of Railways and I understand he had it before him when his decision was given in regard to this case. McInnis says further that, after he left the room this witness was further examined, McAskill was recalled and examined by Mr. Duchemin, and that the commissioner tried to extract a statement from the witness against him but failed to do so. These facts were all before the minister at the time he gave his decision in this case, and it strikes me that the decision was a very severe one. Indeed, as far as I can learn, these are all the charges made against this man McInnis.

Another man was dismissed at Mulgrave, Alexander Wilkinson. There was nothing proved at all against Wilkinson in connection with the recent election. It was necessary to go back to a local election some years ago in order to find any charge against him. I would like to have some pronouncement from the Minister of Railways as to how far back he authorizes his investigations to go. Is a man's whole lifetime to be reviewed in one of those examinations, or what is the limit? Is there any time when an accusation like this goes out of date? I am told that in the post office investigations, and also in the Marine and Fisheries investigations, there was practically no limit, that they went back as far as they chose to go, and that in some cases they struck acts committed under a former administration fifteen, sixteen and seventeen years ago. But of course as they were committed in favour of the Conservative party, these acts were not considered to be a violation of the regulation which requires a man not to interfere with politics

As the Prime Minister is here, I may say there was some disappointment felt in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, because he did not take a firmer stand in regard to these matters, and that he did not, at all events, see that these investigations, carried on under his administration, were fair and judicial investigations. The statement made by my hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes) that they were not fair after 1896 is not in accordance with my recollection. The investigations in eastern Nova Scotia after 1896 were under the management of Captain Douglas, an official of the Admiralty, a retired captain of the navy, I understand, who was accustomed to conducting investigations, and who carried them out very fairly I am told, hearing both sides, and giving a judicial verdict. That was the way in which the investigations were carried on after 1896 in Nova Scotia. I do not believe any fair minded man would complain of any investigation or of any decision given by the late Captain Douglas. He was a man incapable of doing any of those things that are now charged in connection with recent investigations; it was quite in order for the official who was charged to cross-examine witnesses if he wished to do so. Why should a man be refused the right to be represented by counsel in a trifling matter of this kind where a man is charged with having canvassed for a vote? Why, if a man is charged with murder in our courts, he is allowed to be represented by counsel. The worst crime that a man can commit in this country does not deprive him of the right to counsel, but it appears that under this administration, not only in Manitoba, but in Nova Scotia, a man cannot have the right to be represented by counsel in a trifling charge of this kind. Why should he not be allowed to cross-examine? Will any gentleman on the other side of the House defend the laying down of a rule that an accused official shall not be represented by counsel, or justifying the ruling, refusing the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) the right to ask questions of the witnesses. It is impossible to have a fair trial under circumstances of that kind, and I am surprised that my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) does not interfere, and see that these things are changed, and that a fair trial is granted. When my right hon. friend was in opposition he laid down some very broad and liberal principles in regard to this matter, principles which are perhaps more liberal than would be agreed to by most of the hon. gentlemen present. Let me quote from the speech my right hon. friend made after the elections of 1896 when this same question was under discussion. I am quoting from Vol. 2 of 'Hansard,' for 1896, page 388. This is part of what he said:

> It seems to me that the fact of the payment of public money to public officers for their services ought not to enter very largely into the question as to how far these gentlemen should participate in election contests. It is not the money of the Liberal party or of the Conservative party which is paid these gentlemen for their services. It is the money of the country and the fact that these gentlemen worked for either party so long as they worked openly, honourably and fairly ought not to weigh against them, if at the same time they do not neglect their duty as public officers. It seems to me that those gentleman who are in the civil service of this country ought to have the same right as other electors not only to vote, but to work during elections subject to certain limitations.

These are perhaps more advanced ideas than most of us will agree to, but at the

same time I did hope, and I think the people of this country hoped that my right hon. friend would take a step forward in this important matter, and they are disappointed that he did not do so. I know that his own constituents brought a great deal of pressure to bear to have officials of the late government dismissed and his own political friends put in their places. There was so much pressure that his own organ The Halifax Herald came out very strongly in the matter. Here is what the Herald said:

> Mr. Borden should, moreover, lose no time in introducing such reforms into the civil service as will put a prompt and complete end to the scandal of the hungry horde of party heelers, who apparently think the sole business of the Government is to provide them with an opportunity to feed at the public trough—a humiliating example of which is furnished in Halifax to-day. This horde of political dervishes seems under the impression that it is the sole business of the Government to drive away the present occupants of the public trough to make room for themselves, without regard to consequences.

Now, that is pretty strong language, but the case was so serious in the city of Halifax, that the principal organ of the Government in that city found it necessary to use such strong language in denouncing the conduct of the heelers who were persecuting and chasing those poor men who voted at the last election for the Liberal party. I suppose that if these principles which my right hon. friend laid down after 1896 were good then, they are good now. Principles do not change, but governments do, and we expected that these principles would, to some extent be adhered to. Apart from that altogether, however, I think we have a right to claim that a fair trial will be given. That is the natural and ordinary right of a British subject, and il there is going to be a trial at all, it ought to be a decent and fair trial. My hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) professed to defend Mr. Duchemin, but he has not told us that he is in favour of conducting a trial without counsel, or by forbidding cross-examination, and, I was going to say, by examining witnesses in absence of the accused. I have not proven that.

An hon. MEMBER: No.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But I am going to prove it when we reach the Marine and Fisheries cases. There has been ample proof in the two cases referred to by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte), whose word, I presume my hon. friend (Mr. Rhodes) does not doubt, that he was refused the right to cross-examine a witness, and even to appear for a defendant in the county he has the honour to represent. That, I understand has been the regular course of this gentleman, Mr. Duchemin, throughout the investigations he has conducted in eastern Nova Scotia, and I submit to the committee that Mr. Duchemin's conduct ought to be investigated, because, it appears, he violated the instructions he got. The minister never told him not to have counsel; he undertook of his own accord to lay down that rule, and he had no right to do so. But the minister will not say that he gave him instructions not to have counsel. He has not said so, and I am quite sure the minister has not done it. He did not tell him not to allow cross-examination of witnesses. Why, then, did Mr. Duchemin, acting under a statute which required him to be fair and just, undertake to deny these common rights of a British subject to these men when they were being investigated? Will the hon. member for Cumberland defend that? Why did Mr. Duchemin break the regulations that he got? He certainly had no instructions to do these things, he did them because he was anxious to find a verdict of guilty against the men whom he was investigating and I think he succeeded in most of the cases he conducted in my county.

Mr. RHODES: Just one word, because I do not desire it to be imagined that I am going to allow these statements of the hon. member for Guysborough to go as a matter of course. Undoubtedly this question will arise at a later stage in the session, when the estimates are under discussion, and I will reserve the right at that time to discuss them more fully.

Mr. GRAHAM: Mr. Speaker, there seem to be two classes of electors in the country, and these two classes of people have been discussed here to-day. One is the class that does what it actually thinks is best for the country and believes that government is a serious matter carried on in the best interests of the people so far as the party in power, whichever it may be, sees that interest. There is another class, and I regret to see how for it has grown in Canada, that appears to think government is carried on solely for what there is in it for the hangers-on. This latter class is the class that is worrying to men in office and it is worrying because those who compose it consider that the head of a department or the member of parliament who cannot hand over some loaves and fishes to them has lost his vocation. The only interest they appear to have in public life is what reward they are going to get out of the result. It requires some backbone to refuse the overtures of this latter class, but the time has come in Canada when—I say it seriously—both parties ought to do their

utmost to discredit the growth of that kind of sentiment. Government is a serious thing and it ought to be carried on in the best interest of the greatest number. After all, this kind of thing can be suppressed if men will stand up against it, although it requires a good deal of courage.

In so far as the affairs of the Intercolonial railway are concerned, particularly this provident fund board, I might point out that the men are represented on this board and that no decision can be come to as to the payment of a claim except through this board. The minister can, in exceptional circumstances, override the board, but generally they sail very close to the statute and the men, being represented on the board, have a voice in every decision rendered for or against any claim in connection with the provident fund. There has been a change in the management of the railways. Years ago there was not this Provident Fund Act, and no definite rule existed, such as would be laid down by statute, at least, to govern the appointment or dismissal of men. The road was not under the brotherhoods in the various departments as it is now. But that change has brought about an altered condition—an altered condition between the department and the employees to a large extent and an altered condition between the men who ask for appointments and those who appoint them. Under the regulations of the Provident Fund Act, no man can be permanently appointed to the Intercolonial railway at present who is over thirty-five years of age, unless he be an expert or has had previous experience in the work to which he is to be appointed. By many it is thought severe, but when you come to consider the relations between the provident fund and the men who are paying into that provident fund you can see that it has to be conducted on some basis approximating an insurance standard. If men, fifty, sixty or seventy years old were employed on the road they would fast become a burden on those who are younger. That condition has changed during the past few years and, while ten or fifteen years ago, men of any age could be permanently employed, and no doubt were, at the present time they cannot be owing to the Provident Fund Act.

Then, take another point in connection with that, if my hon. friend will allow me. It becomes a more serious matter at the present time to dismiss a man and deprive him of the rights which he had in that board than it was previously before he became insured, in the provident fund in which he has a vested right unless he conducts some overt act, which Act is described, I think, very fairly in the statute.

Mr. COCHRANE: Was there not a Civil Service fund?

Mr. GRAHAM: It was not the same thing and not upon the same basis.

Mr. COCHRANE: They paid into it.

Mr. GRAHAM: They did but not under the same conditions. Civil Service rules cannot be satisfactorily applied to a railway. But this law was brought about, the men were given a voice in the management of the fund, in the questions as to how the money shall be collected and how much each shall have to pay and it is a more serious matter than ever before to dismiss any of these men. The brotherhoods, having secured a foothold all over the line, and justly so, they have a large voice in saying who shall and who shall not be dismissed, who shall and shall not be promoted and the time at which promotion comes. I think that my hon. friend will find that under the agreement with these men—not by act of grace, but under that agreement with these brotherhoods—he cannot dismiss a man without investigation, particularly if investigation is asked for. It is different altogether from the situation which existed before the brotherhoods were dealt with instead of individuals. I have been criticised in this House by my own friends as well as by hon. gentlemen opposite for allowing the Intercolonial railway, when I had charge, to be placed under the regulation of various brotherhoods. I have yet to see that the Government, or Parliament, was wrong in allowing that to be done. The railway business has been invaded by the Dominion Government. When the Government, or a municipality, undertakes the operation of a public utility, to my mind, it has to approximate at least the conditions and the regulations which govern a like undertaking under private control. So soon as the Intercolonial railway was placed upon practically a company footing, and even before, I believe, it was perfectly proper for its employees to bind themselves together in various brotherhoods and to work in harmony with the brotherhoods in similar employment on private undertakings. They have the same duties to perform, the same examinations to pass, and practically the same regulations to conform with.

That brings me to another point, and I know a number of my hon. friends will disagree with me on this. I said it, when I was to the right of the Speaker, and some people were uncharitable enough to say that I had an ulterior motive. I am going to repeat it now that I am on the left side of the Speaker. In our treatment of the men on our railways, we indulge in

language of a peculiar character if put side by side with genuine sincerity Men employed on the Grand Trunk railway can be candidates for public office in the town in which they live; they can be very useful members of school boards or municipal councils, and nearly always these men are active politicians both in provincial and federal matters. Every man in a railway town knows that. Seeing that we have embarked in the railway business, should we go the length in this House of placing the men who happen to be employed on our railway on a different footing in regard to citizenship from the position they would be placed in were they working for the Canadian Pacific railway, the Grand Trunk railway or some other private railway company? I adhere strongly to the view that they should not be allowed to be offensive partisans, and a company would not permit them to be so, if they knew of it; but a man can be an active partisan in his own locality without being offensive to his neighbours, even if they disagree with him, and I think we ought to be broader in our views. An employee of a railway, whether it is a government or a private concern, is far different from an employee of the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department is not a commercial enterprise. It is an enterprise solely for the Dominion Government, and there is no competition with the Post Office Department. So with the Customs Department or the Agricultural Department. Here, however, we find running through the province of Quebec and through the maritime provinces two or three or four systems of railways. A man in the city of St. John, who is on the Canadian Pacific railway, can take an active part in elections and enjoy the full responsibilities and privileges of a citizen, but if he happens to be working on the Intercolonial railway in exactly the same position, if he were to take an active part on either side of politics, somebody would lay a charge against him the next day, invariably some person who wants his job. I think I can say very frankly on this side of the House, as I said when I was on the other side, that we ought to take a broader view in regard to employees of our railway, and they ought to be allowed more latitude than is permitted to employees of departments that are not industrial departments at all. I think some regulations were passed a few years ago preventing men from taking part in municipal elections. In some parts of the province, municipal elections are as bitter as Dominion elections, and they run on party lines, but I have had in my time the most urgent applications and petitions from citizens in some parts of the eastern provinces, asking me to allow a certain gentleman to run as a member of their council, saying that he was the man best fitted in that community, and in some cases they wanted to elect him by acclamation. I admit now, that, notwithstanding any regulation, I shut my eyes and let him go, because I believed it was in the interest of the community, and the fact that he worked on a government railway did not detract from his ability as a citizen. I just want to point out as my view now, as the view I have always taken when on the other side of the House, that the strict rule should not be applied to men working on the Government railway that be applied to other departments of the Government.

The question has arisen as to these investigations and the refusal to allow counsel to appear. The principle is not different, but the legalizing of the investigation would depend under what Act this investigation was ordered, and this commissioner given his authority. If it was under the Inquiries Act he certainly acted illegally in refusing counsel, for the amendment to that Act says that a man accused must be allowed counsel if he so desires. It just depends whether the investigation was merely a departmental inquiry, or whether it was under the Inquiries Act, but I take this view, although perhaps it is broader than is usually taken, that where a man is accused and a commissioner appointed to investigate, he ought to be allowed counsel. If an official of the Intercolonial railway or an official of any other department went solely for the purpose of conducting an investigation to let the department know if there was anything really seriously wrong, I can see a reason why no counsel should be allowed, because an officer of the department went there merely to perform his duty, to find out for himself what the situation was, and nine times out of ten he can get a fairly good idea without a public investigation. Where a commissioner is appointed, however, I think it is fair to all parties, and only justice, that counsel should be allowed where so desired. This Bill I think is in the right direction, although I am sorry it has to be passed on account of the dismissals. It would have been far better if the dismissals had not taken place and the men could remain in their employment and the fund had not been the loser by these men's contributions. My hon. friend, from Cumberland seems to have overlooked in his argument this afternoon that in cutting these men off, they are also cutting off their annual contributions, but so far as the Bill is concerned, now that the men are dismissed, I think that the least that can be done is to have the money that they paid into the provident fund returned to them.

Mr. COCHRANE: I simply want to state that I take the ground absolutely that these men offended against the Civil Service Act, and not against the railway, and it was only from a desire on my part that the men should get an absolutely fair trial that I took the ground that we would investigate in each case, and I am glad to say that I have satisfied the men, or at least those who are looking after the men, if I have not satisfied the members of the Opposition. It has been stated that we are taking men on our permanent staff who are over thirty-five years of age. I am sure that this is not true, because a protest was received from the men themselves against anything of that kind, and that protest was acted upon. Some men have been taken on temporarily who are over thirty-five, some of those who were dismissed in 1896 without an investigation of any kind, and I want to say that there was a fund which the men paid into before 1896, and some of those who were dismissed were paid back, just as this Bill provides for, and some were not. My endeavour has been to use the men in a fair and equitable manner irrespective of politics or anything else, and as regards promotion, I have carried out exactly what the ex-Minister of Railways says that he did, to promote in the service, and the best man too. A railway cannot be run in any other way. It cannot be efficient unless the system of promotion takes place out of the ranks, and the best man too, irrespective of politics or anything else. I did not know that these discussions with regard to the different officials was to come up here to-day, or I might have been better prepared with the information in each case. Of course, it is impossible for a man to carry all these facts in his head. But I am satisfied that fair-play has been extended to each and every one of these officials; and the letters read by my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) from Mr. Murray are evidence of that fact. I did not seek this letter and knew nothing about it until it came to my office yesterday or the day before. And Mr. Lowe's letter also. And the conversations I have had bear it out. There have been cases on which we did not agree, but in conversation between Mr. Murray and myself and others we have arranged, and have satisfied one another that justice has been done.

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

Mr. COCHRANE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 25), to amend the Intercolonial Railway and Prince Edward Island Railway Employees Provident Fund Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REGULATION OF RADIOTELEGRAPHY.

On motion of Mr. Hazen, House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution—(Mr. Meighen in the Chair).

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide for the compulsory installation and inspection of radiotelegraph apparatus on certain ships, and for the general regulation of radiotelegraphy.

Mr. HAZEN: The necessity for the Bill which will be introduced if this resolution is concurred in arises from the fact that wireless telegraphy is constantly acquiring a more important position and greater utility in the affairs of the world almost month by month. The Bill, too, is the outcome to some extent of the deliberations of the Radiotelegraphic Convention that was held in London last year, at which there were representatives of all the nations and countries which adhere to the convention, among others, Canada, which was represented by the deputy minister of naval affairs, under which department the wireless telegraph of Canada comes, and also by the superintendent of wireless telegraph.

There is at present an Act on the statute book with regard to radiotelegraphy, and it is this Act which it is proposed to amend. The existing legislation in connection with wireless telegraphy is contained in that Act which is part of the Telegraphs Act passed in 1906. The existing Act substantially provides that no wireless telegraph station shall be installed by any person in the Dominion except under license granted therefor by the minister. It is, in fact, that provision of the present Act which it is sought to amend by the Bill to be introduced if the committee approve this resolution.

The new Radiotelegraph Act, in addition to providing for the issuance of licenses as required by the present Act, also provides for:

The compulsory installation of wireless equipment on passenger ships carrying fifty persons and plying between ports more than 200 miles apart;

The forwarding of radiotelegrams by all Canadian land lines, and cables;

The employment of only British subjects as operators on land stations;

The taking of a declaration of secrecy by all officers.

A penalty for the transmission of a false distress call or wilful interference.

It gives power to the Governor in Council:

To fix the fees for the different licenses;

To accede to any international convention in connection with wireless telegraph;

To make regulations for the effective carrying out the same.

With regard to that, I might say that the increased use of wireless telegraphy has

made the international control of the same a necessity. At the present moment this regulation is undertaken by the International Radiotelegraphic Conference to which practically all the nations of the world, including Canada, subscribed. The following is a list of these nations; Germany and her protectorates; The United States of America, Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bosni Herzegovine, Belgium and Belgium Congo, Brazil, Bolivia, Chili, Denmark, Egypt, Spain and her colonies, France and African Possessions, Great Britain and all colonies and protectorates except Newfoundland, Union of South Africa, Australia, Canada, British India, New Zealand, Greece, Italy and her colonies, Japan and her colonies, Morocco, Monaco, Norway, Holland and Dutch Indies, Persia, Portugal and her colonies, Roumania, Russia, Republic of St. Marin, Siam, Sweden, Turkey, Uruguay.

So, it will be seen that practically all the countries in the world are subscribers to this Radiotelegraphic Convention. It is important that powers be given to the Governor in Council to subscribe to such international conventions which are held every five years in order that the Dominion may be represented at the deliberations and have a say in the drafting of the regulations, since at this moment the Canadian Government owns more coast stations than any government in the world, namely 37. And it is also of importance that Canada should be entitled to all the benefits ensuing from the regulations, one of which is that Canadian ships will be provided with wireless stations by other adhering countries in every part of the world. If any hon. gentleman would like to look into the matter I will furnish a copy of the London convention. In addition to providing for the issuance of licenses and other provisions, and in addition to the power given to the Governor in Council, the Act gives to the minister certain powers as follows:—

To classify stations into different classes, and to specify what equipment the stations in each classification shall carry.

To issue different kinds of licenses and fix the period for which they shall be valid.

To prescribe the form of the different licenses and the conditions and restrictions to be continued therein.

To examine persons for operators' certificates, to prescribe the form of the examinations for the different classes of operators, and to prescribe what class of operator will be required to work each class of station.

To specify the watches to be kept at the different classes of stations and the number of operators which shall comprise their staff.

To make regulations for the inspection of all stations.

To make regulations to govern the working of installations on ships within territorial waters.

To make regulations to govern the working of all stations in the Dominion with reference to intercommunication.

The Bill gives power to His Majesty to assume at any time possession of a station and to work the same for the public service, or to censure the messages transmitted by and received at any station. Adequate penalties are prescribed for any violations of the different provisions of this new Act. The main defect first found in the working of wireless telegraphy, and which to a great extent exists at this moment, is the fact that signals are usually sent out with equal energy in all directions. Every receiving station within the range of a transmitting centre can read all the messages sent out from that centre, provided its receiving apparatus is capable of adjustment to the wave length of the transmitted wave, and at the same time it is not possible for more than two stations in a given area to interchange signals at a given time without mutual interference unless they are a considerable distance apart, are equipped with well tuned apparatus, and have at least 15 per cent difference between the wave lengths they employ, while if the stations are near together, a very much greater difference in the wave length must be employed if interference is to be avoided. Under the new Act the minister will have power to make regulations prescribing how such stations shall be operated, and the regulations will be drawn up with a view to obtaining a maximum of efficiency with a minimum of interference at the stations under his jurisdiction. When the matter is carefully looked into it is found that quite as much of the interference is due to inefficient operators as to poor apparatus. With this point in view, the minister, under the new Act, will have power to compel certain operators to hold certificates of proficiency in wireless telegraphy, and to state what class of certificate the operators on the different classes of stations must hold.

These are, briefly stated, the provisions contained in the Bill. I believe that this enactment is made necessary by the requirements of the times, and the fact that wireless telegraphy is becoming such an important agency in the commercial life of Canada and all other countries. It is held by many persons that wireless telegraphy, so far as its usefulness is concerned, is at the present time but in its infancy, and there is reason for believing that in a comparatively short time wireless telegraphy will be used for the transmission of press despatches and commercial messages of all kinds, to an extent which a few years ago was little dreamed of. I think this Bill is necessary in order that Canada's control over the wireless telegraphy within its borders may

be placed on a proper foundation, and so that regulations may be imposed consistent with those adopted in other countries, and in accordance with the principles laid down by the convention which meets every five years for the purpose of determining questions of this nature.

Mr. PARDEE: I presume this enactment will appy to the great lakes?

Mr. HAZEN: It applies to all wireless telegraphy in Canada.

Mr. PARDEE: That is, wireless telegraphy on ships?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, there is no exception of any kind.

Mr. PARDEE: How does the hon. gentleman arrive at the distance of 200 miles. Does he not think that is a rather long voyage, and that it should be set down at a shorter distance? On certain portions of the great lakes a vessel might get into considerable trouble in a voyage of 200 miles. I think a distance of 100 miles would better answer the purposes of the Bill than the 200 mile limit, for there are certain portions of the great lakes where a limit of 200 miles would be of but little value.

Mr. HAZEN: It occurred to me in framing this Bill that perhaps an objection might be offered that we were going a little too fast, or making the Act somewhat exacting. If it is considered that the distance of 200 miles does not meet all the purposes for which the Bill is framed, I would be very glad to make it 100 miles, and this is a matter which can very properly be discussed when the Bill is in committee. I will bring this matter to the attention of officials of my department who have made a special study of the subject, and will ascertain their views in regard to that suggestion.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would this Act apply to ships not registered in Canada?

Mr. PARDEE: Of course there are a great many ships not registered in Canada to which the Act could not possibly apply.

Mr. HAZEN: As a matter of fact very few trans-atlantic steamers are registered in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would it apply to that ship called the Duke of Connaught?

Mr. HAZEN: I think so. I may say the only trans-atlantic vessels registered in Canada are those of the Canadian Northern railway—the Royal George and the Royal Edward—which are registered at Toronto. The vessels of the Allan line, the White Star line, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are all registered on the other side of the water, but I think this Act ought to apply to all vessels that sail from Canadian ports.

Mr. PARDEE: A great many of the vessels on the great lakes are not registered in Canada.

Mr. HAZEN: Yes, a great many.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the hon. gentleman thought of the steamship service on the Bay of Fundy?

Mr. HAZEN: To what service does my hon. friend refer?

Mr. PUGSLEY: From St. John to Digby. It is hardly more than 40 miles and it is quite as dangerous a body of water as most of the internal waters of Canada. Before reaching St. John the last stop of those steamers plying between Boston and St. John is at Eastport, and from that point to St. John is less than 100 miles. My hon. friend ought to consider that there are many bodies of water where the distance from port to port is not more than 40 or 50 miles, and navigation of which may be just as dangerous.

Mr. HAZEN: There is a great deal of force in what my hon. friend says, and this is a matter which may properly be taken up by the House when the Bill is discussed. There has also been some doubt in my own mind as to whether this enactment should be applied only to ships carrying at least 50 passengers, or whether it should extend also to any ships carrying passengers regardless of the number. As it stands at present, it applies to ships carrying not less than 50 passengers, and the view might be entertained that it should apply to ships carrying five or fifty or five hundred passengers. At the same time it may be contended that under the conditions existing in Canada certain small steamers that carry only a few passengers would find it inconvenient to install wireless telegraphy.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The installation of wireless telegraphy is not so very expensive.

Mr. HAZEN: It is fairly expensive. Many of these small steamers in Canada are hardly paying their way, it might hardly be necessary to equip with wireless telegraphy a vessel carrying only ten or twelve passengers, but that is a matter of consideration. It can be easily seen that there are two sides to the question, and these matters can be discussed when the Bill comes before the House.

The service in the Bay of Fundy alluded to is, I suppose, that from St. John to Digby. It is only a little over 40 miles, but it is important and there are occasions when boats running across there

carry hundreds of passengers on one trip.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would call attention to a terrible disaster I think on Lake Ontario two or three years ago when my attention was called to the matter particularly because some complaint was made against the Department of Public Works in reference to it. In that case several lives were lost and I have no doubt that if the vessel had been equipped with wireless that disaster might have been prevented.

Mr. HAZEN: In the United States legislation very similar to this has already been passed and similar legislation is contemplated by all the leading nations in the world that adhere to the international radio-telegraphic conference. United States legislation is more drastic than that proposed in this draft Bill. Their Bill compels all ships, whether licensed to carry passengers or not, carrying 50 or more persons and plying between ports 200 miles apart to carry a wireless telegraph equipment and a staff of not less than two operators with a penalty of $5,000 against the ship and $100 against the master of the ship for each violation of the Act.

So far as can be ascertained, all boats of Canadian register which would come under the terms of this section are already equipped with the necessary wireless apparatus. This remark applies to ships on the east coast, great lakes and west coast.

Several ships of British and foreign register will be affected, particularly the service between St. John, N.B., and Mexico, the Pickford & Black line to the West Indies, and the Furness-Withy service between Halifax and England, by St. John's, Nfld.

The general procedure adopted in connection with wireless installations on ships is for the shipping company to arrange with one of the wireless companies to instal the apparatus and operate it for a certain amount per annum. In practically every case this sum is $1,000 per annum for which amount the wireless company agree to instal the apparatus, maintain it in first-class condition, provide an operator, and handle the messages concerning the business of the ship free of charge.

No doubt there are certain steamships carrying on business in a small way in Canada to whom a charge of $1,000 a year would be a very considerable imposition which might hamper them in the carrying on of their business. If the ship desired to instal apparatus herself, the cost of a first-class equipment with a range of from 150 to 200 miles complete with an emergency equipment would be between $3,000 and $3,500. A second-class equipment with the same range could be obtained cheaper, at a cost of about $2,500.

The salaries paid to operators on ships are as follows: East coast, $40 per month and board; great lakes, $40 to $45 per month and board; west coast, $45 to $60 per month and board.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would call the attention of the minister to the importance of not making the Act too drastic. I am glad he has that in his mind, that there may be cases where small steamboats would be crippled if compelled to comply with the proposed regulation and employ an expensive man or two to run the apparatus after it was installed. I hope these matters will be looked into with a great deal of care, because it would be a mistake to follow the example of the United States and legislate our ships off the sea altogether. They have made it so difficult to own and run a ship in the United States now that they have very little shipping, and I fear that we are following their example to some extent. A few years ago this Parliament passed a law that a coasting captain on the ordinary coasting schooner should not navigate his ship south of Cape Hatteras. For generations the captains of Nova Scotia had been accustomed to sail around the Horn and trade on the western coast of South America, but all at once a regulation was passed prohibiting them from going any further south than Cape Hatteras. In the winter the trade of the maritime provinces is largely with the West Indies, and it struck a very severe blow to our coasting vessels, so much so that in order to escape this stringent regulation a number of them changed their registry to the Barbadoes and ceased to be Canadian vessels altogether. That was the only way in which they could continue to exist, because they had to go south of Cape Hatteras in order to do their business. I mention that as an example. A few years ago another regulation was passed requiring the inspection of steamboats, making it very stringent indeed. A steamboat that had been inspected in Great Britain by Lloyds, when it came to Canada might be submitted to a second inspection. That means very often that the ship has to be put on the dry-dock; it is very expensive and causes a good deal of delay. That created a great deal of friction among our shipping people and happily the regulation was repealed, and I believe the law at the present time recognizes the inspection made by the Lloyds in England and by some of the other great inspecting shipping companies in Europe.

Taking the coasting trade, for exemple, I would like to know how this regulation will apply to the large number of coasting steamers along the coast of the Maritime provinces, starting from Halifax to Prince

Edward Island, or a port in northern New Brunswick, or Cape Breton, which may be more than 200 miles. Such a boat calls at a large number of ports on the way. If this means 200 miles between the different ports of call the Act would not apply, but if it is 200 miles from the starting point of the ship to the final destination then it would apply, and I think it would be unnecessary that these small coasting vessels on our coast should be subjected to these charges. I question if they would be able to afford them. With regard to the number of passengers, that varies greatly. I suppose sometimes with an excursion a small vessel would have 50 but very often they would not have half that many.

Mr. HAZEN: The Bill provides that this shall not apply. It says that the clause about the boats being equipped with wireless shall not apply to passenger ships plying between ports not more than 200 miles apart. That covers what my hon. friend has in mind.

Mr. PARDEE: The question of making a hard and fast rule with relation to wireless telegraphy is rather a hard one. In many instances where the boats may be running on voyages of much less than 200 miles, wireless may be much more called for than on a longer voyage. I have wondered whether it would be feasible to have a provision that such boats should be equipped with wireless telegraphy as should be recommended to be so equipped by inspectors appointed for that purpose.

Mr. HAZEN: What inspectors would you suggest, the collectors of customs?

Mr. PARDEE: No, I would not, because the collector of customs might not always be fitted to make a recommendation in such a case. But I would suggest that now that wireless telegraphy has got to be so absolutely essential to all boats, practically, plying on the great lakes and ocean-going boats, the Act should say: Provided that such boats as such an inspector appointed for that purpose shall be forced to carry wireless equipment. Of course, it may very well be said, and I recognize the force of the contention, that if certain small boats were compelled to carry wireless telegraph apparatus at an expense of $1,000 a year, it would practically put them out of business. But we cannot get away from this patent fact that, even although boats do not carry as many as 50 passengers, that supposing they carry only 25 passengers, these 25 passengers have as much right to be protected by the wireless telegraph as 50 would have. It therefore appears to me that, taking into consideration what we know of the history of the lakes, it might be well for the Government to consider whether or not a man should be appointed for the inland waters and the great lakes to make such recommendations as he might think proper regarding the carrying of wireless apparatus by those boats. I am not prepared to say this is feasible at all, because I recognize the fact that such an Act as this should be imperative. If it is possible to arrive at the size of the boats and the number of passengers they should carry, perhaps it would be better to have a hard and fast rule. Nevertheless, I think it is well worth while considering whether or not it would be feasible to appoint an inspector to look after those boats and to take into consideration the number of passengers, the general equipment of the vessels, and their general sea worthiness.

Mr. HAZEN: I feel sure that if it is to be worked out satisfactorily, it would be better to have a hard and fast rule rather than leave it to the discretion of any official or of any department. If in a matter of this sort discretion is left in the hands of an official or of a department of the Government there is a very great danger of pressure of a political character or of some other character being brought to bear, which it might be difficult in certain cases to resist. If you have the matter absolutely defined by statute, there is little or no difficulty in carrying out the provisions of the law. There is no need to rush this matter through the House. It is one of very great importance and if, after the Bill gets its first and second reading, it is allowed to wait a reasonable time until after we come come back from the New Year recess, perhaps by that time the fact that such a Bill has been introduced to Parliament will be pretty well known in shipping circles, and to the press, and we will then have an expression of opinion that will enable us to modify the Bill and make it more in the public interest than in the form in which it is now being introduced. These are all matters of detail which we desire to settle as far as possible in the public interest, but at the same time I think there will be no dispute concerning the fact that regulations of this character or of a somewhat similar character should be enacted. I move that the resolution be now reported.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): I understood the hon. minister to say that there was a clause in the Bill providing that the Government of Canada could purchase wireless stations at any time. I have been strongly in favour of the Government owning, controlling and operating these stations from the first, for I am confident that it is the proper course for the Government to take. The hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) has placed the mat-

ter, so far as the Great lakes are concerned, very fairly before the House. It is a matter which deserves a very great deal of consideration, because the traffic on these lakes during certain seasons of the year is enormous. There is a 200 mile stretch, and while there are not many boats that can make that trip, there are dozens which carry passengers and go from 50 to 100 miles. I would like to ask the minister (Mr. Hazen) whether any provision has been made for the purchase of wireless stations and the operating of them.

Mr. HAZEN: The Bill gives power to His Majesty's Government to assume possession of a station at any time and operate the same for the public service. This provision is not designed with the object that the hon. gentleman has in mind, of public ownership. The idea is that these stations will be essential to the carrying out of the commerce and business of the country, and if it be found that they are being inefficiently managed or not properly carried on, or that messages of a confidential character are being communicated to people to whom they should not be communicated, or for reasons of that sort, power is given to the Government, a very wise power, I think, to step in and operate them.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it the intention of the Government to refer this Bill to the Marine Committee?

Mr. HAZEN. It is a Government measure, and I do not think that it is customary to refer Government measures to a committee. Perhaps there will be no necessity to do so, but if there should be any such necessity, I would have no objection to its being referred.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is possible that quite a number of interests might want to be heard, and there is a better opportunity to hear them before the committee than otherwise.

Mr. HAZEN: We will probably hear in a short time from those interests, and we will keep track of the representations made.

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

Mr. HAZEN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 26), respecting Radiotelegraphy.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Mr. Hazen, House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved that it is expedient to amend The Canada Shipping Act, chapter 113 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, and to provide (a) that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries may give directions respecting the registration of wrecked ships and concerning the names of ships; and, (b) that the inspectors appointed under Part VII of the said Act, together with such other persons as the minister may appoint, shall form the Board of Steamboat Inspection.

Mr. HAZEN: When we were discussing the other Bill, my hon. friend from the city of St. John (Mr. Pugsley) made a facetious allusion to the registration of a dry dock as a ship. I have discovered in my department that a few years ago, when the Government, of which my hon. friend was a member was in power, a crane which was brought out by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal for the purpose of loading and unloading vessels was also registered as a ship. However, that has nothing to do with the Bill now before the House. The Bill I intend to introduce to amend the Canada Shipping Act is one that experience in the department has convinced the deputy head of the department and other permanent officials, is necessary in the public interest. That applies more particularly to the second part of it. The first part of it is simply for the purpose of facilitating the despatch of public business. At the present time, as every hon. member who has been a member of the Government knows, there is scarcely a meeting of council at which there is not a report from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries recommending a change in the name of some vessel that is registered in Canada. It may be that a vessel is brought into Canada and it is found that there is a vessel in Canada of the same name. Application is made to the department for the purpose of changing the name of the vessel. The result is that the time of council is taken up unnecessarily dealing with matters that are really of departmental concern and it is a ridiculous thing that the whole Government has to consider matters of this sort which should be dealt with by the head of the department. The change that is proposed in the Act is to substitute the word 'minister' for 'Governor in Council.' The minister, by this Bill, will be authorized to approve these applications. This procedure, I my say to my hon. friends, is not at all radicial in any way as it is in conformity with the practice in Great Britain where the board of trade, and not the government, or His Majesty in Council, deals with these cases. Otherwise the law as regards registration of ships will be unchanged.

The other point dealt with is of more importance and is in regard to the composition of the board of steamboat inspection and the appointment of a chairman. A real and substantial difficulty arose during the present season, when I was in England

and my department was being looked after by another member of the Government, and in consequence this proposal is brought to the attention of the House with a recommendation in its favour by the deputy minister. At present membership is confined to the steamboat inspectors. It is proposed under this law that the minister shall have power to appoint to the board additional persons other than steamboat inspectors. The chairmanship of the board, it is felt, should be open to any of its members. At present the post can only be filled by an inspector and it is undesirable that this state of affairs should continue. It hampers the department in the management of this important branch of the service, and it prevents the board having a representative capacity. Provision must be made for the expansion and development of this service and the power to appoint other persons than steamboat inspectors on the board must be conferred on the head of the department.

It is, of course, not proposed to entrust the inspection of boilers and machinery, or of hulls, to any person who has not passed an examination as a steamboat inspector; only qualified officers will be allowed to do that work. But such questions as life saving appliances can be considered and dealt with to advantage by men who do not hold such inspectorships, and who do not wish for them and for whom none is available. The proposed amendment will tend to broaden the services and improve its usefulness. The appointment of the chairman is a matter of importance. If the minister's choice is limited to an inspector the service may suffer because the available men may not be the best for that responsible position. A man may be an exceedingly good inspector of machinery, or of hulls, and yet make a very poor chairman. The qualifications for the two positions are not the same. Then there is the delay in the examination if a new man is chosen. Before he can be appointed chairman he must pass as an inspector. The actual difficulty which occurred in the department this year was explained to me by the deputy minister as follows: When the former chairman, Mr. Adams, was superannuated last spring, the department although having a highly qualified man, Mr. Macdonnell, in the service, was unable to appoint him deputy chairman. We were obliged to designate one of the inspectors to that office. He was shortly afterwards taken ill and has been incapacitated all through the season. The result has been that the business of the branch has been seriously interfered with. Had this Bill been law, had it been possible for the minister to name some additional members of the board, I would have named the deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries as a member of the board and chairman and with him as chairman the work of the board would have proceeded satisfactorily and properly. As it was, Mr. Adams being superannuated at his own request, and the other gentleman who was named as chairman having been taken ill, there was not actually anybody that the department had the right to appoint as chairman. There was in the department a man qualified whom we were unable to appoint because he had not passed the necessary examination. It is necessary to have properly qualified inspectors because the inspection of hulls is something that is of the most important character for the safety of people who travel throughout the country and it is also very desirable that the Act should be extended so as to give this additional power of appointment to the minister who for the time being may be in charge of the department. That is the view of the permanent officials of the department, that is the recommendation that they have made and it is a recommendation with which I fully agree. If the House concurs in these proposed changes we will never be left again in the position in which we were unfortunately placed last summer.

Mr. PARDEE: The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that if there was a vacancy he should have the right to appoint an inspector even although he had not passed an examination.

Mr. HAZEN: Not to appoint an inspector?

Mr. PARDEE. A member of the board.

Mr. HAZEN: A member of the board. No man can be appointed inspector who has not passed the examination.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The law as to that is left unchanged?

Mr. HAZEN: Entirely unchanged. Hon. gentlemen can understand what an advantage it will be if you could appoint the deputy minister, or some other official of the department, who is familiar with the work as chairman so that he could take charge of and organize the work of the board. There might be an inspector who was not the right man to act as chairman or to deal with matters that come before the board.

Mr. SINCLAIR. May I ask the minister if he has limited the number that may be appointed, or if the number is unlimited?

Mr. HAZEN: The number has not been limited, and I think there is possibly some force in my hon. friend's suggestion. The same view occurred to me as I was reading the Bill to-night and I will consider that point with my deputy before the Bill comes before the House again.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is there any salary attached?

Mr. HAZEN: It is not proposed to pay any salary. It is proposed to appoint men who are already in the employment of the department.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the minister will pardon me for taking advantage of this discussion to ask if the very serious collision which took place in Sydney harbour between the City of Sydney and the tug Douglas Thomas has been brought to his notice, or if any investigation into that most serious disaster in which several lives were lost has been had, or if any steps to inquire into the matter have been taken. I have had some letters from Sydney complaining that so far no investigation has taken place. I would suggest to the minister that this is a case in which the most careful investigation should be made by the department.

Mr. HAZEN: As soon as the attention of the department was called to the matter instructions were given to direct the commissioner to proceed to Sydney and hold an investigation into the cause of the disaster. The Wreck Commissioner has had his hands pretty full lately in connection with disasters which have occurred on the St. Lawrence river; but I understand that if he is not already on his way to Sydney, he will proceed there at once for that purpose.

Mr. PARDEE: I would like to ask the minister another question which is pertinent to the Bill introduced just now; why it is a rule of the department that no reports of boiler inspectors or hull inspectors are allowed to go out to those asking for such reports on certain steamers. It appears to me at first blush that no particular harm could be done to anybody, if such reports were given out. If the boat is in good order they cannot hurt anybody, and if the boat is not seaworthy, so much the better that it should be known as soon as possible, and on application, the report of the boiler inspector or of the hull inspector should be made known to those interested.

Mr. HAZEN: I was not aware that any such rule existed.

Mr. PARDEE: About two months ago I wrote to the department asking for such a report, and I got a letter stating it was the rule of the department that such reports should not be given out.

Mr. HAZEN: Who was that letter from?

Mr. PARDEE: From the deputy minister.

Mr. HAZEN: I was not aware that the rule existed. There may be, however, a very good reason for it. My attention has never previously been directed to the matter, but I will make inquiries about it and find out the reason.

Mr. PARDEE: I am not saying there may not be a very good reason indeed, but I do not know what it is at present.

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

Mr. HAZEN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 27, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Pelletier, House adjourned at ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 9, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

A message from His Royal Highness the Governor General was presented by Mr. Borden, and read by Mr. Speaker, as follows:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I have received with great pleasure the Address that you voted in response to my speech on the occasion of the opening of Parliament.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Commission of Internal Economy of the House of Commons for the preceding year.—Mr. Speaker.

Report of the Public Service Commission; also Orders in Council accepting the resignations of the Commissioners.—Mr. Borden.

On motion of Mr. Borden, it was ordered that the report be printed forthwith.

CANADIAN-WEST INDIAN TRADE AGREEMENT.

On motion of Mr. Foster, it was ordered that the House go into Committee tomorrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide as follows:—

1. That the agreement of the ninth day of April, one thousand nine hundred and twelve entered into at Ottawa by representatives appointed by the Government of Canada and by the representatives of the West Indies colonies, parties thereto be approved.

2. That there shall be levied, collected and paid after the said agreement is in accordance

with its terms brought into operation, and so long as it remains in force, on all goods enumerated in schedule B to the said agreement being the produce or manufacture of any of the colonies, parties thereto, when such goods are imported direct from any British country into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein if imported as aforesaid, duties of customs—

(a) At the rate of four-fifths of the several rates of duties, if any, imposed on similar goods when imported from any foreign country; or

(b) at the several rates of duties, if any, set opposite to each item respectively, or charged on goods as not enumerated in the column, British preferential tariff, in schedule A to the Customs Tariff, 1907, and in any amendment thereof, whichever shall be the lower rate.

3. That nothing in the next preceding paragraph shall affect the rates of duties of customs payable on raw sugar when imported into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein, to which the rates of duties of customs provided by tariff item 135b in schedule A to the Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by chapter 10 of the Statutes of 1909 apply.

4. That on and after a date to be named in a proclamation published at such time as the Governor in Council deems expedient in the Canada Gazette, the goods, enumerated in schedule B to the said agreement shall only be entitled to the advantages or concessions provided for when such goods are conveyed by ship direct without transhipment into a sea or river port of Canada from any one of the respective colonies and possessions as may be admitted thereto by proclamation published in to the said advantages or concessions under the provisions hereof.

5. That before the discretion granted to the Governor in Council by the next preceding paragraph has been exercised provision shall be made for an effective control of rates of freight in all steamship subsidy contracts to which Canada is a party and under which steamers ply between ports in Canada and ports in the colonies which are entitled to the advantages or concessions hereby provided.

6. That the advantages or concessions granted to the colonies, parties to the said agreement, shall extend to the other colonies enumerated in schedule D, to the said agreement for the period of three years from the date on which the said agreement shall, according to its tenor, come into operation.

7. That the advantages or concessions granted to the colonies, parties to the said agreement, shall extend to the United Kingdom and such of the other British colonies and possessions as may be admitted thereto by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette, so long as the colonies, parties to the said agreement, continue to be entitled to such advantages or concessions; provided, however, that nothing herein shall be held to diminish any advantage which the United Kingdom and British colonies and possessions enjoy under the British preferential tariff.

8. That the Governor in Council may make such rules and regulations as are deemed necessary to carry out the provisions and intent hereof and the said agreement.

9. That the operation of all laws inconsistent with the giving to the provisions hereof, and of the said agreement their full effect shall from time to time be suspended to the extent of such inconsistency.

Mr. FOSTER: I desire to lay on the table of the House the document asked for by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean).

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: What is it?

Mr. FOSTER: It gives the rates of import duty at present existing in all the West Indian Islands which are parties to the agreement.

THE NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

On motion of Mr. BORDEN, it was ordered that the House go into Committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient in connection with the Bill now before this House intituled: An Act to authorize measures for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, to provide:—

(a) That from and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada there may be paid and applied a sum not exceeding thirty-five million dollars for the purpose of immediately increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire;

(b) That the said sum shall be used and applied under the direction of the Governor in Council in the construction and equipment of battleships or armoured cruisers of the most modern and powerful type;

(c) That the said ships when constructed and equipped shall be placed by the Governor in Council at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the Empire; and

(d) That the said sum shall be paid, used and applied, and the said ships shall be constructed and placed at the disposal of His Majesty subject to such terms, conditions and arrangements as may be agreed upon between the Governor in Council and His Majesty's Government.

MRS. LABERGE'S CLAIM.

Mr. ETHIER: Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask a question of the hon. Postmaster General. Towards the latter part of last session I asked the hon. gentleman that a special indemnity be granted to the widow of Mr. Laberge, a mail carrier drowned in the lake of Two Mountains last fall. The Postmaster General said that it was too late, at that stage of the session, to put such moneys in the estimates. On the 4th of November last Mrs. Laberge wrote to the minister, and she received a reply on the 6th of November. It is written in French, and I will translate it:

I received your letter, dated the 4th instant, in regard to the indemnity which you wish to obtain from the department. I have taken

note of what you tell me, and will see what I can do.

Yours truly,
L. P. PELLETIER.

Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to grant the request of Mrs. Laberge?

Mr. PELLETIER: I am not in a position to answer my hon. friend before the estimates are brought down.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PURCHASES OF WELSH COAL.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any contract been awarded by the Department of Public Works for a Welsh coal supply to the various buildings belonging to the Dominion Government in the city of Montreal?
2. Were the tenders advertised? If so, in what papers?
3. What is the name of each tenderer, and the amount of each tender?
4. What is the name of the lowest tenderer?
5. What is the name of the firm to whom the contract was awarded?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.
2. (a) Yes. (b) Montreal Gazette, Standard, l'Action, Le Devoir, Canadian Century, Tribune, Le Moniteur du Commerce, La Patrie, Canadian Jewish Times and l'Areldo del Canada.

—	Anthracite.			Bituminous.
	Furnace.	Egg.	Stove.	
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Geo. Hall Coal Co	7 25	7 50	7 50	4 00
J. C. Labrecque & Co	7 50	7 75	8 00	4 50
The Merchants Coal Co.	7 25	7 50	7 50	
Ernest Lemire	7 50	7 75	7 75	4 75
Farquhar Robertson Ltd.	7 50	7 75	8 00	
Andrew Baile	7 25	7 25	7 25	
General Improvement & Contracting Co	....	.....	.. ..	4 15

4. Geo. Hall Coal Co., The Merchants Coal Co., and Andrew Baile were lowest for furnace coal for custom house.

Geo. Hall Coal Co., lowest for bituminous coal for examining warehouse.

Geo. Hall Coal Co., The Merchants Coal Co., and Farquhar Robertson (Ltd.), lowest for egg coal for postal station 'B.'

Andrew Baile was lowest for egg coal for Express Parcels office, postal stations 'C' and 'D,' Revenue Building and Immigration Building, also for stove coal for latter.

5. On a report from the Superintendent of Buildings, Montreal, that the Welsh coal that Andrew Baile intended to supply was not so satisfactory, the contract for that supply was awarded at the same price, $7.25 a ton, to J. O. Labrecque & Co., for: Custom House, The Merchants Coal Co.; Examining Warehouse, Geo. Hall Coal Co.; Postal Station 'B', Farquhar Robertson (Ltd.); Postal Station 'C', J. O. Labrecque & Co.; Postal Station ' ', J. O. Labrecque & Co.; Revenue Building, J. O. Labrecque & Co.; Express Parcels Building, J. O. Labrecque & Co.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. When did Mr. Guillaume Narcisse Ducharme cease to act as commissioner?
2. What salary did he receive as such?
3. What were his travelling expenses?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. November 19, 1912.
2. $6,690.00.
3. $430.40.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. When did Mr. Morine cease to act as commissioner?
2. What salary has he received from the Government as such?
3. What were his travelling expenses?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. June 1, 1912.
2. $4,920.00.
3. $154.65.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Have Messrs. Morine, Lake and Ducharme completed their work of investigation?
2. Have they filed a report of their proceedings in each investigation?
3. Has their commission been cancelled?

Mr. BORDEN:

1 and 3. Messrs. Morine, Lake, and Ducharme have, at their own request, been relieved from the prosecution of the duties with which they were charged under Orders in Council copies of which have been laid upon the table of the House.

2. Reports of their proceedings up to the date of their resignation have been received and have been laid before the House today.

CONTRACTS FOR DOMINION STEAMERS.

*Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. What steamers have been contracted for by any department of the Government during the past year, and what were the tenders received therefor from Canadian, British and foreign builders, respectively?
2. To whom were the respective contracts awarded and at what price?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Department of Customs:

Steamer Margaret—for which the following tenders were received:—John I. Thornycroft & Co., Ltd., Southampton, England, tender (including guns) £56,300 stg.; Wm. Beardmore & Co., Ltd., Dalmuir, Scotland, tender £58,200 stg.; Collingwood Shipbuilding Co., Ltd., Collingwood, tender, $315,000;

Department of Marine and Fisheries, fiscal year 1911-12:

Steamer Dollard. The following tenders were received, viz.:—La Compagnie Pontbriand, Sorel, P.Q., offer to build steamer in accordance with plans and specifications, $140,000 (tender withdrawn); Fleming & Ferguson, Paisley: Offer to build steamer in acordance with plans and specifications delivered at Montreal, £31,200—$151,839.79; Kingston Shipbuilding Co., Kingston: Offer to build steamer in accordance with plans and specifications delivered at Montreal, $155,000; Chambers & Simpson, Toronto: Telegram only, delivered on Clyde $165,000. Received after time expired for receiving tenders. Polson Iron Works, Toronto: Offer to build steamer in accordance with plans and specifications, delivered at Montreal, $199,331.

Department of Public Works:

(a) A tug boat, 50 feet long; (b) two tenders received from Canadian builders. The Polson Iron Works and La Cie, Pontbriand.

2. Department of Customs:

Contract for steamer Margaret awarded to John I. Thornycroft & Co., Ltd., at £56,300 stg.

Department of Marine and Fisheries:

Contract for steamer Dollard awarded to the Kingston Shipbuilding Co., of Kingston, Ont., at their tender price.

Department of Public Works:

To the Polson Iron Works for $31,499.75.

QUEBEC DRY DOCK.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any site been selected for the proposed dry dock at Quebec?
2. If so, was the site selected after consulting an engineer?
3. What was the name of the engineer employed by the Government in connection with said site?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes. At Lauzon on south shore.
2. Yes.
3. Goode, Son & Matthews, through their representative, Mr. M. F. Wilson, made an examination and report as to the most suitable site for a dry dock at Quebec.

ST. PETERS CANAL IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals received any protests from the harbour master or other residents of St. Peters against the contractor in charge of the St. Peters canal improvements using the harbour for a dumping ground?
2. Has any communication on the subject been received from the resident engineer? If so, has any action been taken thereon?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. A complaint was received by the Department of Marine and Fisheries on July 8th, 1912, that clay is allowed to roll down the slope into the waters of the present canal. The matter was referred by the Department of Marine to the Department of Railways and Canals.
2. On July 20th, 1912, a report was received from the resident engineer stating that every precaution was being taken to prevent clay rolling down into the present canal. The principal assistant engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals also made personal observations at St. Peters on the 15th of July, and he noted that every precaution had been taken to prevent any clay dropping into the canal.

PURCHASES OF PRIVATE CARS.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many private cars have been purchased by the Government or by any member thereof since October 10, 1911?
2. Were competitive prices secured in each case?
3. By whom and where were the said private cars purchased, and for whose use were they intended?
4. What was the cost of each such private car?
5. How much money has been expended on the fittings, alterations, &c., of each of the said cars up to November 1, 1912?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. One private car, the Canada.
2. No.
3. By the Department of Railways and Canals from the Canadian Pacific railway, for the use of His Royal Highness the Governor General.
4. $15,000 appropriation voted.
5. $238.25, on the Canada.

IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHWAYS.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

Did the Department of Railways and Canals or any other department of the Government of Canada, since the close of the last session of Parliament, carry on any negotiations, by correspondence or otherwise, with any of the governments of the provinces of Canada relative to the expenditure of moneys voted at the last session of Parliament to be expended upon, and for the improvement of the highways of the several provinces of Canada?

2. If so, with what provincial governments, and what was the nature, extent, and result of the same?

3. If no such negotiations were carried on, what cause is assigned for not doing so?

4. Was any portion or the whole of said moneys voted for said purposes for the several provinces, expended during the past six months? If so, what amount was expended in each province?

5. If no portion of said moneys so voted were expended in any province during the past six months, what is the reason assigned for the non-expenditure of the same?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No such negotiations were undertaken or carried on.

2. Answered by number one.

3. The Bill introduced at the last session of Parliament for the improvement of highways did not become law, and no negotiations were undertaken.

4. No expenditure of money for the purpose referred to was made.

5. Answered by number three.

THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—PORT OF SHIPMENT.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the attention of the Government been directed to the report of a speech made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens, which appeared in the daily press of Canada on October 17, 1912, as follows:—

Attacks Railways—Maritime Provinces Member says Grand Trunk Pacific has no Port in Eastern Canada.

'Halifax, N.S., Oct. 16.—Before the Dartmouth Board of Trade last evening, speaking on the Grand Trunk Railway, F. B. McCurdy, M.P., who was the chief speaker, claimed that although the company had received all its financial aid from Canada, its freight will not be shipped from a Canadian port. He said the people of Canada, especially those in the eastern provinces should object to this state of affairs and especially when the road will cost more than three times the original figure. The Grand Trunk Pacific, he stated, did not leave a dollar in this province. He said that the east should be alive to its interests in this matter. He believed Mr. Borden, a maritime man, would do his duty in this matter, but the people should be alert to prevent the sacrifice of their interests by the railway.'

2. If so, has the Government any information showing that it is not the intention of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to ship its freight from a Canadian port?

3. If so, what action will be taken by the Government to prevent the company from carrying out its intentions?

Mr. BORDEN: This question is open to the same suggestion that was made last year. It seems to contain a statement of fact, and I would suggest that the hon. gentleman would do well to amend it.

DAMMING OF ST. LAWRENCE RIVER.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any application been made to the Government with the object of damming the St. Lawrence river in the vicinity of Coteau, Cedar, Split Rock and the Cascade rapids to the level of the lake St. Francis?

2. If so, by whom has such application been made?

3. Has any decision been taken in the matter?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No application has been made.

2. Answered by number one.

3. Answered by number one.

AGE LIMIT FOR APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What is the age limit for appointments in the customs service, the railway service, and the lighthouse service respectively?

Mr. CODERRE: Department of Customs for appointments to the outside service, the general rule for age limit is under thirty-six years. Appointment to the inside service, the age of the person is required to be not less than eighteen years or more than thirty-five years, except as to certain special officers appointed under section 21 of the Civil Service Amendment Act 1908.

Department of Railways and Canals.—The age limit for inexperienced men in railway work is thirty-five years, and for men experienced in railway work forty-five years.

Department of Marine and Fisheries.—There is no specified age limit in the lighthouse service.

ST. LIN POST OFFICE.

Mr. SEGUIN:

Does the Department of Public Works intend, in the course of the present session, to have the necessary amount voted for the construction of a post office at St. Lin, a town of the Laurentides, county of L'Assomption? If not, what are the causes that prevents such construction?

Mr. ROGERS: Inquiry was made by the department concerning this work and from information secured, it was deemed to be immediately pressing.

RIVER L'ASSOMPTION WHARF.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Does the Department of Public Works intend, in the course of the present session, to have the necessary amount voted for the building of a wharf on the river L'Assomption?

2. If not, what are the causes that prevent such construction?

Mr. ROGERS: The matter is under careful consideration.

RIVER L'ACHIGAN BREAKWATER.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to have built on the river l'Achigan at St. Gérard de Magella, county of L'Assomption, some breakwaters to take the place of the icebreakers, for the construction of which special appropriations were voted in the estimates of 1911-1912?

2. If the Government does not intend to build the breakwaters, why has the building of the icebreakers voted for not been done, and at whose request?

Mr. ROGERS: Application has been received and the matter will be carefully considered when the estimates are being prepared.

FENIAN RAID BOUNTIES.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. What is the interpretation of the Department of Militia and Defence of the provisions of the Fenian Raid Volunteer Act, 1912, as to what services qualify a person for the bounty?

2. If an enlisted volunteer of a militia regiment was called out for regimental drill, and did undergo drill, but whose company or regiment was not ordered from the drill grounds for active service elsewhere, is he entitled to a bounty under the provisions of said Act?

3. What is the departmental definition of 'Active Service' as used in clause 2 of the Fenian Raid Volunteer Bounty Act?

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria):

1. That a volunteer must have been enrolled in a corps called out for active service and have actually served with that corps during the period of a raid, in pursuance of the order or proclamation which called it out.

2. If the corps was called out for active service and the drill or service was performed in connection with such calling out, yes; but the order for mere annual training, or drilling without the order for active service does not count. Verification must be by declaration of applicant and of at least one comrade; and the name must appear on the service or pay roll for the period—or other equally satisfactory evidence must be given.

3. Active service means service performed in response to the order or proclamation which called out the corps for the purpose of repelling invasion.

APPOINTMENT OF S. E. MACK.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Was S. E. Mack appointed to the customs service at Lunenburg, Nova Scotia?

2. If so, to what position was he appointed, what are the duties to be performed by him, if any, and what salary is he paid?

3. Was any recommendation made by any person in the custom service of Canada that it was in the interest of the customs service at Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, to create an additional office there, and to which Mr. Mack was subsequently appointed?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. Yes.

2. His rank is that of preventive officer of customs. His duties are to assist in the general work of the Port of Lunenburg. Salary $1,000 a year.

3. The appointment was made on the responsibility of the Minister of Customs to meet the needs of the customs service at Lunenburg.

DUTIES ON STEEL RAILS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is there an application before the Government for the reduction of duties on steel rails?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): No.

ISAAC'S HARBOUR BUOYS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Has the contract held by John Myers, of Isaac's Harbour, N.S., for maintaining buoys in the locality expired? If so, on what date?

2. Has the contract been re-let? If so, to whom?

3. Were tenders for this service asked for? If so, what are the names of the parties tendering and the amount of each tender?

4. What amounts per year was payable for this service under the contract of John Myers?

5. What yearly sum is payable by the department under the new contract, if any?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes. On the 23rd of November, 1912.

2. Yes. To Mr. Edgar Silver, of Goldboro, N. S.

3. Tenders were not called for and the service was transferred at the rate paid the former contractor.

4. $202.91, including the winter service.

5. $202.91, including the winter service.

HUMBOLDT HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. NEELY:

What are the names of the homestead inspectors appointed to the Humboldt Agency between September 21, 1911, and July 11, 1912, and the salary of each?

Mr. ROCHE : Albert Smyth, $1,200; R. G. Mackey, $1,300.

FARMERS' BANK INVESTIGATION.

*Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Have the stenographic notes of the evidence taken at the Farmers' Bank investigation been extended?
2. Will the notes be available for the perusal of members of the House?
3. If so, when and where can members see the evidence?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1, 2 and 3. The Government has no information as to whether the stenographic notes have been extended. Inquiry has been made of the commissioner and upon receiving his reply the Government will be in a position to fully answer the question of the hon. member for Ontario.

SASKATOON HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. McCRANEY:

What are the names of the homestead inspectors appointed to the Saskatoon Agency between September 21, 1911, and July 11, 1912, and the salary of each?

Mr. ROCHE: J. J. White, $1,200; J. G. Johnston, $1,200; T. W. Collins, $1,200; Wm. K. Walker, $1,200; Walter Cravette, $1,200.

PRINCE ALBERT HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. McCRANEY:

What are the names of the homestead inspectors appointed to the Prince Albert Agency between September 21, 1911, and July 11, 1912, and the salary of each?

Mr. ROCHE: Sinclair Snell, $1,200; Thos. L. Sutherland, $1,200.

DANBY—STE. CHRISTINE MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Has the contract granted to Felix Grisé, for carrying the mails between Danby and Ste. Christine, county of Bagot, been cancelled? If so, for what reasons?
2. Who is to replace him?
3. What price will he receive for the said contract?
4. Who requested this change?
5. By whom was the new contractor recommended?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. (a) The usual three months' notice has been given as provided in the contract. (b) In the public interest.

2 and 3. A. Bizaillon will perform the work at $195 per annum which is less than the amount previously paid.

4 and 5. Ordered by Postmaster General.

Mr. NEELY.

MARINE AFFAIRS AT ST. ROCH.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. For what reasons has the Government taken away the care of the ferry boat at St. Roch from Captain Andrews, to give it to David Bourgault, of St. Roch des Aulnaies?
2. What complaint is made against Captain Andrews?
3. Does the Government know that complaints are said to have already been made against David Bourgault, at the time he was lightkeeper at the entrance of the Saguenay?
4. Does the Government know that the said David Bourgault, as alleged, has publicly declared that he had paid $500 to one of the political organizers of Dr. Paquet, at St. Roch des Aulnaies, to be appointed in the place of Captain Andrews?
5. If not, will the department cause an inquiry to be made on this subject?

Mr. HAZEN: There appears to be some misunderstanding about questions 1 and 2, as the department does not maintain a ferry boat at St. Roch, and it knows nothing of Captain Andrews. Questions 3, 4 and 5 would indicate, though they are not very clear, that they refer to the lightkeeper at St. Roch des Aulnaies, and if the hon. gentleman will correct his questions, we will be very glad to answer them.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has stated that there is no ferry boat at St. Roch. There is a mistake in the question as it appears on the Order Paper, due to an error in translation. The question as it appears in French reads as follows:

1. For what reasons has the Government taken away the care of the ferry boat at St. Roch from Captain Andrews, to give it to David Bourgault, of St. Roch des Aulnaies?

The word 'bateau-phare' meaning lightship, has been translated as meaning ferry boat.

Mr. HAZEN: That is where the mistake has evidently arisen It came into the department as 'ferry boat.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Then the hon. gentleman will be prepared to give an answer to the question?

Mr. HAZEN: I will be prepared to give an answer next day.

Question allowed to stand.

ACTON VALE AND ST. THEODORE D'ACTON MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. MARCILE:

1. Has the contract granted to Joseph Bousquet, for carrying the mail between Acton Vale and St. Théodore d'Acton been cancelled?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. Who is to replace him?

4. What price will he receive for the said contract?
5. Who requested this change?
6. By whom was the new contractor recommended?

Mr. PELLETIER: This contract has not been cancelled. It expires in the regular course on the 31st instant. A new contract has been authorized dating from 1st January, 1913, with L. Gauthier, at the same price as paid to present contractor, J. Bousquet, viz., $134.16 per annum.

LABOUR GAZETTE CORRESPONDENTS.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. How many correspondents of the Labour Gazette in Nova Scotia have been dismissed or asked to resign?
2. What are the names of said correspondents?
3. What were the grounds for dismissal or request for resignation in each case?
4. Were any investigations held? If so, in what cases?
5. Who were the appointees in each case to fill the vacancies?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Three—dismissals.
2. (a) A. D. Ross, (3) Thomas Bales, (c) A. J. Smith.
3. (a) Inefficiency, (b) offensive partisanship, (c) offensive partisanship.
4. No official investigations were considered necessary.
5. (a) J. Forsyth, (b) L. H. McKenzie, (c) P. Clancy.

MOOSEJAW HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle):

What are the names of the homestead inspectors appointed to the Moosejaw agency between the 21st of September, 1911, and the 11th of July, 1912, and the salary of each?

Mr. ROCHE: George A. MacKenzie, $1,200; J. Mines, $1,200; W. H. Erratt, $1,200; H. L. Bowyer, $1,200; Wm. Rathwell, $1,200; R. R. Miller, $1,200.

REGINA HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. THOMSON (Qu'Appelle):

What are the names of the homestead inspectors appointed to the Regina agency between the 21st of September, 1911, and the 11th of July, 1912, and the salary of each?

Mr. ROCHE: P. R. Brandt, $1,200; A. C. Sipes, $1,200; Jas. Balfour, $1,500; C. J. Ouellette, $1,200.

SWIFT CURRENT HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. THOMSON:

What are the names of the homestead inspectors appointed to the Swift Current agency between the 21st of September, 1911, and the 11th of July, 1912, and the salary of each?

Mr. ROCHE: A. E. Sparshatt, $1,200; Wm. Shields, $1,200; Peter McLaren, $1,200.

BAYVIEW, CARIBOO, LOBSTER HATCHERY EMPLOYEES.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou):

1. What are the names and the remuneration paid to each of the employees of the lobster hatchery at Bayview, Cariboo, for the operating season of 1911?
2. What are the names and the remuneration paid to each of the employees of the lobster hatchery at Bayview, Cariboo, for the operating season of 1912?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. W. H. McLaren, $3 a day; W. S. Munroe, $2.25; Joseph Laverdière, $2; James Johnstone, $2.25; John Chisholm, $1.75; David Anderson, $1.75; John Reid, $1.75; Duncan Henderson, $1.75; Joseph Babineau, $1.75; W. L. Holmes, $1.75.
2. J. W. Hogg, $3 a day; Finlay McKenzie, $2.25; John Reid, $2; Isaac Harris, $2.25; Marshall Murray, $1.75; Robert Talbot, $1.75; William Leslie, $1.75; John Meagher, $1.75; Leslie Simpson, $1.75; Albert Murdock, $1.75.

POST OFFICES IN MEDICINE HAT.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. How many applications have been made for the establishment of post offices in the constituency of Medicine Hat, Alberta, since September 21, 1912?
2. How many of these applications have not been granted, and what was the reason or reasons in each instance?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. 67.
2. 39 applications have been granted; 23 are under inquiry; 5 have been refused as conditions were unfavourable, and the inspector's report against establishment. The ones refused names and locations are as undermentioned:

(a) 'Roseglen'—S.E. ¼, section 4, township 16, range 3, west 4th meridian: country but sparsely settled Excessive price asked for service. Report unfavourable.

(b) 'Kasimir'—S.W. ¼, section 14, township 14, range 20, west 4th meridian. District neither well settled nor likely to improve rapidly. Report unfavourable.

(c) 'Blairgowrie'—S.E. ¼, section 18, township 28, range 2, west 4th meridian. Proposed site within 4 miles of one office and 5 miles of another. Report against establishment.

(d) 'Klaras'—S.W. ¼, section 14, township 16, range 4, west 4th meridian. Proposed

site within 3 miles of a post office; another office unnecessary.

(e) 'Walhonding'—S.E. ¼, section 14, township 15, range 4, west 4th meridian. Proposed site within 4½ miles of a post office. Another office not required. Report unfavourable.

CUSTOMS OFFICE FOR GLEICHEN.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has a request been made for the establishment of a customs office at Gleichen, Alberta?

2. If so, is it the intention to accede to the request?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): There appears to be no request on file in the Department of Customs for the establishment of a customs office at Gleichen.

GOVERNMENT BUILDING AT BASSANO, ALTA.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

Has the contract been let for the new Government building at Bassano, Alberta, provided for in the estimates of last session?

Mr. ROGERS: No, preparation of plans and specifications now in hands of chief architect.

BURDETT, ALTA., PORT OF ENTRY.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has Burdett, in the constituency of Medicine Hat, been made a port of entry by the Department of Customs?

2. If so, by whose request and on whose recommendation?

3. For what reason was this port of entry established?

4. Who is the officer in charge?

5. Where was his residence when appointed, and on whose recommendation was he appointed?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. Yes.

2. On the request and recommendation of the Minister of Customs.

3. To afford facilities for customs entries of imported goods.

4. Augustine Kerkham.

5. His residence at time of appointment is given as Lethbridge. He was appointed on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs.

MEDICINE HAT LANDS AGENT.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Has a permanent appointment been made of an agent of Dominion Lands at Medicine Hat, Alberta?

2. If so, who has been appointed?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. No.

2. Mr. Geo. H. Macdonell is acting agent.

Mr. PELLETIER.

ICE BREAKING IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. DELISLE:

In view of the great damages said to be caused in the spring by the inundation from Cap Rouge to Montreal, is it the intention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries to give orders that the Montcalm and the Lady Grey be solely employed during the winter in breaking the ice from Cap Rouge upward?

Mr. HAZEN: It is the intention of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, to utilize the C.G.S. Montcalm and the C.G.S. Lady Grey for breaking ice at Cap Rouge and upwards during the present winter.

STE. JUSTINE MONGENAIS MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. BOYER:

1. On what date will the contract end for the carriage of the mail between the station of Ste. Justine de Newton and the village of Ste. Justine and Mongenais?

2. What is the amount of the contract and when did it end?

3. Who is the present holder of it, and does the Government intend to cancel this contract before its expiration? If so, for what reasons and will new tenders be asked for?

4. When will these tenders be asked for?

5. If complaints have been made against the present carrier, by whom were they made?

Mr. PELLETIER: S. Lanthier's contract for this service was due to expire on the 30th September, 1913. On a report from the post office inspector it was found that this contractor was not performing the service properly. In accordance with a condition of his contract, three months' notice of cancellation was given on 5th October last, and arrangements made with another person to perform the service temporarily from the expiration of the three months' notice at the same amount as Lanthier received, viz.: $312.25 per annum.

RIGAUD POST OFFICE.

Mr. BOYER:

1. When does the Government propose to have the post office at Rigaud open?

2. Has one or more guardians been appointed to take care of the building?

3. What is their name or names and the emoluments paid for such duties?

4. Is the Government at present in possession of the building or has the contractor yet delivered it?

5. Has the Government asked for tenders for repairs of this building? If so, what are the names of the tenderers and their residence and the price asked in each tender?

6. To which of the tenderers has the contract been granted, and for what amount?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. The building is now completed; the post office fittings are not yet installed, but will be in place about the end of December.

2. Two caretakers appointed.
3. J. B. Charlebois, caretaker, $12.50 per month; Gédéon Vallée, assistant caretaker, $12.50 per month.
4. Yes.
5. Tenders were invited for the post office fittings. One tender received, J. T. Schell Co., Alexandria, Ont., $1,487.00.
6. J. T. Schell Co., Alexandria, $1,487.00.

STE. MARTHE POSTMASTER.

Mr. BOYER :

By whom was the appointment of Mr. Emery Quesnel, as postmaster at Ste. Marthe, Vaudreuil, recommended?

Mr. PELLETIER : The appointment was made by the order and on the responsibility of the Postmaster General.

WHARF GRAHAM, VAUDREUIL.

Mr. BOYER:

1. What amount of money has been spent on repairs to the wharf Graham, in Vaudreuil, since September, 1911?
2. Who had the superintendence, and how much have the overseers and other employees each received?
3. What are the names of the furnishers of materials and what is the amount of each of their accounts?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $759.38.
2. Treffié Coulombe, conductor, 18th September, 1911, 21st October, 1911, 29 days at $3, $87; Antoine Bertrand, conductor, 7-31st March, 1912, 21 days at $3, $63; Peter Graham, carpenter, 22nd September, 21st October, 1911, 22 days at $2.50, $55; Arthur Pilon, helper, 26th September, 17th October, 1911, 7 days at $2, $14; Antoine Bertrand, senior painter, 8-31st March, 1912, 20 days at $2, $40; Peter Berry, carpenter, 13-31st March, 1912, 16 days, at $2.50, $40; Barny Séguin, carpenter, 13-31st March, 1912, 16 days at $2.50, $40; Ludovic Séguin, teaming, 16-31st March, 1912, 12½ days at $4, $50.—$389.
3. William Hodgson, Como, Quebec, 3rd October, 1911, lumber, $167.51, 28th March, 1912, lumber, $50.93, $218.44; Alphonse Dumoulin, Boyerbourg, Quebec, 26th September, 18th October, 1911, smithwork, $9.50, 29th March, 1912, smithwork, $10.35, $19.85; W. Graham, Boyerbourg, Quebec, 23rd October, 1911, hardware, $2.45; Chevrier Frères, Rigaud, Quebec, 8th April, 1912, lumber, $82; B. Decoste, Rigaud, Quebec, 26th March, 10th April, 1912, hardware, $47.64.—$370.38.—$759.38.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. GAVUREAU:

1. For what reason was Odilon Pelletier, excise officer, or customs, at St. Roch des Aulnaies dismissed?
2. What is the salary of Joseph Dupon, who replaced him, and what are his duties?
3. Does the Government know, as alleged, that this officer can neither read nor write?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Because he has made no reports of work done since his appointment in September, 1908.
2. The same salary, viz., $200 and the same duties.
3. No.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Why was R. A. Burriss dismissed from the position of immigration agent at Port Arthur?
2. Who has been appointed in his place?

Mr. ROCHE.

1. Incompetency and active partisanship.
2. No one has been appointed in his place.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. What was the reason for the dismissal of Gordon Macdonald, homestead inspector in the Edmonton land agency?
2. Who was appointed in his place?
3. What was the occupation of the person so appointed before his appointment, and what was his personal reputation?
4. Is he still in the employment of the Interior Department?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Political partisanship.
2. C. J. Brown.
3. No record in the department with respect to this.
4. No.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Mr. Napoléon Rousseau, postmaster at Ste. Clothilde, been dismissed?
2 If so, for what reasons and who asked for his dismissal?
3. Who has been apointed as his successor and at whose request?
4. Was there an inquiry?

Mr. PELLETIER: Charges of political partisanship having been made against the postmaster, he was written to by the department, requesting an explanation. As he failed to reply to the department's letter, he was again written to and as he again refused to reply, his silence was regarded as equivalent to an admission of the charges, and his removal and the appointment of Mr. Alfred Laforest as his successor was authorized by the Postmaster General.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Mr. George Rouleau, postmaster at St. Paul de Chester, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. Was his dismissal asked for by Mr. Arthur Gilbert?
4. Who proposed his successor?
5. Was there an inquiry?
6. Who has been appointed postmaster in Mr. Rouleau's place?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. For political partisanship.
3 and 4. His removal was directed and his successor appointed by order of the Postmaster General.
5. No. He admitted having acted as a political partisan.
6. Mr. Octave Lafontaine has not been appointed receiver, but postmaster.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

1. Has Mr. L. P. Leclerc, postmaster at Bon Conseil, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reasons and who asked for his dismissal?
3. Who has been appointed his successor and at whose request?
4. Was an inquiry held?

Mr. PELLETIER: The postmaster was dismissed on facts which the Postmaster General considered sufficient, that he had acted as a political partisan, and consequently the expenses of an inquiry would have been useless. Mr. Bruno Chagnon has been appointed his successor by direction of the Postmaster General.

Mr. BROUILLARD :

1. Has Mr. Pierre Potvin, junior postmaster at St. Rémi de Tingwick, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reasons and who asked for his dismissal?
3. Who has been appointed as his successor and at whose request?
4. Was there an enquiry?

Mr. PELLETIER : The postmaster was dismissed on facts which the Postmaster General considered sufficient, that he had acted as a political partisan, and consequently the expenses of an inquiry would have been useless. Mr. Louis Trottier has been appointed postmaster, by direction of the Postmaster General.

Mr. BROUILLARD :

1. Has Mr. Calixte Lavoie, postmaster at St. Cyrille de Wendover, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reasons and who asked for his dismissal?
3. Who has been appointed his successor and at whose request?
4. Was an inquiry held?

Mr. PELLETIER : The postmaster was dismissed on facts which the Postmaster General considered sufficient, that he had acted as a political partisan, and consequently the expenses of an inquiry would have been useless. Mr. Louis Laforest has been appointed postmaster, by direction of the Postmaster General.

Mr. BROUILLARD :

1. Has Mr. Omer Marcotte, postmaster at Daveluyville, been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reasons and who asked for his dismissal?
3. Who has been appointed his successor and at whose request?
4. Was an inquiry held?

Mr. PELLETIER : It having been represented, and ascertained to be the fact, that Mr. Adolphe Daveluy had been unjustly removed from the postmastership of Daveluyville, in 1908, and that his residence was a convenient location for the post office, the Postmaster General directed his reinstatement as postmaster.

DISMISSALS IN HUNTINGDON COUNTY.

Mr. ROBB moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, and petitions for and against the dismissal of Duncan McDonald, preventive officer of customs at Athelstan, county of Huntingdon; also a copy of the report of investigation and evidence submitted to investigating commissioner.

He said: This resolution refers also to James Bennett, customs house officer, who was dismissed on 11th June. McDonald was dismissed on 27th June. Whatever may be said for or against the dismissal of public officials in other counties, it has been the proud boast of the county of Huntingdon that, from the time of Confederation until the present Government attained office, no public official, either federal or provincial, had been dismissed for political partisanship. In that county the public officers exercised their rights freely as free men, believing that the people they served were big enough and tolerant enough to allow them to vote and to act according to the dictates of their own consciences; and it was in this belief, and with this knowledge, that in 1908, and again in 1911, the Government officials, custom house officers, postmasters, and mail contractors, acted in a way that our Conservative friends would classify as political partisanship. In 1908 the Liberals were re-elected, and such had been the conduct of certain Conservative officials that some good zealous Liberals demanded their dismissal. But these Liberal friends were told that in the county of Huntingdon, Government officials were free men and had a right to vote and to act as free men. They were told, further, that if they insisted on the dismissal of those officers, the member for the county was prepared to surrender his mandate and to resign rather than make such a recommendation. To-day, the Liberals, and, I think, a good many Conservatives in the county of Huntingdon are glad to know that under a Liberal administration, and on the recommendation of a supporter of the Liberal Government, in the advancement of salaries that was granted throughout the county, no discrimination

was made against Conservative office-holders. Indeed, I have in mind one customs house officer, a Conservative, who had taken what our Conservative friends would call an offensive part in the campaign of 1908, but who was given a considerable increase. Now in the campaign of 1911, the Conservative-Nationalist combination, the Borden-Monk-Bourassa combination, had for a candidate in the county of Huntingdon, a man who was a delegate to the Farmers' Convention in Ottawa which demanded reciprocity. That man, a very good friend of my own, and against whom I have nothing to say, presented himself in the county as an Independent, and emphasized that position upon every platform throughout the county. But, notwithstanding that, we know that he received very generous support from the Conservative headquarters at Montreal. No sooner was the election over than this Independent, with some of his friends, was seen in the front row of the House demanding the dismissal of good honest officials whose only offence had been that they had voted as they had always voted. One of them, a Scotchman, with the proverbial hospitality of his race was charged with having given to the Liberal candidate a refreshment, not a very grave offence in the eyes of a man who had campaigned throughout the county and was often hungry. The other man was an Irishman, and with the fearless character of a fearless race, he was bold enough to express his opinion of the Conservative-Nationalist alliance, particularly of that class who, the present Postmaster General tells us, were giving advice that might have led to civil war. Charges were made, and an investigation was held, and I am told, upon credible authority that the report of the investigating commissioner was to the effect that the evidence did not justify dismissal. But so insistent were the demands made upon the minister by those so-called Independents, that the minister dismissed two good honest faithful officials, and established a record of having made the first dismissal for political partisanship since Confederation in the county of Huntingdon. If this Government are resting quietly under the impression that the people of that county approve of the spoils system, they will change their minds after the next election. But in the meantime we lay upon them the responsibility of having established a record in the county of Huntingdon which, perhaps, some day they and their friends may be sorry for.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Customs is on his way to England, and I am sorry that I have not been able to put myself in possession of the information that would enable me to reply to my hon. friend. The documents for which he asks will, of course, be brought down. Let me say, however, generally, that dismissal for active partisanship is not a recent policy. It has been a policy of hon. gentlemen opposite while in power, and I believe it has been a generally recognized policy that officials drawing money for services rendered to the public irrespective of politics, shall not be permitted to take the part of active partisans during an election. I think that policy has been concurred in by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, and it has been concurred in, as far as I know, by both parties since Confederation. The question of whether a particular officer has or has not been guilty of offensive partisanship is a question of fact. This motion indicates that an investigation has been held, and the statement of my hon. friend is at best, I submit, an ex parte statement. When the documents have come down, we shall be prepared, I have no doubt, to meet the charge which he has made, to discuss the matter, and to see if the complaints connected with this dismissal are justified, as I have no doubt they will be. But let me say a word further. My hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie), one night last winter, read to this House, and it took him no less than two or three hours, a list of dismissals made by the late Government upon their accession to power in 1896, and the list comprised hundreds of names. There is no doubt about it, the leader of the Opposition is on record as having said, in substance, that if any public official desired to take an active part in politics he would have to take the consequences, that he would give him the opportunity—I believe I quote almost his exact words—of taking the consequences of being an active partisan. No doubt it is very regrettable that dismissals should have to take place by reason of active partisanship; but as long as officials who know the regulations will take an active part in politics during an election, they must be prepared to stand the consequences. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), the other night admitted that this principle had been acted upon. In fact, there is no use of elaborating the point because it is a well known and admitted fact. The hon. gentleman concurred with the view that if officials were guilty of active partisanship they must pay the penalty. Speaking for myself personally, I have held the view enunciated in this House some years ago by the late Sir Richard Cartwright then Minister of Trade and Commerce. He intimated that he would disqualify civil servants, or rather that he would put them in the same posi-

tion as that in which judges are. His view was that they should not be permitted to vote in order that they should be without any incentive to take part in active politics during an election. A candidate who has been fighting a hard battle in a close constituency, finding lined up against him before the election, a number of men paid by the public, irrespective of political considerations, would not be human if he did not come to Ottawa and insist that those men who had transgressed the very proper regulations made to prevent such a practice, should be dismissed. Personally, I am in favour of giving very considerable latitude, but at the same time I do not know of anything that would disorganize the service more quickly than to take the ground that under no circumstances should officials be dismissed for active partisanship. It is very regrettable but the rules are there and they must be enforced. This principle has been acted upon by both parties when in office and the question of whether a man is or is not an active partisan is a question of fact. These papers will be brought down and I am sure that when they are brought down they will show that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs has acted properly, after investigation and only in accordance with the regulations and policy adopted by both parties.

Mr. ROBB: If the facts are as presented this afternoon, is the Minister prepared to say that he will reinstate this man?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): As I understood the hon. gentleman, his statement contained no specific details. The hon. gentleman was most general in what he said. That is the objection I have to his mode of presentation. He says that no such dismissals have taken place since Confederation. I understood him to admit the possibility of active partisanship. However, we cannot discuss the question intelligently until the papers are brought down. When they are brought down I will be very glad to take the matter up and discuss it with my hon. friend and I have no doubt whatever that at least a prima facie case and probably a conclusive case will be shown by the papers to have been made out.

Mr. TURRIFF: The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. White) is going on the assumption that we, on this side of the House, are asking for the reinstatement, or are objecting to the dismissal of, officials who have been active partisans in the elections. We are not objecting to the dismissal of officials who have been partisans in the late election. We are objecting that officials have been and are being dismissed who took absolutely no part in the election, that they have been dismissed without any investigation, or that, if an investigation has been held, it has been nothing more nor less than a fake investigation. I do not think any one will object to a man being dismissed who is an active partisan but that is not the question at issue at all. It is a question of the dismissal of officials who have not been partisans, who have done nothing more than go and record their votes just as they have done all their lives. I do not think any person will object to any official casting his vote. I believe the whole official service should be disfranchised, but until that is done every official has an absolute right to go and cast his vote. I have told hundreds of officials that if they choose to go out and work for one side or the other in a political contest, they take their official lives in their hands, and if they are dismissed they have nobody to blame but themselves. We are not objecting to partisans being dismissed, but we are objecting to the dismissal of officials who are not partisans.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSALS OF OFFICIALS IN THE COUNTY OF LOTBINIERE.

Mr. E. FORTIER (Lotbinière) moved:

For a list of officials dismissed by the present Government, in the constituency of Lotbinière, including the names and duties of such persons, the causes of their dismissal, the nature of the charges laid against them; also a copy of all correspondence relating thereto and of all reports of investigations when such were held.

He said: If I make this motion, Mr. Speaker, it is because I am convinced that a great number of public servants in the county of Lotbinière have been dismissed without cause. The only reason that could be given would be that these officials are Liberals. But then it is a well known fact that Lotbinière is a Liberal constituency.

I have yet to learn that any of these employees have taken an active part in the elections which were held at different times since I represent this county. I may add that, for my part, I have never recommended the dismissal of officials because they were of the Conservative party.

I ask the production of these documents in order to know why so many employees were dismissed. I have no other remarks to make for the present.

Motion agreed to.

CUSTOMS TARIFF ON CEMENT.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams and correspondence between the Government of Canada or any member thereof, since April 1, 1912, to the present time, with any corporation, company, party or parties, in any way relating to the customs tariff upon

cement, or to the temporary reduction made of the customs tariff upon cement; also for a copy of all letters and correspondence by and between members of the Government of Canada during the same period relating to the same subject, and of all papers, documents, memoranda and Orders in Council relative to the reduction of the customs tariff upon cement made by Order in Council since the close of the last session of Parliament.

He said : I think a similar motion was made by some other hon. gentleman, and of course, if the papers asked for here are included in that prior motion, I do not necessarily want them brought down.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): There is a motion for production of papers by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), and I am under the impression that it covers the same ground as this motion.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The motion may go, with the understanding that if the papers are included in a prior motion, they need not be brought down. May I ask to change the date in the resolution to October 1, 1911 ?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): In connection with this, I might say that I am advised by the Customs Department that it regards as confidential any letters or correspondence from business firms relating particularly to their own business, and dealing with such matters as, for instance, cost of production. I think I should be able reasonably to satisfy my hon. friend from the public file, but I would like to ask him if he desires correspondence that might be reasonably regarded as confidential, on the ground that I have mentioned. I am told that in the department it has been customary not to give out such reports. I assure my hon. friend, however, that everything he reasonably wants will be given him.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I will confer with the hon. minister, and will be glad to agree with his suggestion if at all possible.

Motion amended to read, 'since October 1, 1911,' agreed to.

TARIFF DUTIES ON LUMBER.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved:

For a copy of all papers, documents, petitions, Orders in Council, letters and telegrams in any department of the Government of Canada, or that passed between the Department of Trade and Commerce and the Department of Justice or any solicitor, counsel, association, company or individual, during the past twelve months, respecting the imposition of tariff duties upon imported lumber dressed on one side and sized, or respecting the interpretation of tariff item No. 504, together with a printed copy of any stated case, appeal, factum or argument used before the Exchequer Court of Canada or the Supreme Court of Canada, in the matter of the judicial interpretation of tariff item No. 504.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Might I ask my hon. friend if he does not mean the Department of Customs rather than the Department of Trade and Commerce?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. minister is correct. I meant the Department of Customs.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): That will be amended accordingly.

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend has not asked for the judgments. It might be desirable to have the judgments or the reasons for the judgments laid before the House.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, if the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden) will be good enough to direct the minister in charge of the department to embody that, it might come in as a document.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSALS AT DESCOUSE AND WEST ARICHAT.

Mr. GEORGE W. KYTE moved :

For a copy of all recommendations, correspondence, letters and telegrams, relating to the dismissal of Leon N. Poirier, wharfinger at Descouse, N.S., and the appointment of Andrew Landry to succeed him.

2. Of all recommendations, correspondence, letters and telegrams, relating to the dismissal of Dougald R. Boyle, of West Arichat, N.S., fishery officer, and the appointment of Andrew Landry to succeed him.

3. Of all recommendations, correspondence, letters and telegrams, relating to the dismissal of Captain Frederick Poirier, of Descouse, N.S., buoy contractor, and the appointment of Andrew Landry to succeed him.

4. Of all petitions, recommendations, correspondence, letters and telegrams, asking for the discharge of Andrew Landry, from the common jail at Arichat, N.S., alleged to have been under sentence by Justice Graham for forgery, and the report of the hon. the Minister of Justice thereon, and of the order granting the discharge.

He said : I desire to make one or two observations in respect to the rather extraordinary condition of affairs disclosed by the motion which has just been read. If there is one thing the people of Canada expected with the greatest confidence when the present Government came into power, it was some attempt to adhere to the platform enunciated on many occasions by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Government, and the hon. gentlemen associated with him in conducting the affairs of this country. I will content myself with quoting one declaration from the Halifax platform made by the right hon. leader of this Government some time previous to the last election. Among the reforms which he felt it was necessary, in

the interest of the country, to bring about, and which would be consummated on the return to power of the Conservative party, was the recognition of the principle that men should be appointed to office by reason of their fitness and character, and not as a reward for political services. That section of the plank in the Halifax platform reads as follows :

Appointment of public officials upon considerations of capacity and personal character and not of party service alone.

As I have said, we all felt that the right hon. gentleman would exercise the very greatest discrimination in the appointment of men to offices in the public service, and that character and capacity would be the sole determining factors in the appointments of men to such positions. On the 8th of December, 1911, about two months after the present Government came into power, Mr. J. A. Gillies, who was my opponent in the last federal election, wrote the following letter to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries :

Arichat, N.S., Dec. 8, 1911.

Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—At a full meeting of the executive of the Liberal-Conservative Association held here yesterday, a resolution was unanimously passed asking for the dismissal of Dugald R. Boyle, of West Arichat, fishery inspector on Isle Madame. Mr. Boyle is a noted political partisan and was most active at the last election. He attended meetings of the Liberal party, canvassed openly and actively, and was the sworn agent in the poll at West Arichat on last election day of the Grit candidate. His position is indefensible and deserves and expects instant dismissal. The executive recommends the appointment of Captain Andrew Landry, of Descouse, to this position, and I now endorse that recommendation.

Yours truly,
J. A. GILLIES.

On December 13, 1911, the Minister of Marine wrote the following letter in reply to the one I have just read :

December 13th, 1911.

Dear Sir:—

I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 8th instant, stating that at a meeting of the executive of the Liberal-Conservative Association of Richmond county, held at Arichat, a resolution was unanimously passed asking for the dismissal of Mr. Dugald R. Boyle of West Arichat, fishery overseer, Isle Madame, on the grounds of offensive political partisanship, and that the executive recommend the appointment of Captain Andrew Landry, of Descouse, to this position, which recommendation you endorse.

In reply I may say after an examination of the existing organization of the outside staff of the Fisheries branch, I am quite convinced that it is not the best one that could be devised in the public interest, and I have therefore in view, just as soon as time will permit, going thoroughly into the matter with the object of completely reorganizing that branch of the service. I have in the meantime taken your letter into consideration, and hope to be in a position to advise you further in regard thereto in the course of a few days. Yours faithfully.

J. D. HAZEN.

J. A. Gillies, Esq.,
Sydney, N.S.

The following letter was written to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on December 18, 1911 :

The Honourable
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Canada.

Honourable Sir:—

Permit me the following: I have it from a reliable source that a Mr. Andrew Landry has been recommended for the office of fishery inspector for this county. Being pastor of a parish in this county of sixteen hundred souls, I am greatly interested in its progress and in having as public officers men worthy of the confidence of the people and a credit to the administration that has named them.

Consequently I think it is my duty and to the interest of your administration, to inform you that the above mentioned Mr. Landry is not a man for any public office in this county. Would you think a man who has a case pending against him for forged notes worthy of a public office and our confidence? Believe me, Honourable sir, your administration will be lauded by rejecting this demand.

I know you will believe that a good purpose animates me in laying this information before you, and that you will give this matter your attention.

Humbly yours,
WILFRID A. BOUCHER, P.P.

Descouse, Richmond Co., C.B.
Dec. 18th, 1911.

P.S.—The office above related to is now in hands of a Mr. Boyle of West Arichat.

W. A. BOUCHER.

The minister sent the following reply to that communication:

Reverend and Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 18th instant, stating that you have received information from a reliable source to the effect that Mr. Andrew Landry, of Descouse, has been recommended for the office of fishery overseer in the county of Richmond, in lieu of Mr. D. R. Boyle, of West Arichat, and I note you state as you are a pastor of sixteen hundred people you are interested in their progress, and in having as public officers men worthy of the confidence of the people, and a credit to the administration, and you therefore deem it your duty to inform me that the above mentioned Mr. Landry is not a man for any public office for many reasons (inter alia) that he has a case pending against him for forged notes.

In reply I beg to thank you for your letter, and state that it is the desire to have thoroughly competent and worthy officers, and I have therefore caused your letter to be filed for consideration in the event of a vacancy

occurring in the position now held by Mr. Boyle.

Yours faithfully,
J. D. HAZEN.

Reverend W. A. Boucher,
Descouse, Richmond Co., C.B.

I have here a certified extract from the minutes of a meeting of the treasury board held on January 15, 1912, approved by His Royal Highness the Governor General in Council on the 30th of January, 1912 :

Marine and Fisheries.

The board recommend that the services of Mr. Dugald R. Boyle, of West Arichat, who was, by Order in Council of the 6th of November, 1896, appointed a fishery overseer in and for the county of Richmond, in the province of Nova Scotia, be dispensed with on the ground of offensive political partisanship.

RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

The Honourable
The Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

The following letter was written on January 26, 1912, by the Superintendent of Fisheries to Mr. D. R. Boyle:

Sir,—I beg to inform you that by Order in Council of the 20th instant your services as fishery overseer have been dispensed with on the ground of offensive political partisanship. You will please continue to act until the end of the present month, up to which time your salary and regular expenses incurred on official business will be paid.

Any documents or other property in your keeping which are official in their nature you will please immediately forward to the inspector of fisheries at Englishtown.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
W. A. FOUND,
Superintendent of Fisheries.

Dugald R. Boyle, Esq.,
Fishery Overseer,
West Arichat, N.S.

The recommendation of Mr. J. A Gillies, the defeated Conservative candidate, so far as the dismissal of Mr. D. R. Boyle is concerned, was immediately complied with, as you will observe from the communication I have just read. There was no investigation into the charge of partisanship alleged against Mr. Boyle, and the statement made by the defeated Conservative candidate in the county of Richmond was accepted. On January 26, 1912, Mr. Found addressed the following letter to Mr. Morrison, inspector of fisheries at Englishtown, N.S.:

Sir,—I enclose herewith a copy of a letter to-day written to Mr. Dugald R. Boyle, of West Arichat, informing him that his services as fishery overseer have been dispensed with from the end of the present month. The department is not at the moment prepared to say who will be employed to succeed him, and you will therefore arrange that the nearest fishery officers or guardians, who may still be engaged in the district, in order to prevent any violations of the law.

I am Sir,
Your obedient servant,
W. A. FOUND.
Superintendent of Fisheries.

J. G. Morrison, Esq.,
Inspector of Fisheries,
Englishtown, N.S.

On the 26th of January, 1912, after Mr. Boyle had been dismissed from the office of Fishery Officer on the ground of offensive partisanship, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries addressed the following letter to Mr. J. A. Gillies:

January 26th, 1912.

Dear Sir,—Adverting to your letter of the 8th December last, recommending for reasons contained therein, that fishery overseer D. R. Boyle, of West Arichat, be dismissed, I beg to inform you that an Order in Council was approved by His Royal Highness on the 20th instant dispensing with Mr. Boyle's services, and he has been notified that his engagement with the department will determine on the 31st instant.

In your letter you recommend that Captain Andrew Landry, of Descouse, should be employed to fill the vacancy. Subsequently I received a letter from Reverend Wilfrid A. Boucher, of Descouse, in which he expressed the opinion that Mr. Landry is not a suitable man to be employed ir any public office, and I gathered from his letter that action is pending against him for having forged notes. It may be that this information was not before you when you made your recommendation, and before proceeding with employment of a successor to Mr. Boyle, I shall await a further letter from you.

Yours faithfully,
J. D. HAZEN.

J. A. Gillies, Esq.,
Barrister, &c.,
Sydney, N.S.

Mr. Gillies then despatched the following to the minister:

Sydney, N.S., Feb. 16, 1912.

J. D. Hazen,
Ottawa.

Please send Andrew Landry his appointment fishery overseer immediately no foundation for charges against him.

J. A. GILLIES.

To that the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries replied as follows:

21st February, 1912.

My dear Sir,—In the absence of the honourable the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who, is at present in Washington, I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your telegram of the 19th, instant, with reference to Captain Andrew Landry.

As soon after the minister's return as convenient your telegram will receive his attention.

Yours very truly,
A. JOHNSTON.

J. A. Gillies, Esq.,
Barrister,
Sydney, N. S.

On February 21, 1912, Mr. Gillies addressed the following letter to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

Sydney, N.S. February 21, 1912.
Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa, Canada.

Re Appointment of Captain Landry.

Dear Sir,—I wired you the other day asking you to be good enough to forward Captain Landry's appointment as fishery overseer at Isle Madame. I have made very careful inquiry respecting the matter touched upon in your letter and I have no reason whatever to withdraw my recommendation of him. It is simply bad blood between different factions at Descouse, and some of the parties are trying to damage the Landrys. I have known them for over twenty years and during that period of time I have found them absolutely straight and correct in every particular. Please send on his appointment at once as it is important that the distribution of the bounty cheques should be in the proper hands.

Yours very truly.
J. A. GILLIES.

You will note that he emphasizes the fact that the distribution of bounty would be in proper hands if placed in the hands of Capt. Landry. On March 2 Mr. Gillies addressed this further letter to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

Ottawa, March 2, 1912.
Hon. J. D. Hazen,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Hazen,—Will you kindly drop me a line stating whether Captain Andrew Landry's appointment as fishery overseer has been yet sent to him.

I wrote you on the 19th February—before leaving home—your acknowledgement thereof, dated 21st of February has been received by me here.

As the bounty will soon be distributed I will be very glad to know that Captain Landry has been duly installed in his position before this distribution begins.

Yours very truly,
J. A. GILLIES.

P.S.—Please address to Russell House.

On March 6, 1912, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries addressed the following letter to Mr. Gillies:

March 6, 1912.

Re Captain Andrew Landry.

Dear Sir,—I have to asknowledge yours of the 2nd instant with further reference to the above.

In reply I beg to say that pressure of sessional work has made it impossible for me to overtake this and a number of other matters of a similiar nature.

At the very earliest opportunity I shall give it consideration.

Yours very faithfully,
J. D. HAZEN.

J. A. Gillies, Esq.,
Russell House,
Ottawa, Ont.

Mr. KYTE.

That completes the file of public documents having reference to this matter, which was brought down in response to an order of this House during the last session.

From the evidence I have produced, it is apparent that on the 8th of December Mr. J. A. Gillies, the defeated Conservative candidate in Richmond, N.S., recommended the appointment of Andrew Landry as fishery officer in place of D. R. Boyle. On the 12th of December Rev. W. A. Boucher addressed a letter to the Minister of Marine intimating that the appointment of Mr. Landry to any public office in the county of Richmond would be highly undesirable, and, if I may paraphrase his language, would be a public scandal. Notwithstanding that, on the 23rd of November, 1911, the Deputy Minister of Marine addressed the following letter to Mr. Leon N. Poirier, wharfinger, Descouse, N.S.:

Department of Marine and Fisheries.
Ottawa, 23rd Dec. 1911.

Sir,—I have to inform you that the Order in Council of the 31st May, 1906, appointing you as wharfinger of the Government wharf at Descouse, N.S., has been cancelled and your services as wharfinger dispensed with owing to offensive political partizanship.

Captain Andrew Landry has been appointed in your room and stead to whom I have to request you to give up possession of the wharf and of all Government supplies pertaining thereto when required.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd) A. JOHNSON.
Deputy Minister.

Mr. Leon N. Poirier,
Descouse, N.S.

While the letter of the Rev. W. A. Boucher was in the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Ottawa, the Minister deliberately dismissed Capt. Leon N. Poirier, wharfinger at Descouse, on the alleged ground of partisanship and appointed this very man Landry to that position in the face of the statements and warnings he had received from the Rev. Mr. Boucher. It is apparent from the file that Mr. Gillies attempted to impress on the minister the fact that the charge made against Landry in connection with the forgery of notes was trumped up and was the result of bad blood in the parish of Descouse. On the 1st of February, 1912, Landry was brought before a stipendiary magistrate in Arichat on a warrant charging him with forgery. The charge was investigated and he was committed for trial in the Supreme Court of the county of Richmond. The Court met on the 4th of June and I have here the indictment presented by the Grand Jury.

In the Supreme Court—Crown Side.

1. The jurors of our Lord the King present that Andrew Landry at Arichat in the county of Richmond on the fifth day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ten unlawfully and knowingly did make a false document to wit; a promissory note in the words and figures following:

$50.00 Due April 8th, 1911.

Arichat, C. B., April 5th, 1910.

One year after date I promise to pay to the order of Andrew Landry,

Fifty ....Dollars,

at the Royal Bank of Canada, Arichat, value received.

his

Witness J. V. Shaw, Paul x LeBlanc,

mark.

No..... endorsed Andrew Landry.

Knowing the same to be false, with the intention that it should be used and acted on as genuine to the prejudice of one Paul LeBlanc, contrary to the form of statute in such case made and provided.

2. And the jurors of our Lord the King further present that Andrew Landry at Arichat in the county of Richmond on the fifth day of April in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ten, unlawfully and knowingly did make a false document to wit: a promissory note in the words and figures following:

$50.00 Due April 8th, 1911.

Arichat, C. B., April 5th, 1910.

One year after date I promise to pay to the order of Andrew Landry,

Fifty ....Dollars,

at the Royal Bank of Canada, Arichat, value received.

his

Paul x LeBlanc,

mark.

No..... endorsed Andrew Landry.

Knowing the same to be false, with intent that one Paul Leblanc should be induced by the belief that said false document was genuine, to pay the said Andrew Landry the sum of fifty dollars, contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided:

3. And the jurors of our Lord the King present that Andrew Landry at Poulamond in the county of Richmond, on the thirteenth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ten, well knowing a certain document to wit: a promissory note in the words and figures following:

$50.00 Due April 8th, 1911.

Arichat, C. B., April 5th, 1910.

One year after date I promise to pay to the order of Andrew Landry,

Fifty ....Dollars,

at the Royal Bank of Canada, Arichat, value received.

his

Witness J. V. Shaw, Paul x Leblanc,

mark

Endorsed: Andrew Landry,

to be forged, did utter the said forged document as if it were genuine, contrary to the form of the statutes in such case made and provided.

4. And the jurors of our Lord the King present that Andrew Landry at Poulamond in the county of Richmond, on the thirteenth day of December in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ten, well knowing a certain document to wit; a promissory note in the words and figures following:

$50.00 Due April 8th, 1911.

Arichat, C. B., April 5th, 1910.

One year after date I promise to pay to the order of Andrew Landry,

Fifty ....Dollars,

at the Royal Bank of Canada, Arichat, value received.

his

Witness J. V. Shaw, Paul x LeBlanc,

mark

No..... endorsed Andrew Landry.

to be forged, did use the said forged document as if it were genuine, contrary to the form of the statute in such case made and provided.

5. And the jurors of our Lord the King further present that said Andrew Landry at Poulamond, in the county of Richmond on the thirteenth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ten, well knowing a certain document to wit; a promissory note, in the words and figures following:

$50.00 Due April 8th, 1911.

Arichat, C. B., April 5th, 1910.

One year after date I promise to pay to the order of Andrew Landry,

Fifty ....Dollars,

at the Royal Bank of Canada, Arichat, value received.

his

Witness J. V. Shaw, Paul x LeBlanc,

mark

No..... endorsed Andrew Landry.

to be forged, did deal with the said forged document as if it were genuine, contrary to the form of the statute in such cases made and provided.

6. And the jurors of our Lord the King further present that the said Andrew Landry at Poulamond, in the county of Richmond, on the thirteenth day of December, in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and ten, well knowing a certain document to wit; a promissory note, in the words and figures following:

$50.00 Due April 8th, 1911.

Arichat, C. B., April 5th, 1910.

One year after date I promise to pay to the order of Andrew Landry, the sum of

Fifty ....Dollars,

at the Royal Bank of Canada, Arichat, value received.

his

Witness J. V. Shaw, Paul x LeBlanc,

mark

No..... endorsed Andrew Landry.

to be forged, did cause one Paul LeBlanc to act upon the said false document as if it were genuine, contrary to the form of the statute in such cases made and provided.

(Signed) Daniel A. Cameron,

Prosecuting Officer,

County of Richmond.

That indictment was tried in the Supreme Court before Mr. Justice Graham after a true bill had been returned by the grand jury, and at the conclusion of the trial Andrew Landry was convicted of the

offence, and I have here the record of the conviction:

In the Supreme Court.
Arichat, 5th June, 1912.

The King vs. Andrew Landry.

On indictment for forgery and uttering the sentence of the court is that you be imprisoned in the county jail in Arichat for the term of one year.

(Sgd.) D. H. CAMPBELL,
Acting Clerk of the Crown.

So that Andrew Landry was convicted and sentenced by Mr. Justice Graham to serve a term of 12 months in the county jail at Arichat for the said offence. On the 11th day of June, 1912, six days later, the superintendent of lights for the province of Nova Scotia addressed the following letter to Capt. Frederick Poirier:

Marine and Fisheries Department.
Office of Superintendent of Lighthouses,
Agency at Halifax, N.S., June 11, 1912.

Mr. Frederick Poirier,
Descouse, Richmond Co., N.S.

Sir,—It has been decided to appoint Captain Andrew Landry, of Descouse, to maintain the buoys which you have a contract for, and which terminates on the 15th inst., you will therefore be good enough to transfer the service to Captain Landry, giving him all the spare buoys that are now in your charge. You are supposed to have all the buoys in good order before transferring them to him.

I am, Sir,
Yours sincerely,
P. C. JOHNSON,
Superintendent of Lights.

On the 14th day of June, Capt. Frederick Poirier, replying to this letter of the superintendent of lights, stated that he had received Mr. Johnson's letter, but that it was impossible for him to carry out his instructions to deliver the buoys to Captain Andrew Landry, inasmuch as Landry was at the time serving a sentence for forgery in the county jail at Arichat. Now, the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the right hon. the leader of the Government were in possession of all the facts. What did they do? Was Captain Andrew Landry allowed to serve out his sentence which the judge had imposed upon him? You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that on the 23rd day of December, Captain Landry was appointed wharfinger by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The intimation which Captain Frederick Poirier sent to the superintendent of lights, who no doubt forwarded it to Ottawa, was the first intimation to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that Captain Andrew Landry was in durance vile, and serving a sentence for forgery in the county jail of Arichat. He was not permitted to remain there very long, however, because it would appear that my hon. and compassionate friend the Minister of Justice was appealed to. A few days afterwards, on the 3rd day of August, the doors of the jail at Arichat opened as if by magic; we had a jail delivery such as had never been known in the county of Richmond, and Andrew Landry, convicted of forgery, and having served only two months out of the twelve months, walked out of jail a free man. Landry had no intention of giving up any of his emoluments as a public official on account of his conviction and sentence, because on the 6th day of August, a few days after he had been discharged from jail, he addressed the following letter to Captain Frederick Poirier:

Descouse, Aug. 6, 1912.

Captain Frederick Poirier,
To Dominion Government Wharf,
Descouse, Dr.

To wharfage on buoys and moorings, for winter seasons 1909 and 1910 and 1911 and 1912, at $10 per season, $30.
E. & O. E.

Immediate settlement is requested by order of department.

(Sgd.) ANDREW LANDRY,
Govt. Wharfinger.

If paid at once I will settle for $10, otherwise I am instructed to press the claim for $30.

(Sgd.) ANDREW LANDRY.
Govt. Wharfinger.

This was three days after he got out of jail. It was the only office he held at that time because the letter addressed by the Rev. Wilfrid Boucher to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries prevented him at the last moment from committing the additional error of appointing Landry fishery officer, and thus as Mr. Gillies says: 'placing the distribution of bounties in proper hands.' He had been appointed buoy contractor while he was in jail, but his inability to take charge of the buoys and moorings on account of his incarceration at that time, compelled the minister to appoint a substitute in the person of another man in the vicinity. But there is one job to which he did hold on throughout all the stress and difficulty of his rather embarassing circumstances, and that was the office of wharfinger. That was a perquisite that Landry was determined not to relinquish, and in order that he might discharge his duties as wharfinger, this Government was compassionate enough to open the doors of the jail, and to release him from the conviction and sentence which had been imposed by Judge Graham, after he had served only two months of the twelve. There are other interesting documents with respect to this matter that I am extremely anxious should be brought before the House. I am anxious to know under what circumstances, and on what plea Captain Andrew Landry was released from jail. Captain Landry, as I am informed, is a man enjoying the best of health. He has been a sea-faring man for many years, he

is a man who is never known to be laid up on account of illness and the fact that the moment he was released from jail he proceeded to his regular avocation goes to show that the plea of illness could not have been urged as a reason for his discharge. Since that time Captain Landry has acted in the discharge of his duty as a citizen in the village of Descouse and in the discharge of all the other duties which the Government have entrusted to him. He is still the wharfinger, in so far as I know that appointment has not been cancelled because it appears to be a matter of anxiety on the part, if not of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, certainly on that of Joseph A. Gillies, and other leading Conservatives in the county of Richmond, that Captain Landry shall still have the distinction of being a public officer in that county.

Mr. BLAIN: What salary does he get?

Mr. KYTE: If he knocks down all their accounts the way he tried to knock down that account it would not be very much. He is paid by commission.

Mr. BLAIN: Has the hon. gentleman before him anything to show the amount that this gentleman received during the preceding year, whether by salary or dues?

Mr. KYTE: Wharfingers in Nova Scotia are paid by commission. I have not been fortunate enough to get any other accounts collected by Captain Landry, but if he is prepared to knock down all the Government accounts to the same extent that he has knocked down this one, his commission will be very much smaller. These are the facts as I have detailed them from the public documents, in the Department of Marine and Fisheries and the records of the Supreme Court in Richmond county. It is not a source of pleasure or delight on my part to bring forward the shortcomings of any citizen in my county thus publicly before the high court of Parliament, but as representatives of the people we all have duties to discharge. In any case where miscarriages of justice are perpetrated by any department of the Government it is the duty of the representatives who sit in this House to bring them to the attention of Parliament.

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Speaker, in so far as my department is concerned, there would not seem to be any reason for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Kyte) moving for these papers on this occasion, as the papers were all laid before the House at the last session of Parliament.

Mr. KYTE: The documents relating to Captain Landry's appointment as buoy contractor are not before Parliament.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman could have seen these papers at a moment's notice by coming over to my department if he had desired to do so. It is evident that the hon. gentleman is more desirous of making a speech for the purpose of calling in question the action of Mr. Gillies, who has been his opponent in Richmond in several elections, than of obtaining information in connection with this matter. As far as the department over which I preside is concerned, any papers there are will be brought down willingly and placed at the disposal of the hon. gentleman, and I presume that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) will be pleased to bring down any papers in his department also. As far as the action of the Minister of Justice is concerned, I may say to my hon. friend that I have heard to-day for the first time that Captain Landry had been actually sent to jail and that the sentence had been remitted by the Department of Justice. I never knew of the matter before. As far as the record of the Department of Marine and Fisheries with regard to this matter is concerned, the facts are that, a vacancy had occurred. The complaint of my hon. friend to-day is not that that vacancy had not properly taken place, he has not found any fault with the dismissal of Poirier and he has not said that Poirier was not an active partisan of the Liberal party. That vacancy having taken place, Mr. Gillies who was the member who had previously represented Richmond in the House of Commons and who had been a candidate on several occasions, made a recommendation to fill the vacancy. It is customary with all governments in filling vacancies in a constituency to take the recommendation of the member of the House of Commons representing that constituency who happens to be in political sympathy with the Government of the day, or to take the recommendation, in most cases, of the gentleman who has been the unsuccessful candidate in support of the Government of the day. Mr. Gillies made his recommendation in favour of Captain Landry as a suitable official. I have no doubt whatever, knowing Mr. Gillies as I do, that when he made that recommendation he believed Captain Landry to be a suitable man, worthy to fill that position, but, before the matter was considered by the department or myself, a letter was received from a clergyman, the parish priest, referred to by my hon. friend from Richmond. Having received that communication from the parish priest, I felt it would not be proper, until this charge against Landry was disposed of that Landry should be appointed to the important position of fishery officer in that coun-

ty. As a result Landry was not appointed, he has never been appointed to the position and he is not holding the position now. Now, most of these positions as wharfingers are, as a rule, small and very unimportant positions. In most cases the remuneration is extremely small. The system that prevails is that the wharfinger is allowed a commission on the collections which he makes of, in some cases 25 per cent and, in some cases, 50 per cent. If I had known that the hon. gentleman was going to bring this matter up in the way he has done this afternoon, I would have had all the facts here. I do not know what the amount of the collections is on the wharf to which my hon. friend refers, but I know many cases where wharfingers, who are paid a commission of 25 per cent or more, get a very few dollars a year for their services, and that in some cases the commission will yield but $10 a year, running up possibly to $100. If the commission was 25 per cent the probabilities are that the amount the wharfinger would receive would be very small indeed. I do not want the House to understand me as arguing that a man who is unfit for the position should be appointed for that reason, but the position being a small one, when the recommendation was made, it may not have been scrutinized with the care that the appointment to a higher or more responsible position would be, and it never occurred to any official of the department, and my attention was never drawn to the fact, or it never occurred to me, that the man who was recommended for the position of wharfinger was the same man who had been recommended for the position of fishery officer against whom the parish priest there had made statements in the letter which he addressed to me. That is the way in which this man was recommended for the position of wharfinger and also to take charge of the buoy service. I do not think that at the present moment he has any other position and, in so far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned, had it for one minute occurred to any official in the department, or had my attention been drawn to the fact that this man, recommended for the position of wharfinger, was the same man whom we had refused to appoint to the position of fishery overseer, he certainly would never have been appointed.

I think my hon. friend has perhaps served the purpose for which he brought the matter before the House, that is, the opportunity of making an attack on the gentleman who was his opponent in the county of Richmond at the last election, and, having accomplished that purpose, I presume that my hon. friend will be satisfied. I may say to my hon. friend that it is not the desire or intention of my department, if we are aware of the fact, to appoint to a position of responsibility any man who is not fit for the position for which he is recommended. We accepted Mr. Gillies recommendation, believing, as I still believe, it was made in good faith, and believing, as I still believe, that Mr. Gillies firmly believed that Mr. Landry was a fit and proper person for the position and that he was the victim of some conspiracy that may have been formed against him. But, having received the communication from the priest referred to by my hon. friend, we declined to make the appointment of this man as fishery officer which is a responsible position. With regard to the other position referred to, as I have already stated, it never occurred to any one in my department that he was the same person whom we had refused to appoint and who had been previously recommended by Mr. Gillies. Any further papers, whether in connection with this matter or in connection with any other matter that my hon. friend wants to see, will certainly be laid on the Table of the House. I can say nothing about the circumstances regarding the discharge of this man from prison after serving two months, but I have no doubt that my hon. friend the Minister of Justice will be able to give the hon. member for Richmond all the information he has in his possession.

Mr. CARVELL: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of entering into any discussion as to the appointment of this man Landry to a position in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries states that he did not know anything about it, and, of course we take his word. It does seem rather singular that none of the officials in his department knew anything about this man. If my hon. friend is in a position to state that neither he nor any member of his department knew anything about this, we must take his word for it.

Mr. HAZEN: I can only speak for those higher officials with whom I come in contact practically every day.

Mr. CARVELL: It is not that branch of the case I wish to emphasise; it is the other branch of the case which has reference to the liberation from prison of a man after serving two months of a sentence of a year. It seems to me that this is something which is worthy to be considered by every member of this House and by every member of the community. I am in favour of the ticket of leave system. I believe that every lawyer in this House knows that

there are many instances where the ends of justice are just as well served by keeping a man in jail during a part of his sentence as by keeping him there during the whole of it. But, if, for political reasons, the Minister of Justice, or the Department of Justice, is to liberate men from jail we have a different state of affairs entirely.

Mr. HAZEN: I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has never heard of that taking place under the other Government.

Mr. CARVELL: I certainly never have.

Mr. HAZEN: Has the hon. gentleman never heard of the case of Bruce McDougall who was sentenced to jail by Mr. Justice White for defamatory libel and who was released by the then Minister of Justice before the sentence had been completed?

Mr. CARVELL: My hon. friend is trying to draw something across the track which does not do him credit. He knows that Bruce McDougall was in a dying condition when he was released and that he was not released for political reasons. As a matter of fact, Bruce McDougall lived only a few weeks after his release from prison.

Mr. HAZEN: May I correct the hon. member? Bruce McDougall was no sooner released from jail than he at once started publishing another paper and he met his death in consequence of an accident in Truro, and his death had nothing at all to do with the general condition of his health at the time.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. minister is pursuing exactly the same course which he and his leader have been pursuing from the beginning, and that is, when we draw attention to any wrong, they try to justify it by saying we did the same thing. Is it going to be the settled policy of this Government that every time a political friend finds himself incarcerated he is going to be released, after serving one-fifth or one-sixth of his sentence, for political purposes? That is the question I want to emphasize; that is the only object I have in discussing this matter this afternoon. There may be good reasons for it, but it seems to me the reasons are not patent at the present time which will justify a man in the best of health, a man who is able to carry on the ordinary avocations of life, being released from jail after serving two months out of a sentence of one year.

Mr. BORDEN: I was not aware, until the discussion this afternoon, of the appointment of Mr. Landry; but, as the latter part of the motion refers to the action of the Department of Justice in respect to a certain matter, and as the Minister of Justice is unfortunately not here to-day, I would move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY — BRANCH LINES.

Mr. EMMERSON moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable in furtherance of the transportation interests of this Dominion, that the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial railway as a Government operated railway shall be widened and extended by securing by lease or otherwise such of the branch lines of railways now connected with the Intercolonial, as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway; and further by securing as aforesaid such of said branch lines as may be considered to be in the general interest of the Dominion of Canada and of its people, with relation to its transportation problems and interests, without especial consideration to the immediate direct financial results.

He said: In the absence of the Minister of Railways, I think it would be inconvenient to have this matter discussed, and I do not object to allowing it to stand, for that reason. I want, however, to call the attention of the Prime Minister and the ministers of the Government to the desirability of having the question of branch lines determined one way or the other before any action is taken by the Government with regard to the granting of running rights to the Canadian Pacific railway over the Intercolonial railway. In that event, the branch lines would then be taken up by any railway company having running rights, to the detriment, in my judgment, of the Intercolonial railway itself. I am anxious, therefore, to have the matter discussed, and if possible determined before any such action is taken.

Mr. BORDEN: I will direct the attention of the Minister of Railways to the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson). I presume the consideration he urges would depend a great deal upon the nature of the agreement.

Motion stands.

LAUCHLIN McNEIL DISMISSAL.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams and reports relating to the dismissal of Lauchlin McNeil, postmaster at New France, county of Antigonish, and the appointment of his successor.

He said: I desire to call attention to the facts in relation to the dismissal of Lauchlin McNeil. There have been a great many dismissals of postmasters in the county of Antigonish, about a dozen small country postmasters have been dismissed, and if there had been more Liberal postmasters there would probably have been more dismissals. During the 15 years the Liberal party were in power, there were no dismissals so far as I can ascertain in the county of Antigonish on account of alleged partisanship. In fact, over one-half of the postmasters in that county are Conservatives and nobody has ever sought to remove them or interfere with their positions. They have given satisfaction and performed their duties. As a rule these offices are taken in the country districts for the convenience of the people and the first thing sought is the most convenient location. Under the late Government one class of people were always sacred, the postmasters.

I want to get at the principle applied by the Postmaster General in regard to the dismissal of postmasters. There must have been about a dozen complaints against postmasters, because nearly a dozen of them were dismissed, but there was only one investigation. That man was investigated by Commissioner Duchemin. When he held his court no witnesses appeared against the postmaster although it is alleged that several were subpoenaed. And, of course, the commissioner could not make a report against that man because there was no evidence of any kind. I do not think, however, that the failure to dismiss the man who was investigated was due to any kindness or consideration on the part of the patronage committee but to the fact that the Conservatives in that district arose in arms and said no, you must not remove that man, he has been a competent official who has never interfered in any way; true he is a Grit like his father but he is an honest, conscientious man and you must not interfere with him. That is the only case I know of where there was an investigation. The Postmaster General, finding, I suppose, that this man against whom a charge was alleged could not be removed, or perhaps I should say that the men in charge of the patronage finding themselves baulked in getting rid of him, found another scheme to remove the unfortunate postmaster. The Postmaster General sent out a letter to the various postmasters accompanied by a declaration. It is a most unique document, and reads as follows:

Solemn Declaration made by virtue of the Act respecting Extra-Judicial Oaths.

I, the undersigned postmaster of.....do solemnly declare:

1. That I was appointed postmaster in the year.....

2. That since my appointment as postmaster, I have taken no active part in federal or provincial elections. I have not canvassed or taken any voter to the polls, nor have I offered or given money or liquor or represented any candidate at any polling division. I have not checked or verified any list of voters outside any polling station, neither did I take part in any committee of organization or address a meeting in favour of any candidate and I did not interrupt any public speaker during the course of any meeting.

3. All I did was to quietly cast my vote.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

And I have signed.

Declared before me at.....this ....day of.....1912.

It does not say how far back this extends, it may be 10, 20 or 25 years, and during all that time it was an offense if at any time a postmaster carried a voter to the poll or treated a friend of his. It does not say that he has not given or offered liquor for the purpose of influencing a vote or debauching anyone. I ask how any conscientious man or how the average, conscientious postmaster could subscribe an affidavit of that kind. Lauchlin McNeil, when he received this declaration and was asked to sign it, naturally felt insulted. He was disposed to return the affidavit in the form in which it was sent, according to the information I have received, but it appears that on second thought he wrote to the Postmaster General and enclosed such an affidavit as he could conscientiously subscribe, an affidavit which removed every charge or suspicion of partisanship. The affidavit which he sent to the Postmaster General with a letter of explanation is as follows:

Solemn Declaration made by virtue of the Act respecting Extra-Judicial Oats.

I, the undersigned.....postmaster of.....do solemnly declare:

1. That I was apointed postmaster in the year.....

2. That since my appointment as postmaster, I have taken no part in federal or provincial eleections. I have not canvassed or taken any voter to the polls except that I took my brother or a neighbour who had no team of his own, nor have I offered or given money or liquor to any voter to influence his vote, nor have I represented any candidate at any polling division. I have not checked or verified any list of voters outside any polling station, neither did I take part in any committee of organization or address a meeting in favour of any candidate and I did not interrupt any public speaker during the course of any public meeting.

3. All I did, so far as taking part in elec-

tions go, was to cast my vote, making no unusual noise when doing so.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Mr. PELLETIER: I did not quite understand the words 'he quietly cast his vote.'

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): The paragraph in the declaration proposed by the Postmaster General, paragraph 3, was as follows: 'All I did was to quietly cast my vote.' He modified that and put in 'all I did, so far as taking part in the elections go, was to cast my vote, making no unusual noise when doing so.' I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if he could have subscribed to any other oath than that. Lachlan McNeil lives 6 or 7 miles from the polling booth, and his brother did not have a team of his own; so on election days, whether municipal or local elections, he took that man to the poll just as he would have taken him to church on Sunday, or to funerals, or to the village store, or to any other place. He could not, therefore, make an affidavit that he did not take any voter to the poll. He did not take any voter for the purpose of getting his vote, and he made an affidavit accordingly.

I have been put in possession of a letter, not by the postmaster, which was sent to the Postmaster General, explaining why he could not subscribe to the declaration in the form originally presented, and why he modified the declaration, and setting forth that he was prepared to meet any accusation that his traducers could make against him:

New France, Antigonish Co., N. S.
April 30, 1912.

Dear Sir,—When I accepted the office of postmaster at New France, I did so at the solicitation of the people of the district and for their accommodation. In doing so, however, it was not stipulated that I should barter away my freedom or be restricted in my rights or liberties as a citizen. Were such a condition proposed I would not have accepted the office.

I have always tried to do my duty as postmaster and I think I am safe in saying I gave satisfaction. No reflection has ever been cast upon me as an official. It is no wonder therefore, that I was tempted to return the declaration as it was received, and to treat the insult involved in being asked to make such a declaration with silent contempt, even if it cost the loss of my little office. I do not wish, however, to be discourteous and as representations (misrepresentations I call them) have been made to the department as alleged, I make the declaration (with proper modifications) as required. I cannot swear I have never taken any voter to the polls. I did, and I would not refuse any of my neighbours whether Tory or Grit, the accommodation of taking him in my carriage either to the polls or to church or the village store or anywhere else that we both happened to be going to on common business, and I have not a neighbour who would not treat me in the same way. The member of the county is a nephew by marriage of mine and a very intimate friend and I share his political views. None of these circumstances I hope render me unfit to receive mail matter from or distribute it among the people served by this office. I do not know what is meant by the 3rd paragraph in the original declaration. I may add however that I never influenced or attempted to influence any voter in the exercise of his rights as a citizen, and I always find I have enough to do to mind my own business without interfering in the way stated in the declaration.

I deny all charges of active or offensive political partisanship and challenge the fullest inquiry into my conduct as postmaster.

Now, when the Postmaster General received the declaration containing as full and unequivocal a denial of the charges of partisanship as could be made by any conscientious man, accompanied by that letter of explanation, I think he owed it to himself and to his department to at least grant an investigation, and I want to know why an investigation was not granted in this case. Commissioner Duchemin was always available in Antigonish. He spent the greater part of last summer there; I am told they are seriously considering the propriety of putting his name on the voters' list, because he has been in Antigonish for so long. I am quite sure that with the remuneration which he receives he would have been glad to conduct any investigation of a case of partisanship, and if the patronage committee had any evidence to submit I have no doubt that Mr. Duchemin would have been equal to the occasion, and would have discharged his duty to the fullest satisfaction of that committee.

Now, let me call the attention of the House to a case that I know of, in which a similar declaration was sent to a postmaster. When he read it and found that he was asked to state that since his appointment he had taken no part in elections, he was naturally astounded, for he happened to have been a very strong Conservative worker in the old days. He had been one of the most active Conservaties in his district, but at the last election, like many more loyal Conservatives in the county of Antigonish he had his own views on the question of reciprocity, and he thought that the reciprocity proposed by the late Government was the same measure for which Sir John Thompson had fought in his last election, and for which the great Conservative leaders in past days stood. But because forsooth he voted Liberal at the last elec-

tion they went after his scalp. However, they over-reached themselves when they put such a declaration as the one I have referred to before him. He wrote to the Postmaster General explaining his position that he had always been a good fighting conscientious Conservative in the days of Sir John Thompson and of other Conservative candidates in Antigonish, and that he had been an active partisan in those days. Well, he heard no more about it, and he was not dismissed. Perhaps it was due to the fact that they could not get anyone to take the job. I know there are lots of postmasters who are suspected of being Grits and who are marked for slaughter but the Postmaster General cannot get men to take their jobs, and the result is that they have been allowed to continue in their positions. In the case of Lauchlin McNeil I direct the Postmaster General's attention to the fact that he caused a great deal of inconvenience to the vast majority of the people in that district by the change which he made. The post office was moved to one end of the section, leaving the south-eastern end of it practically without any mail facilities whatever, and the people in that section have to go four miles now for their mail on account of the change. I know of many other cases of a similar kind, but I am not complaining so much of that. What I desire to know is why the Postmaster General did not have some consideration for Mr. Duchemin when he established the precedent that there should be investigations into the cases of postmasters. Why did he not order an investigation into the cases of Lauchlin McNeil and others, who were dismissed without any inquiry, notwithstanding the fact that they courted the fullest investigation? I do not know that I should discuss the matter further until the papers are brought down. When that is done perhaps we shall see why it was that Lauchlin McNeil was dismissed.

Mr. PELLETIER: There is no objection whatever to the motion made by my hon. friend from Antigonish. The papers will be brought down. The declaration which my hon. friend has read, which was so severely criticised by the postmaster of New France, and which he thought fit to correct and to send to the Postmaster General, to teach him how it should be drafted, is not after all such a bad document. I find with a great deal of regret, and I must apologize to this postmaster, that I forgot to put in the last sentence that he made no noise. I really forgot to put that in. I admit that this correction is a most important and vital one under the circumstances, and I must thank him for having called my attention to this very great sin of omission on my part. However, when the papers are brought down, they may show more than my hon. friend has said. But I think we have had enough in the letter which my hon. friend has read to show that this postmaster that 'the Postmaster General may do what that 'the Postmaster General may do what he likes, and I don't care what happens.'

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I suppose he knew that would happen any way.

Mr. PELLETIER: That may be, but that is the way it struck me when the letter came.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): That is very mild.

Mr. PELLETIER: This declaration, bad as it is, and, omitting the knowledge that it does, has been availed of in my department to avoid expense. A great many investigations have been dispensed with because, when these documents were received, a certain number of postmasters were honest enough to say that they could not sign the declaration because they had taken an active part in the election. If the postmaster signs that declaration, well and good; we have an investigation. If he does not sign it, and says, 'I have taken a part in politics,' we save $50 or $60, in some cases $75, which we would otherwise spend for an investigation.

Mr. CARVELL: But the man has to go just the same.

Mr. PELLETIER: Well, as he has made his bed he must lie upon it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): If the declaration is made, is that to be accepted as proof that the representations that were made to the department were not well founded? Would you accept the declaration of the postmaster rather than the vague statement of some committeeman in charge of the patronage?

Mr. PELLETIER: When we receive a declaration duly signed, we inform the persons who made the charge that the postmaster has denied the accusation. In some cases we have been told to stop there. Evidently, they were content to take the declaration as good and not go any farther. In other cases we receive letters saying that they are astounded that the man should have signed that under the circumstances, and then the matter is investigated. My hon. friend said that in many cases we had had a good deal of difficulty to find persons to take the places of dismissed postmasters. I can tell him that that has not been my experience.

Mr. ROSS: What would happen in the case of a Conservative postmaster who was a violent partisan?

Mr. PELLETIER: We would dismiss him just the same.

Mr. ROSS: Was he dismissed?

Mr. PELLETIER: I do not know. My. hon. friend from Antigonish has not stated the name nor the place where this happened. He spoke of the case of a postmaster who had been a Conservative all his life, but who had voted for reciprocity. If my hon. friend stated the name of the person, I did not catch it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I am afraid that I might do him an injustice, so I shall not name him at the. present time. I fear the Greeks bringing gifts.

Mr. PELLETIER: It is somewhat difficult for me to answer a charge with regard to a postmaster in the large county of Antigonish, not having the name of the place or of the postmaster. However, there is no charge when the name of the postmaster and the name of the post office is not given; therefore, I assume, I am absolved from the necessity of going into the facts of such a case. I was going on to say that we always find somebody to replace postmasters who are dismissed, and, except in one or two cases in the west where the population is very limited in number, we have always had, not only one, but two or three and sometimes more applications for the job. That is not a difficulty which I have to meet. The papers will be brought down and I think my hon. friend will find in them some corroboration of the strong facts against his friend which he has put before the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that, if a postmaster who has been appointed by him should take an active part in politics on the Conservative side he will be dismissed?

Mr. PELLETIER: The rule applies to all. A case such as that to which the hon. gentleman refers has not come under my observation since I have been in the department. This is the first case to which my attention has been called. I have been told that I have kept this man because he has been a Conservative. If he had been a Conservative all his life and, in the last election had voted for reciprocity, that was his business; but if he interfered as an active partisan, the rule would certainly apply to him. If my hon. friend finds fault with me because I have not dismissed him, we might look into the case and see what can be done about it.

Mr. TURRIFF: Where a postmaster is conscientiously able to fill out the very extreme form of affidavit sent, such as has been read here to-night, where he is able to answer satisfactorily that he has not transgressed in any one of these cases that have been referred to, even to the extent of voting quietly, and where that is not taken as satisfactory, and he is not confirmed in his position, where an investigation is held and nobody appears to give evidence against him, what would be the policy of my hon. friend?

Mr. PELLETIER: If a charge is made against a postmaster, that he was an active partisan, that is prima facie evidence on the one side, and the accused postmaster is asked for a solemn declaration. If he denies the charge, an investigation takes place in the regular course. If no witnesses come forward then the postmaster is not dismissed, and I have in my department sixty or seventy cases of that kind.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is exactly what took place at Alameda. The postmaster at Alameda was able to make an affidavit that he was absolutely not guilty of partisanship and the Postmaster-General ordered an investigation. The investigator waited, and nobody came forward to give evidence against the postmaster and then he told the postmaster to go out and hunt up someone to say something in his favour. The postmaster did so, and the investigator absolutely refused to take down anything which the postmaster himself had said, or that any of the men who spoke in his favour had said. No witnesses appeared against the postmaster of Alameda, but yet he was dismissed. So far as I can judge, the Post Office Department has been swinging the axe in my part of the country with greater vigour during the last few months than ever previously. Of course, there will have to be a stop to it pretty soon, because there will be nothing more to do, and then perhaps the Postmaster General will weep because he has no other worlds to conquer. What is the policy of the department in this matter ?

Mr. PELLETIER: The policy of the Post Office Department is as I have stated that if a charge is made, a blank form is sent to the postmaster to sign. If there is a charge and a denial, an investigation takes place.

Mr. CARVELL: If no evidence is given, what then?

Mr. PELLETIER: I would expect the investigator to report that no evidence was put in.

Mr. CARVELL: What will the department do then?

Mr. PELLETIER: I could not dismiss the postmaster unless the investigator reported against him.

Mr. PUGSLEY: This man was dismissed.

Mr. PELLETIER My hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) made out what I thought was a strong case the other day in favour of the postmaster of Alameda, and I immediately wired the inspector to stop the transfer of that office because the statement made by my hon. friend appealed to me. I showed the answer which I got from the post office inspector to my hon. friend. There is on file in the department a report from the investigator, Mr. Dorsett, who states that he investigated the charge and has found the postmaster guilty. I told my hon. friend privately, what I now tell him across the floor, that I sent the 'Hansard' report of his speech to Mr. Dorsett and asked him to answer that. What more could I do? It seems to me I have acted fairly.

Mr. TURRIFF: May I ask——

Mr. SPEAKER: This debate is irregular; the hon. member has already spoken.

Mr. TURRIFF: I wish only to ask a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: When the hon. member asks a question, he usually drifts into a debate.

Mr. TURRIFF: Did Mr. Dorsett enclose with his report any evidence taken by him?

Mr. PELLETIER: No.

Mr. TURRIFF: That is just what I have maintained all along.

Mr. PELLETIER: I know most of the investigators in Quebec, and I know some of them in Ontario; but I could not possibly know them in the western provinces. and the maritime provinces, and in these cases I have taken as much care as I possibly could to name as investigators respectable men, whom I could trust. I have told them in my instructions that they must not employ shorthand writers because of the heavy expense. In some cases they have sent in evidence taken in long hand; in others, they report the general nature of the evidence, as in Mr. Dorsett's case, they have sent no return of evidence at all, but simply their report that the man is guilty or not guilty, as the case may be. The case of the Alameda postmaster being exceptional, I have sent the remarks of my hon. friend to Mr. Dorsett, and asked him for a report.

Mr. TURRIFF: He absolutely refused to take any evidence.

Mr. OLIVER: A reading of this affidavit which a postmaster is required to take under certain circumstances, leads me to the conclusion that the Government through the Postmaster General, have undertaken to place a considerable portion of the citizens of Canada under conditions that I think are intolerable in a free country. I do not know whether other members of this House look upon this matter as I do, but I take the liberty of placing before the House my views in regard to it. First of all, is the fact that a man draws a salary of $25 or $35 a year from this Government, to be the purchase price of his soul and body as well as of his services in licking postage stamps? I think there should be some right or liberty on the part of the citizens of this country, even if they should draw a salary of $35 a year from the treasury. I quite appreciate the position generally taken, that if a man is dependent upon his services to the country for his livelihood, he must serve his country and not his party, but I submit that because a man is drawing a very small amount from the treasury, for services rendered, which bears no reasonable proportion to a salary large enough for him to live upon, in such a case, the country that exercises such a tyrannical control over him as to require him to sign an affidavit of this description, as a condition of his holding that paltry office, is not a free country, and such a government is a government of tyranny. It is degrading to Canada that men who are discharging a public service in the interest of their fellow citizens for a very trifling consideration, and in many cases at a loss rather than at a gain to themselves, should be required to place themselves in the position they are required to do on this form of affidavit sent to them by the Postmaster General.

In regard to this affidavit, and in regard to the procedure that has been sketched to the House by the Postmaster General: I am not of a legal profession; but I will risk suggesting that when an accusation against any postmaster is presented to the Postmaster General it would be only right and fair that the Postmaster General should inform the postmaster of the accusation made against him, that is, if any proceedings were or are to be taken in regard to those accusations. The Postmaster General, however, does not do so.

Mr. PELLETIER: I do.

Mr. OLIVER: Here are the forms of affidavit that my hon. friend the Postmaster General sends out to men who are accused of partisanship, or whom he or his friends desire to displace for their own partisans. The letter that accompanies these affidavits has, I have no doubt, been read to the House.

Mr. PELLETIER: The affidavit has been read, but not the letter.

Mr. OLIVER: This is the letter:

Sir,—It is represented to this department that since your appointment as postmaster

at New Frances, N.S., you have taken an active part in federal and provincial elections.

I am therefore, directed to request that you will be good enough to say whether this is true.

If the accusation is not well founded, I presume you will have no objection to sign the solemn declaration herewith enclosed, which would be attested before a justice of the peace.

An early reply is requested.

I am sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) HECTOR B. VERRET,
Assistant Deputy Postmaster General.

A general accusation is made in the letter to which the accused postmaster is required to make certain specific replies by affidavit, which specific replies may or may not cover the accusation that has been made against him. It is an elementary principle of justice, and, I believe, also of law, that where a man is subject to punishment by reason of any act of his, he has the right to know specifically what he is charged with, and to have an opportunity of disproving that charge specifically; and he is presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty. But my hon. friend the Postmaster General does not act on that principle at all. He informs the man that there is a general accusation against him; he requires him to make an affidavit as to certain specific facts; and, having received the man's affidavit, he does not accept it as evidence. He puts the man in the position of having to swear that he is not guilty of something which he has not been specifically charged with, and, after swearing to that, he becomes subject to such trial and such conviction as the Postmaster General sees fit to hand out to him. Such a procedure is absolutely discreditable to this country, and cannot be justified under any rule of law or any theory of justice or fair play. Further, by what authority does this Government presume to restrict the activity of a $35 a year postmaster in regard to provincial politics? A few moments ago, I said that a salary of $35 a year is not an adequate price for the soul as well as the body of a self-respecting Canadian citizen, besides paying for his services in licking stamps for a whole year. I believe that the country postmaster has some rights. He renders his country some service, and the mere fact that in many cases he is a comparatively unimportant citizen is no reason why the Postmaster General, as a member of this Government, should put upon him such an insult as is contained in this affidavit, should treat him so unfairly, or should exercise such acts of tyranny against him.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): I would like to say a very few words in connection with these declarations that are being sent out by the Postmaster General to the postmasters of this country. I do not object to persons being dismissed from office because they have taken a strong part in elections—because, in other words, they are branded as partisans. A man who is a partisan, and who shows that partisanship to the extent of going around and canvassing against any political candidates, be he Grit, Tory or Socialist, stands amenable to the Government of this country, and they have an absolute, perfect and justifiable reason for dismissing him from office, be his office worth $10 a year or $10,000.

I have never raised my voice in this House, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PELLETIER: Does the hon. member for Edmonton follow that?

Mr. CARROLL: I have never raised my voice in this House to object to the dismissal in my constituency of any persons who have been partisans. But I consider the reason given here to-night by the hon. Postmaster General for sending these declarations to the postmasters of the country rather a lame one. He tells us that these declarations are sent out in order to save expense. In my opinion, the declarations sent into the riding of South Cape Breton were not sent for the purpose of economy, but because the postmasters lived in remote places which could not be reached by Mr. Duchemin in a parlour car. My first lieutenant in the fight in my constituency—Mr. Wallace Richardson, one time mayor of the city of Sydney—spoke with me on almost every platform in the riding. He did not mind losing his position, that of secretary of the Board of Pilot Commissioners for the port of Sydney. Why did not my hon. friend dismiss a man like that without an investigation? Every man in South Cape Breton knew he was a partisan, but Mr. Duchemin holds an investigation and brings in evidence, while if he had written to Mr. Wallace Richardson himself he would have told him at once that he was a partisan.

Mr. BARNARD: Was the Secretary of the Pilotage Commission dismissed by that body, or by the Government?

Mr. CARROLL: He was dismissed by the present Government.

Mr. BARNARD: We have exactly the same situation in my own riding. The secretary of the Pilotage Commission was the president of the Liberal Association, and he was dismissed by the commission.

Mr. CARROLL: That has nothing to do with my position. Why did Mr. H. P. Duchemin investigate this case? Because he could hold the investigation in the city of Sydney; but when he comes to deal with the case of a postmaster in a district which could be reached only by driving over very bad roads for 20 or 30 miles, he says to the Postmaster General: 'We don't want to investigate this case.' Somebody lays a charge, and, instead of sending the charge to the postmaster in the district, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Edmonton, this declaration is sent to him. I understand from the Postmaster General that in some instances affidavits are sent in by the accusers. I ask the hon. Postmaster General if he does not think it would be fair and equitable to give this man the statement that was sent in by his accuser, and afford him an opportunity of answering the accusation? If an indictment is found against a man in our courts upon a charge of theft, what would the public think if, after being indicted for that he was charged with murder as well? That is the position of affairs in respect to those declarations. A man is asked to swear that he has not under any circumstances or at any time since his appointment taken the least part in politics. There is not a man in Canada who can make a declaration to that effect, for while some postmasters may not be active partisans they may still be unable to sign these declarations sent broadcast throughout the country by the Postmaster General.

I know several instances of dismissals in the county of South Cape Breton to which I have no objection, and which I am not going to discuss at the present time. I have been hounded from pillar to post in my constituency and opposed by postmasters there; and I may say that I am going to send in the name of one of these postmasters, and ask that an investigation be held. He is a Conservative, and was appointed before the year 1896. He has attended the nominations in the city of Sydney, and abused me roundly before every person who would listen to him. He did this not only in the last election, but in every election held in the constituency of South Cape Breton during the last ten years. Such a man is the postmaster at Marion Bridge in the county of Cape Breton. I am not going to mention his name, but I intend to lay a charge before the hon. the Postmaster General, and see whether he is going to keep his word in respect to treating Conservative postmasters in the same manner as he deals with Liberals.

I did not intend rising on this particular occasion, but there are a few instances in my own constituency in which I consider that officials were wrongfully dismissed, and I intend to bring the matter up at the proper time. In respect to the small army of Liberal office-holders in the county of Cape Breton who have been removed from office, they earned their dismissal by working for me. Speaking from a charitable standpoint, I do not like to see poor men dismissed from office because they assisted me in the last election; but now that they are dismissed, I feel sure that they will assist me with more vim than ever in the next election if I should again be a candidate in that constituency.

Mr. CARVELL: This discussion goes to show the difficulties any man will get into when he departs from the recognized principles of fair-play and common decency between man and man. It also shows the difficulty in which a man invariably finds himself placed when he departs from ordinary first principles. My hon. friend the Postmaster General started out with a well-recognized principle, and that was to dismiss any official against whom any one could lay a charge, whether or not it could be proved. With my hon. friend the Postmaster General, that was quite a logical proceeding. In my constituency he dismissed eight or nine, I think, within the first three or four weeks after the election, and I do not know whether he even had a charge laid against them—certainly there never was an investigation. They were simply told to get out, and given about twenty-four hours to pack up and hand over their books and papers to their successors.

Mr. EDWARDS: They were supporters of yours?

Mr. CARVELL: They were.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is a sufficient reason for their dismissal.

Mr. CARVELL: But my hon. friend the Postmaster General saw that was not popular, and during the last session of Parliament he was told that these men should not be removed from office without being given a chance to defend themselves. My hon. friend then departed from his well-recognized principle, and commenced to hold investigations. But he found in very many instances that he did not get the evidence he wanted, and that the investigations did not turn out as well as he had expected. So he again departed from his principles, and adopted the procedure of sending out this document which has been placed before the House this afternoon. I must confess, Sir, that this is the first time I have had the pleasure of seeing this docu-

ment, because, as I have already stated, every man in my constituency who could be charged with having political opinions based on Liberal principles was dismissed without an investigation. I beg his pardon, I think there was one little country postmaster, receiving a salary of about $35 a year, whose case was investigated some time during the latter part of the year. Whether or not he was accorded the privilege of signing one of these documents, I do not know.

Let us look at the other side of the question for a moment, and consider what is the position of a man employed in a British country, who is dismissed on the mere ipse dixit of a patronage committee —not always an affidavit, I am informed, —but in some cases simply a letter from the patronage committee, or from an interested person who wants a thirty-five-dollar job. He departs from all principles of British fair-play and British jurisprudence; not only the jurisprudence of Britain but of France and Germany and even other civilized countries; he goes to the jurisprudence of Russia and Mexico, and says: Because a man has made a charge against you swear you are innocent. Think of it. Think of a man being held up and branded as a criminal and saying to him: You are charged as a criminal, you are not entitled to know the particulars of the charge, but it has been asserted by a friend of mine that you are a criminal. Swear you are innocent or off goes your head. It is true that the Postmaster General attempted to take the position that he would give a man a chance to make his affidavit, and when the man had made it there would be one statement against the other. He said one affidavit against the other affidavit, but he has the statement of one of his henchmen against the affidavit of the postmaster, and then he says: 'We will give an investigation.' The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has given particulars of a case where there was no investigation, and no one appeared against the man charged, and yet they dismissed him. It is un-British, unfair, and, if it were not unparliamentary, I would almost say indecent, to mete out to any British subject such treatment; it is a temptation to perjury. It is not treating a man with the courtesy that the British laws of this country expect he shall be treated with. It is putting him down as a criminal, and telling him to prove himself innocent or off comes his head. It is to that that we on this side of the House object.

I think the hon. the Postmaster General will play a finer role and stand higher in the estimation of the people if he goes back to first principles, and when he wants to fire a man, fire him, but let him not go through the farce of having a one-sided investigation and saying: We asked him to sign these documents in order to save $50 or $75. What is $50 or $75 to the Postmaster General or to the country compared to a man being treated as though he were a Russian or living in an uncivilized country? That is a very lame excuse, and I hope my hon. friend will abandon this unfair, un-British policy. If he wants to fire these men, fire them, or give them an honest decent investigation.

Mr. WILCOX (North Essex): Mr. Speaker, the argument of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat is most amusing, in view of the conduct of the Liberal party in dealing with the civil servants in the part of the country from which I come. In the south riding of Essex, a representative of the Liberal party dismissed every civil servant in the customs and excise and boasted how he had cleaned up the Tories in South Essex. Of the splendid array of civil servants that was left at the customs port at Windsor by the Conservative party in 1896, five only were left to tell the story, and they were pretty well disfigured, for they kept them well down in the service.

It does occur to me when we hear these hon. gentlemen on this question, that the voice has been the voice of Jacob, but the hand has been the hand of Esau. Shortly after the change of government in 1896 an item appeared in the Ottawa Free Press which clearly set forth the policy of the Liberal party in this regard. It is as follows:

> The rank and file of the Liberal party will acclaim a plain statement of the need for a closer loyalty of the department to this accepted principle of party government—all patronage should go to the friends of the party. Every departure from this is an act of disloyalty to the followers and supporters of the party.
>
> No Cabinet minister nor any supporter of the Liberal party can assault this position and be loyal to his party.
>
> Every new appointment, every power of patronage, belongs by right of system and precedent to the members of the Liberal party.
>
> To appease a political foe by gifts of patronage is a sign of cowardice, or even worse.
>
> In the initial appointment or in the awarding of a government contract, it is expected that the party in power shall be loyal to its friends. Without such loyalty the party becomes disorganized.

There is the policy of the Liberal party, and to such an extent was this decapitation of splendid civil servants throughout this country carried when the Liberal administration came into power, that a conference of one of the leading religious organizations of this country passed this resolution:

> That the sordid system of patronage unfortunately obtaining in this country is not

only folly from the party point of view with which as such this conference has nothing to do, but that it is contrary to public policy and an offence against the people inasmuch as it proceeds on the assumption that the party in power is justified in administering the affairs of the country to the advantage of that section of the electors who have assisted in returning it, whereas, according to any true view such party should regard itself as a trustee of the whole people.

That was a resolution passed by the Methodist Conference in 1896.

As I understand it, the question of patronage is a matter of law, the duties of a civil servant being clearly set forth in the statute.

Mr. EMMERSON: A case up this afternoon was that of an outlaw.

Mr. WILCOX: The statute provides, among other things, that when a man enters the service of the country he shall leave his politics behind, and if he does not the law provides the penalty of dismissal. The course pursued by my hon. friend the Postmaster General is a very proper one, and I have reason to believe that he is doing his duty to the civil servants of this country. In our part of the country, where we have a great port in which we collected this year $3,500,000, out of 147 civil servants only four have been dismissed, while of the postmasters not one has been dismissed. Therefore, I think that the statements made by my hon. friend the Postmaster General are very well founded. If the law has not been changed, there is no political party to blame but that of my hon. friends opposite, for I happened to have the honour of sitting in opposition in this House when my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (then leader of the Opposition) moved the following resolution:

That in making appointments to the public offices, and particularly to those of a representative nature, party service should not alone be considered, but selection should be made with regard to capacity and personal character.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. WILCOX: And my hon. friends opposite voted that resolution down.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Who are cheering now?

Mr. TURRIFF: Does your leader uphold it now?

Mr. WILCOX: So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the Postmaster General has taken the proper course in notifying postmasters, or any other civil servants in this country, that representations have been made to him that they are violating the law. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), who has such a high regard for liberty and free speech, tried to make it appear that my hon. friend the Postmaster General, by simply notifying a civil servant that he had been charged with a violation of the law, was curtailing free speech. Why, Sir, the thing is not debatable, and I am surprised that a member of the supposed capacity of my hon. friend from Edmonton should use such an argument.

Mr. McKENZIE: I did not intend to say anything on this subject.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: But I am glad to receive the approval of some hon. gentlemen on the other side for having something to say. My hon. friend (Mr. Wilcox) evidently does not know very much about the Civil Service Act. He is not a lawyer, and is not supposed to pay very much attention to these things, and I do not blame him for not knowing very much about that Act. He rates the ordinary country postmaster as a civil servant, and says that the moment he accepts that very lucrative position, paid for at the rate of nine cents a day, he must leave his independence, his opinions, his rights as a citizen, behind him.

Mr. WILCOX: It is hardly worth making a fuss about, then.

Mr. McKENZIE: Certainly, it is not worth making a fuss about; but it shows the principle that we are fighting against, and we have a right to make a fuss when contemptible conduct emanates from the other side of the House.

Mr. HAZEN: Why did not my hon. friend fight against it when his friends were in?

Mr. McKENZIE: We have a right to bring these matters to the notice of the people of this country, to appeal to Cæsar, so to speak, and to let the people know the difference between the high-sounding principles of certain gentlemen in opposition and their performance when in office. That is the privilege and duty which we are discharging, and it is my duty to the people I represent to point out that difference. My hon. friend is entirely mistaken if he thinks that the Civil Service Act applies to the ordinary country postmasters.

Mr. WILCOX : Is it not a fact that the provisions of the Civil Service Act apply to the inside service, and that the principle of that Act is supposed to apply to the outside service?

Mr. McKENZIE: It certainly does not apply to an individual who gets $35 a year.

Mr. WILCOX: Is there any distinction?

Mr. McKENZIE: There is certainly a distinction. If the service is of such a character that the time of the individual is paid for by the State, then the State has a right to exercise control over that individual.

Mr. WILCOX: Where does my hon. friend find that?

Mr. McKENZIE: I should not look for common sense across the way. I suppose, if I did, I think I should appeal to my hon. friend to bring his common sense to bear upon this matter.

Mr. WILCOX: I have lots of it.

Mr. McKENZIE: If my hon. friend has lots of it, let him apply it, and I think he will at once come to the conclusion that it is not necessary to hedge a man around at every stage with statutory regulations. If my hon. friend, who is a prosperous farmer, refused to feed his cattle some Sunday morning, and the Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals went after him to punish him for his neglect, he would perhaps say there was nothing in the statute that compelled him to look after his cattle on Sundays. He expects us to believe that no duty devolves on him unless that duty is declared by statute. Fortunately in this country we have not reached that stage. Fortunately there are a great many things upon which there are no statutes and upon which we have to use our ordinary common sense. There were days long ago—certain developments have taken place since—when I would expect these hon. gentlemen not to require any statutory authority from me to say that $35 a year would not be an obligation which would be regarded as restricting any citizen of Nova Scotia in the exercise of his privileges. There may be other views to-day. I simply want to point out to hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House that there is one thing to their credit in so far as these investigations are concerned. There is a new law in this country and, some years hence, when they are back again where they belong, in the cool shades of opposition, they will claim credit for having passed the statute which received the assent of His Royal Highness the Governor General on March 12, 1912. Let me tell hon. gentlemen that—and I need not tell them because there is a great galaxy of brilliant lawyers before me—that, whatever the custom may have been before the passing of this statute, it is to be remembered that it is now crystallized into law and this is the only authority that is binding upon them. It will not do for them now to go back to 1896, or any of the years between that time and the 12th March, 1912, when this statute was passed and look for a precedent as to the manner in which certain charges were investigated. We have a statute to-day which says that the charge must be specified. The hon. Postmaster General, I understand, is a brilliant lawyer and is familiar with the civil and criminal procedure of this country. He knows that, from Scatarie in the east to Vancouver in the west, we have a procedure, both in the civil and criminal courts, which demands most conclusively and emphatically that charges, whether they be of a civil or criminal character, must be clearly and distinctly specified. Chapter 28 of the statute which hon. gentlemen have placed upon the statute book says that:

> The commissioners may allow any person whose conduct is being investigated under this Act, and shall allow any person against whom any charge is made in the course of such investigation, to be represented by counsel.

You will note that the statute says 'shall allow.' We know of cases where it has been refused. But section 13 is the one to which I particularly wish to call to the attention of the Postmaster General. I submit to him that he is either, by a violation of the analogy of the statute, or by a straight, positive violation of the statute, acting contrary to the law in sending these declarations through the country. The statute says:

> No report shall be made against any person until reasonable notice shall have been given to him of the charge of misconduct alleged against him and he shall have been allowed full opportunity to be heard in person or by counsel.

What is the meaning of the words: He shall be given reasonable notice of the charge? Do my hon. friends opposite imagine that such a blanket declaration as was sent out by the Postmaster General is a compliance with the Act? It is abominably wide of it. It could not for one moment stand the test of an investigation by any court of this country. No court would say that a blanket charge of that kind is what is meant by this law which has been passed by hon. gentlemen with assistance from this side. This Bill was introduced by the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) himself and at his instance it was passed through the House. If he were in his seat to-night I would be glad to ask him for his interpretation of this section:

> No report shall be made against any person until reasonable notice shall have been given to him of the charge of misconduct alleged against him.

That must mean a specific charge, the time of the misconduct, the nature of it and the circumstances under which he violated the law or rule or whatever it might be. If there were half a dozen charges, all of them would have to be specifically men-

tioned, they would have to be placed in his hands and he would have to be given the opportunity of answering them. I submit to the Prime Minister and other members of his Government that, wherever there have been investigations since the passing of this law, that provision has not been complied with. We have heard a great deal about Mr. Duchemin and his court. I was in his court several times in my own town and other places. I have no charge of misconduct against Mr. Duchemin. He treated me as a gentleman but I would say that his interpretation of the law was not to my liking and not, as I understand it, in compliance with the meaning of the statute. He refused me the right to be heard before him as counsel. I put this statute in his hands, showed it to him and he said it was merely discretionary with him whether he should hear me or not. I had to sit down in silence while five, six or seven people were being investigated and he would not hear me at all, putting the interpretation on the statute that, no matter what the language of the statute was, it was discretionary whether he would hear me or not. I submitted to his ruling, and made no fuss about it, because I had to take for granted that he meant what he said. I pointed out to him that there should be something specific put into the hands of an individual in the way of a charge before he could be investigated and on that he laughed and went on with his investigation. Upon these points I did not agree with him, but as to personal insults, I did not receive any at his hands and I am only speaking of him as I found him. I would like to tell the hon. Postmaster General that in my county of North Cape Breton and Victoria, or in Victoria and Cape Breton, before they were put as they are to-day, the position of postmaster was never regarded as a political office. I have been representing that county for quite a while. I could point out to the Postmaster General six or eight places where changes took place in the post office. The old postmaster had died and in every instance his son, or daughter, or somebody belonging to the family, was appointed to the place without any question being raised. If the hon. gentleman will examine the records in his department for the last ten years relating to North Cape Breton and Victoria, he will not find a single instance where the office was vacated in which the position was not filled by some other member of the family.

I submit to the Postmaster General that a most unreasonable state of things is obtaining in Nova Scotia because I believe that he is not taking any notice of the way in which his officials are placing post offices. I do not blame him for not referring to his officials in making dismissals but he should have the report of his post office inspector, or some other competent officer, before he places a post office in some other situation. I can point out to the Postmaster General in my county places where they have corralled four post offices within three miles of each other. I venture to state that he has not the report of a single official in Nova Scotia telling him that these offices are in the proper place. That is what comes of leaving these things haphazard to politicians, whose only object is to gratify their desire to have officials dismissed. I tell the Postmaster General that while he is dismissing these officials by the dozens in my county, such a thing was never done there before and never will it be done again if there should be a change of government. It is a new doctrine and practice to us down there; we do not understand it, and the people Grit and Tory do not approve of it.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) took exception to the doctrine that an official of the federal Government should be removed for participation in provincial politics.

Mr. OLIVER: If I took that position, I wish to withdraw from it. My remarks were applicable entirely to postmasters who draw a salary of $35 a year.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman says that officers of that character should not be removed from office no matter how partisan their conduct may have been.

Mr. OLIVER: I was dealing with the terms of the circular affidavit and I wished it to be understood that a postmaster who draws $35 a year might be guilty of all the specific instances he was required to swear he was not guilty of in regard to a provincial election and still be entitled to hold his office.

Mr. HAZEN: Then the hon. gentleman draws a distinction between interference in a federal election, provided the interference is of officials who belong to the outside service and hold positions the emoluments of which are not very large.

Mr. OLIVER: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: I also understood my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) to draw a distinction between partisan conduct committed by officers in the inside service and partisan conduct committed by officers in the outside service, such as country postmasters with a salary of $35 a year. Such an argument may be pardonable when advanced by the hon. member, because he was not a member of this Parliament in 1905; but the hon. member for Edmonton was, and had he thought for a

moment he would have remembered that a resolution introduced to this House by Mr. Lake, then member for Qu'Appelle, was passed without a dissenting voice, and that Sir Wilfrid Laurier spoke in favour of that resolution, the express terms of which show that there was no intention to draw any distinction between partisanship committed by officers of the inside service and partisanship committed by officers of the outside service, or whether that partisanship be committed in a provincial or in a Dominion election. Quoting from 'Hansard' of July 17th, 1905:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The motion which has been placed in your hands by my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle, is in these words:

'That whilst it is desirable that every official in the employ of the Government of Canada should enjoy perfect freedom of political opinion and the untrammelled exercise of his franchise in accord therewith, no official should be engaged or permitted to engage in partisan work of any description in the election of a representative to the provincial or Dominion legislature.'

My hon. friend will note that there is no distinction drawn between the inside and the outside service, and that the resolution states that no officials, no matter of what sort, shall be permitted to engage in partisan work of any description, whether the election be a Dominion election or a provincial election. Sir Wilfrid Laurier says:

There is nothing in this resolution which has not been accepted more than once by this Government and upon which we have not declared more than once that it is our intention to act. Therefore, I have no hesitation at all in saying that I am ready on the part of the Government to accept this resolution. The only point I had any hesitation about was as to whether this resolution should be limited to Dominion elections or to provincial elections. It may be said perhaps that we have no jurisdiction over provincial matters and that the resolution goes too far in including provincial elections as well as Dominion elections. But after reflection I have come to the conclusion that we would accept the motion as it reads. Political parties are not so differentiated between Dominion and provincial politics as to make it advisable that they should be treated in a different manner. We accept the services of all those who are engaged in the Civil Service of this country on the understanding that they shall give their undivided attention to their business. Of course, they are citizens, they have the right of franchise, they have the right to their opinions; they have the right, as I have said before, of citizens to express their opinion. But for my part I am strongly of the opinion I held when in opposition that an official who takes an offensive part in election campaigns makes himself and his party a scandal, places himself at once at variance with a large portion of the community who contribute towards the payment of his salary, and minimizes to that extent his usefulness.

Mr. McKENZIE: Sir Wilfrid Laurier states there that the civil servant must give his entire and undivided attention to his work; does that cover a $35 a year postmaster?

Mr. HAZEN: Sir Wilfrid Laurier said that he must give his entire and undivided service to the work; he said:

We accept the services of all those who are engaged in the Civil Service of this country, on the understanding that they shall give their undivided attention to their business.

He indicates that while they are taking part in politics they are making themselves offensive to a large number of the people of this country who contribute towards their salaries, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier endorses the resolution which, in emphatic terms, includes every official in the employ of the Government, and which says that no official, whether in the inside or outside service, and whatever his salary be, shall be a partisan without being punished.

Mr. OLIVER: Does the minister think that that resolution was intended by the House at that time to apply to country postmasters drawing a salary of $35 a year?

Mr. HAZEN: I must take the plain meaning of the language in the resolution, and it says it applies to all officials of whatever sort. It is not ambiguous, it is plain and clear and unmistakable. If it does not apply to a country postmaster receiving $35 a year, let me ask my hon. friend, would it apply to a country postmaster receiving $50 a year. Would it apply to one receiving $100 a year; or would it apply to one receiving $200 a year? What is the limit it would apply to? Let me ask any lawyer on the other side of the House if he can read any limitation into it? Because the language is plain and unmistakable; the idea is expressed in terms that cannot be misunderstood, that are free from all ambiguity, and that were accepted by the unanimous vote of this House and with the approval of the Prime Minister of this country, as the declaration of a principle that should guide the House and the country, then and in the future, with regard to dismissing from office officials found guilty of partisanship.

Mr. OLIVER: Will my hon. friend allow me to ask a question?

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend has already spoken.

Mr. OLIVER: My hon. friend asked a question, and I should like to answer it.

Mr. HAZEN: Just wait a moment. I would like to quote a little further from the

remarks of the Prime Minister on that occasion. Something was said about a gentleman acting as a scrutineer. Sir Wilfrid Laurier says:

If he was acting as a scrutineer, he was going farther than I would permit him to go. I do not think that an officer of the Government should act as a scrutineer or agent.

No limitation there as to country postmasters. A country postmaster is an officer of the Government, as well as the man receiving a larger salary. Although it may be a small office, his duties are responsible, and it is important that he should fulfil them properly. Men of honesty and strength of character are wanted for these positions, and there is no limitation whatever in the rule. Sir Wilfrid Laurier goes on to say :

I do not think an officer of the Government should do anything else but record his vote and exercise the legitimate functions of citizenship. An officer of the Government has no right to do things which are supposed to be the function of those whom we know as partisans. To that extent, I am quite willing to go, but I would not be disposed at this moment to prejudge any case. Having laid down this rule, I think that this case ought to be dealt with accordingly.

Now, a word to my hon. friends who supported the cause of the country postmaster, to whom they allot the smallest salary of $35. I think there are no positions in the service of Canada that require for the proper discharge of its duties, men who are not partisans, and who are removed from partisan influences, so much as the small post offices that are scattered throughout the country districts of Canada. The reason is evident. Let the people lose confidence in the post office; let them think that the postmaster, during an election campaign or at any other time, is so influenced by party feeling—it may be a mere suspicion—that when circulars are sent out to be posted in the neighbourhood, those circulars do not reach the parties to whom they are addressed, until after the date of the meeting, or at such a late date that the people cannot get to the meeting,——

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I have had that experience.

Mr. HAZEN: Complaints of that sort have been made against both Liberal and Conservative postmasters. Members on both sides of the House will say they have had this experience. It is of the utmost importance that these men should be free from partisan bitterness. There are cases where it is contended by the people in the country districts, that it is not safe to use the mails as a means of conveyance, because the postmaster may be so moved by party considerations that letters that are supposed by him to be of a political nature, are not delivered to the parties to whom they are addressed. There is, therefore, no reason why the postmaster with $35 a year should be singled out as the exception to the rule laid down by the unanimous voice of this House, and heartily concurred in by the Prime Minister of that time, to the effect that it should apply to all servants of the Government without any limitation whatever—as to inside or outside service, as to party, or as to the time they had been in office—and should apply as much for partisanship in provincial affairs as for partizanship in federal affairs.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): This whole discussion was on the unfairness of the method adopted by the Postmaster General in conducting these investigations, and my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) has not dealt with that phase of the case at all. The discussion arose on the question of submitting to the postmaster a long affidavit swearing to his innocence, before anyone came forward to submit any charge against him. I would like to know if my hon. friend thinks that the Postmaster General is justified in asking the postmasters of this country to take oath as to their innocence before they know what is the charge against them?

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman has asked me a question, but he has not, I submit, correctly stated the facts upon which he bases the question. He has stated his question as if the Postmaster General, without any charge being made, sent to an official in his department an affidavit and asked him to fill it in, denying that he had done such a thing.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I think that the hon. gentleman misunderstood me. The affidavit my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) has read, is submitted to the postmaster, and he is required to make it. If the hon. minister doubts that, I can produce a dozen postmasters who received that affidavit, and who knew nothing about the charge laid against them, but who were asked to make that affidavit. Does the hon minister approve of that method of procedure?

Mr. HAZEN: When a man who is a defeated candidate or who has a complaint comes to the Postmaster General and says that the Postmaster at Dingley Dell, or wherever it is, was guilty of partisan conduct at the last election, that he took an active part for the purpose of attempting to defeat the party who is now in power, the Postmaster General, on receipt of a charge of that sort, writes to the postmaster whose conduct is complained of, telling him that a charge of

partisan conduct has been made against him and asks him if this statement is true or not true. If it is true, that would end the matter very properly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is not what he asks.

Mr. HAZEN: That is exactly what he asks.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not the Postmaster General ask him to swear that, at no time since his appointment, whether it be ten or twenty years ago, he has taken an active part in politics?

Mr. HAZEN: If the hon. gentleman had waited a minute, I would have explained. On receipt of this complaint about the postmaster, the Postmaster General writes to the postmaster telling him a complaint has been made against him, and asks if this statement is true or not true. If the postmaster says it is true, that would end the controversy. If it is not true, the Postmaster General says: 'Will you sign and swear to the declaration I am enclosing?' That declaration makes the postmaster swear that since he has been appointed postmaster, he has not taken any partisan part in connection with any election. That is as I understand the matter, and I think it is absolutely correct. Is it not, Mr. Postmaster General?

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: I am only asking, as I have only the affidavit read here to-night, and have not read it myself, but if I am correct in my statement, as I think I am, if that postmaster has not been violating the rule that governs the Civil Service, and which was laid down in the House by unanimous resolution, I fail to see where any injustice was done to a postmaster by asking him to sign a declaration such as that.

Mr. TOBIN: The Postmaster General has made certain statements here to-night regarding the dismissals of postmasters, and in connection with that matter I would like to read a letter received by Mr. Dionne, the late postmaster at Strathford Centre, Quebec, from Mr. Verret, dated May 22, 1912. It is in French, and reads as follows:

Ottawa, May 22, 1912.

Dear Sir,—You are accused with having, since your appointment as a postmaster, taken a part in the federal or provincial election.

I am directed by the Post Office Department to ask you whether it is true or not.

If the charge is not true, I presume that you will have no objection to sign the enclosed affidavit, which shall be received by a justice of the peace or a notary public.

If there was no justice of the peace nor any notary public in your place, the declaration may be received by the mayor of your parish.

You will please send us an answer at once.

I am sir,

Yours truly,

(Signed.) HECTOR B. VERRET.

Assistant Deputy Minister.

M. A. E. Dionne,

Postmaster,

Stratford Center, County of Wolfe,

Quebec.

Mr. Dionne received the declaration referred to, which required him to declare that he has not interfered directly or indirectly with elections since he has been appointed postmaster. He received this declaration on the 22nd of May, just a few days after the political landslide in Quebec. Evidently there were some persons in Strathford who wanted this position of postmaster, although the department did not see fit to take any stand until after the local elections. Mr. Dionne wrote a letter in reply a few days afterwards, telling Mr. Verret that for personal reasons he did not wish to sign the declaration. The letter is as follows:

Hector Verret, Esq.,

Deputy Minister,

Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In answer to yours of the 22nd, I must telle you that, for personal reasons, I cannot sign the annexed declaration.

If the department wish to be acquainted with the facts of the case, let them ask my accusers to prove them.

Your obedient servant,

(Signed.) A. E. DIONNE.

He stated that those persons who had accused him of interfering with the elections should submit their proof. Did the minister hold an investigation? You, Mr. Speaker, being a fair man, would say yes, but the Postmaster General did not hold an investigation—he dismissed the man at once.

A few days ago I put on the Order Paper certain questions relating to the dismissal of the postmaster at Stratford Centre. The questions are as follows:

1. Has A. E. Dionne, postmaster of Stratford Centre, Que., been dismissed?
2. If so, who requested his dismissal?
3. Was an investigation held?
4. Who called for an investigation?
5. Has any petition been received asking that Mr. Dionne be not dismissed?
6. How many signed the petition?

The Postmaster General says he did not receive a petition, but I am informed that such a petition was sent, and only nine names out of the whole township of Stratford did not appear on the list (reading):

7. How many applications for the position have been received by the Postmaster General?
8. Who is Mr. Dionne's successor and who recommended his appointment?

The answers as given by the hon. the Postmaster General are as follows:

1. Yes.
2, 3, 4. The postmaster was given an opportunity to sign a declaration that he had not acted as a partisan, but he refused to do so, and therefore it was not necessary to go to the useless expense of an investigation.
5, 6. None has been received.
7, 8. Mr. J. I. Campeau, on authority of Postmaster General.

Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that this man was fairly treated? My hon. friend the Postmaster General stated this evening that he always wanted to do what was right. I think he should consider this case, and have an investigation held, and if any injustice has been done to the postmaster at Strathford, I should like to see it rectified.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries could not have read the declaration when he made the remarks which he did, because I am sure if he had done so he would not have stated to the House that he was meting out fair-play to the postmasters of this country. It is evident, from the statement made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, that the postmaster referred to by him was dismissed simply because he did not sign the declaration sent to him at the direction of the Postmaster General. There was no proof given of partisanship; no man came forward to acquaint him with the charges which were made against him, but he was asked by the Postmaster General——

Mr. PELLETIER: Who said no charges was preferred against him?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat.

Mr. PELLETIER: He did not say that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The Postmaster General could not have heard him aright. In answer to a question put to him by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Tobin), the Postmaster General stated that because the postmaster in question did not sign this declaration, it was deemed unnecessary to hold an investigation, and the man was dismissed. By this document the postmaster is required to swear that since his appointment as postmaster he has taken no active part in federal or provincial elections; that he has not canvassed or taken any voters to the polls. As one hon. member on this side of the House has stated, if during thirty years of office he had taken his father or brother to the poll with his own horse and carriage when he himself was going there, he could not properly sign that affidavit. He has also to swear that he has never given money or liquor to anyone on behalf of any candidate in any polling division, or interrupted any public speaker during the course of any meeting. The man has to swear that at no time during a period of office covering perhaps ten, fifteen or twenty years, has he interrupted a speaker at any public meeting, political or otherwise—a school meeting, parish meeting, or municipal meeting—it is not limited to meetings in connection with federal or provincial elections. If my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had read that declaration he surely would not have approved of such a monstrous document as that sent out by the Postmaster General. Every man against whom a charge has been made is presumed to be innocent until he is proven guilty, but, without any charge being made against this official, and without anyone being compelled to go on oath and swear the accused has been guilty of political partisanship, the Postmaster General dismisses this man because he does not swear to every point in this declaration. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says he knows postmasters on both sides of politics who could be found guilty of partisanship and against whom complaints were made with respect to the holding of mails. Let me ask my hon. friend if, since he has been a member of this Government, any Conservative who has been found guilty of political partisanship has been dismissed?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not heard of any being guilty of partisanship.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does not my hon. friend know that in his own constituency there were scores of Conservative postmasters who took an active part in the election upon the Conservative side?

Mr. HAZEN: There were practically none left.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend knows better than that. In Carleton, I am informed, Conservative postmasters took an active part, but we have the statement of the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) that he intends to give the Postmaster General the name of a Conservative postmaster who took a very active part in the election and we shall see whether the Postmaster General will dismiss him for exercising partisanship in favour of the Conservative candidate. When we see the Postmaster General doing that and treating him as he has treated the Liberal postmasters we will be able to judge better of the sincerity of the Postmaster General with reference to this subject. As further evidence of the determination which this Government has shown to get rid of Liberal office-holders by hook or by crook let me call attention

to the case of a gentleman in the constituency of South Ontario, Mr. Lyman C. Smith, who was collector of customs. From this case we will be able to judge the motive that has actuated the minister; and to know whether it is a sincere desire to have the Civil Service of the country removed entirely from partisanship or whether they are actuated by the desire to remove office-holders in order to secure the positions for their friends.

Mr. EDWARDS: You might take up the case of W. S. Milner.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Lyman C. Smith was for some 28 years head master of the Oshawa high school. He was a gentleman universally respected and admired. He was appointed collector of customs at Oshawa at the suggestion of leading business men of the town because it was felt that he would make a first-class officer and maintain the proper dignity of the position. It was admitted that he worthily performed the duties of the position and the only reason alleged against him and the only ground suggested for his dismissal is that he placed himself on record as being opposed to the idea that he should vote for a man who had been guilty of corrupt practices at an election. It appears that Mr. Smith took no active part in elections. It is true that he attended political meetings but he was simply an observer. At the last election he was requested by a Conservative to vote for Mr. Smith the Conservative candidate but he said he could not conscientiously vote for a man against whom the Court had pronounced and who had been guilty of corruption in an election and so, for that remark, as I am informed, that gentleman was dismissed from office.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria): Did the hon. gnetleman say that this gentleman was canvassed for his vote and gave that as a reason?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. HUGHES: Then the hon. gentleman's facts are entirely erroneous.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My information is from a gentleman well known to members of this House, a former member of this House, whose word, I think, would be taken without hesitation by the great majority of the members. That is the statement which has been made to me and no other reason has been given so far as I am aware, certainly no other reason has been given in this House, for the dismissal of Mr. Lyman C. Smith from the office of collector. He is a gentleman of very high ideals, and the Conservative candidate for whom he had been requested to vote had been declared by Mr. Justice Ferguson to have been guilty of corruption during some previous election, and he said he could not conscientiously vote for a gentleman against whom such charges had been proven.

For that and for that alone this gentleman, who was not a partisan, but as I was informed had taken no part at all in political controversies, was dismissed from office.

Mr. EDWARDS: Would the hon. gentleman say that was a reason that appealed to him as a very strong one?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, and I hardly think it would appeal to my hon. friend. Many other instances could be given. There is the instance of the collector of customs at Coaticook who was dismissed simply because he had been appealing to Conservatives and Liberals alike, as appears from a return laid before this House, to frown down disloyal utterances by some of the candidates running in that election. Numerous other instances could be presented to show that gentlemen opposite have not, and I regret to say it is the case, been actuated by the sincere desire to purify the service from political partisanship but rather to secure places which may be filled by their friends.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria): The circumstances in connection with the South Ontario case are more or less familiar to me. A gentleman named Smith, who was the collector of customs there, and who is in many respects an estimable man but who is a dyed in the wool Liberal, as he has a right to be, was dismissed from office. The position taken by those concerned in having him removed was that while he was at perfect liberty to resign his position and exercise any influence he might have in himself as an individual on account of his position in the community, and long-standing as a teacher, in support of the Liberal candidate, he should not exercise the influence which the position of collector of customs conferred on him by seeking to influence those having business dealings with him. This gentleman was not canvassed for his vote. No man in South Ontario would waste time doing that, they knew his politics and knew he was one of those hard-headed gentlemen who could not be influenced. He himself became active, going around with a long face, bemoaning the state of public affairs and saying it was a sad condition when a gentleman who had been condemned by a judge should ask to be returned to Parliament. He was proving himself a white-livered hypocrite and I have no hesitation in saying that had he been in my riding he would have gone out much quicker than he did.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But he was a very estimable man.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria): But there are many estimable partisans. I had the privilege of dismissing one very estimable gentleman myself in about 17 seconds. I make no apology for any of these things. I always take the precaution of warning gentlemen on my side holding public offices to be good enough to mind their own business. I do not want their influence in a campaign. If they wish to vote for me well and good, that is their privilege, but I do not want and will not have their public support or have them canvassing for me in a campaign, and hon. gentlemen can rest assured that when I will not permit friends of my own in offices to canvass for me, I shall take particular pains that those opposed to me do not canvass against me.

Mr. KYTE: I wish to add one or two observations, particularly in replying to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We on this side of the House were very glad to hear him assert his views that partisans ought not to be appointed to the charge of post offices in this country. I appreciate the reasons that have been advanced by the Minister of Marine and I am very sure that had he known the type of postmasters who have been appointed in my county by the Postmaster General he would take the earliest opportunity to reprimand his colleague. Now, in the county of Richmond about 50 public officers have been dismissed, and probably 20 of these are postmasters, and in all cases the appointments have gone to men who have been the most offensive partisans in the respective communities in which they live. There is a case in the county of Richmond of a very important post office being filled by a man whose only qualification was his excessive partisanship on behalf of the Conservative party during the last 20 years. As a matter of fact, he is so illiterate that he was obliged to assure the post office inspector that he would engage the services of another person to act as assistant postmaster, so that the duties of the office would be properly discharged. But as he had been a partisan of the deepest dye he was selected for that high and important position.

I subscribe to every sentiment expressed in the resolution moved by the former member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake), in the session of 1905, and I subscribe readily and gladly to the sentiments which were uttered by the then leader of the Government when he supported that resolution, and when he stated that partisan work of any description, in Dominion or in local elections, ought not to be permitted on the part of any person holding public office.

I am not complaining of the dismissal of partisans in my county. What I do find fault with is the dismissal by the Postmaster General of men who were not partisans in the election. I have upon the Order Paper motions relating to some 40 dismissals in the county which I represent, and when the papers are brought down, I hope to convince hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that a great many of the dismissals in that county were made, not because the officials who held the offices were partisans, but simply and solely because others desired to get their positions, and have secured them through the influence of the defeated candidate. For instance, the only reason advanced against one postmaster is that he made a statement to the effect that he believed the Government would be sustained. In another case a postmaster stated in conversation with a friend that he believed Mr. So-and-So would be returned; in another case a postmaster who was the presiding officer at a poll some few miles from his residence, drove his brother to the poll thinking it would be a brotherly act to take him in his carriage. That was the only evidence adduced against that postmaster, and I have learned within the past few days that he has been dismissed. I desire to emphasize the fact that I will never raise my voice in criticism of the dismissal of any man in the county of Richmond, who has been an active or offensive partisan, or a partisan in any sense of the word. What I do complain of is that in my county men who have not been partisans, who have taken no part whatever in elections, except, perhaps, to casually express an opinion as to whether the government would be sustained, or as to whether a particular candidate would be elected, have been dismissed. The things I have mentioned do not come within the range of political partisanship, and in my judgment the dismissals ought not to have taken place.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) complained of the dismissal of an official for stating that he would not vote for a man who had been noted for corrupt acts.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Who had been found guilty of corrupt acts by the judge.

Mr. DAVIDSON: What has my hon. friend (Mr. Kyte) to say to that as a reason for dismissal?

Mr. KYTE: It would depend entirely upon the nature of the corrupt act. There are some acts that are inherently corrupt; there are others that are merely a technical violation of the law, and I would make a distinction in these cases.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Suppose that he had been disfranchised for seven years for corrupt acts, would he have been justified in voting?

Mr. KYTE: I would like to know if my hon. friend is making any particular reference to me. I have heard that my hon. friend from Annapolis had some ambition to be the junior member for Richmond. I have here a copy of the Conservative newspaper published in my own town, and if my hon. friend has ref——

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member has exhausted his right to speak again. This is a substantive motion.

Mr. KYTE: I am answering a question.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not permissible to enter into a new argument. The rule is that in exercising the right to reply a member may refer to any material part of his speech which may have been misquoted, or misunderstood, but he must not introduce any new matter.

Mr. KYTE: My hon. friend has asked me a question, and I am endeavouring to reply to him, and in order to give the reasons for my reply I wish to quote from a newspaper.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is out of order.

Mr. W. SMITH (South Ontario): I desire to say a word or two with reference to some observations that have come very close home to me. A number of years ago I had the honour of a seat in this House. It is true that for a good many years I was out of it, but I came back despite the strongest opposition that could be placed against me in the riding that I have the honour to represent. I recognize that I have not been, perhaps, the best of men, but I believe that the electors of South Ontario have confidence in me. Now what are the facts in connection with the observations of the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley). He charges that I was personally responsible for the removal of a collector of customs in the town of Oshawa. I admit the guilt, and why? I have in my hand a letter from the collector of customs at Oshawa. I need scarcely read the whole of it, because it is on record in this House already, but one clause of it is as follows:

The head and front of my offending seems to have been that I stated to John McCulloch that I considered the right of franchise so sacred that I would never vote for any man, no matter who he was, or what the party, or what the issue, who had been proved to have been concerned in the giving of money for bribes. I stated that I had on a few occasions unknowingly voted for such, but would never so vote if I knew it. If pure men did not offer I would not vote at all. I further stated that in my opinion, a man that had done this should not have a vote himself or be permitted to hold any office. This view was stated in general terms, and I have often made the same statement when no election was pending. Remember, please, that all this was said in private conversation only.

John McCulloch was an old pupil of his at the high school of Oshawa. He was a member of the firm of McLaughlins, in Oshawa and was interested in the great question of reciprocity which agitated not only South Ontario, but the country generally, in 1911. He believed, as much as he believed anything, that he could influence an old pupil of his by appealing to him that a man who had been guilty of the charges which had been brought against me had no right either to sit in this House or even to have a vote, if it came to that. Mr. McCulloch did not exactly accept the situation but in the petition which was presented to me they say that:

During the election he did and said things which were regarded as offensively partisan, for example—he endeavoured to prevent individual Liberals of joining hands with the Conservative party, by making most offensive allusions to their 'lack of brains', and, secondly, he openly tried to prejudice voters against you personally by making unjust and unfounded attacks upon your 'personal character'——

The man does not live in Canada, and he cannot be found in South Ontario, that I have the honour to represent, that can say anything against my personal character.

—all of which has been regarded by Conservatives and by many Liberals as being very 'offensive' even from a narrow partisanship point of view.

The hon. member for St. John goes to a great deal of trouble in trying to put Mr. Smith's case, but he takes good care that he does not go any further because I removed another man from the customs in Oshawa, Mr. E. T. Mothersill, with regard to whom this document states:

Mr. E. T. Mothersill in our estimation deserves to be removed from office because of his active participation in the election. Not only on account of the quantity but also on account of the quality of his activity, do we most sincerely object. He imported into his section of the riding cargoes of lager, and other beverages with a view of demoralizing the electorate and of exercising such degrading influences in favour of the Laurier candidate, as should meet with instant rebuke from any decent form of government.

Yet I was to blame for removing these two men, one of whom, if he had had any common sense, such as we would expect from an old high school teacher, would not have tried to influence one of the most

important, one of the strongest, men in the town of Oshawa. I removed this man, Mothersill, because he had done everything which it was possible for him to do to influence a certain portion of the electorate in the town of Oshawa. I stand, Mr. Speaker, by what I did in 1911, I know I was right, I know I did right, and I am going to say further, I say it in this House and I say it to the hon. member for St. John, that the man who was the collector of customs was removed because it is reported he bought his way into that position. That is all I have to say, and if hon. gentlemen want to pursue this matter any further, they will find me upon the floor of this House.

Mr CHISHOLM (Antigonish): As the mover of the resolution I have a right to the last word, and my remarks will be very brief indeed. We have got very far afield from the motion, as the hon. Postmaster General has said, but there is just an observation or two I would like to make with regard to that hon. gentleman. I do not think there is anybody on this side of the House who would take serious objection to the remarks of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. We all grant that any person who is guilty of active or offensive partisanship should be treated accordingly, but just what active or offensive partisanship is bringing us to the line of cleavage. With reference to the postmasters to whom I referred, there is no evidence that any one of them was an active or offensive partisan. Certainly, of the dozen postmasters that were dismissed in Antigonish, I can safely make the statement that not more than two of them, in the last fifteen or twenty years, ever acted as scrutineer or agent or took any active part in an endeavour to influence a voter to vote for one candidate or another or to refrain from voting, or did any of the things which we generally understand as constituting offensive partisanship. What I complain of in so far as the Postmaster General is concerned, is that he receives his information or charges from persons who very often do not stand very highly in the community in which they reside, or, if the persons who give him the information are respectable people, that information is very often based by the party laying the charge on the tittle-tattle or gossip in the community, there being no attempt on the part of the persons supplying the information to verify it. The Postmaster General, on the receipt of such information, should write to the country postmaster asking him if he denied this charge and then he should say: If you make a declaration denying this charge, we will accept your declaration. If he wrote to the country postmaster and said: You are charged with so and so, what have you to say about it, and if the country postmaster denied the accusation, then he would be quite justified in saying: We will have to investigate the case. Or, if the Postmaster General wanted to save the expense of an investigation, he would see that the specific charges made against the country postmaster were set down and the country postmaster would be asked to make a declaration denying the charges if he was prepared to do so. If he made that declaration it would be the bounden duty of the Postmaster General to accept the sworn statement of that man rather than the unsupported statement of the informer. Then, again, observe the temptation there is for perjury. Here the Postmaster General puts a declaration to the country postmaster to which he asks him to subscribe and if he does not subscribe to that declaration he is plainly told: You lose your head, you are going to be decapitated, you are going to be dismissed from office. Instead of putting in that declaration specific charges of offensive or active partisanship the Postmaster General makes the declaration of such a wide and varied character, and puts it in such equivocal language that no conscientious man can subscribe to it. In the declaration which he submits to the country postmaster he asks him to declare that he had not taken active part in Dominion or provincial elections since he had become postmaster. That is going pretty far, but, while that is objectionable, there is still nothing downright wicked in the matter. But, he goes further and asks him to declare: I have not paid out money; I have never taken any voters to the poll. He does not put any qualification in the sentence at all. If he said: I have never carried any voters to the poll with a view of getting them to vote one way or the other, or, I have not given any money for the purpose of influencing votes, it would not be so objectionable as the declaration appears as drawn up. Ninety-nine per cent of the country postmasters would refuse to make that declaration in the form in which it was submitted because they would be afraid there was something in it that perhaps was not intended to be in it but at the same time would be calculated to get them into trouble. It is repugnant to the sense of manhood in the official to take such an affidavit, without knowing who his accuser was or what the accusation; it was an insult to these poor country postmasters to send them such a blank and general form of affidavit. When a postmaster did make that affidavit, the Postmaster General should have accepted it, but what was done was to take the stand towards the country postmasters: if you don't swear to the affidavit you will

lose your situation, and if you do swear to it you will lose it also; you will be damned if you will and you will also be damned if you won't. Out of a dozen postmasters in my county who were dismissed, only one had an investigation, and that man had made the required declaration. And, the House will be surprised to hear, that after the poor man sent in the affidavit, the Postmaster General wrote to him; I am surprised to receive such a declaration from you; do you realize that declaration has the same force and effect as an oath; in view of the information we have, we cannot accept your declaration, and the thing must be inquired into further. And it was inquired into further, and Commissioner Duchemin was appointed to make the inquiry, and the Commissioner found nothing against the man and he was exonerated. In our part of the country, the people do not take affidavits lightly, and they are averse to being sworn except on serious and solemn occasions, and it was an insult to them to send out such a form. They have a proper conception of the grave character of an oath and the responsibility it involves. Fancy this poor man, who made the affidavit in the required form, and who told the truth, being insulted by the Postmaster General writing him, no doubt on the statement of some irresponsible person, that he had perjured himself, when, as the investigation disclosed, the poor man was telling absolutely the truth. Mr. McNeil, in his letter to the Postmaster General stated, that he challenged the fullest inquiry into his conduct; he denied the charge of offensive or active partisanship; he stated that he had done nothing but to exercise the God-given right of depositing his ballot as he thought proper, and yet the Postmaster General, without investigation, dismissed him. To-night, the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) interrupting the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), asked him if certain postmasters who had been dismissed were Grits, and being answered in the affirmative, the hon. member for Frontenac said: They deserve to be fired. Well, I suppose there are some who will subscribe to that doctrine, and if the Government laid it down boldly and flatly, well and good, and it would be a much decenter thing for them to do than to pursue the hypocritical process of going through a farce of an investigation, simply because they want to remove a Liberal from office. Why don't they say openly to the officials whom they want to dismiss: You are out and we are in, we have to look after our friends; you are Grits; to the victors belong the spoils; we have friends on our side whom we have to look after; we are sorry for you personally, but we must play the game of politics and out you have to go. If the Government took that more manly course nobody would raise a howl about it, but the trouble is that the Government resorts to these sham inquiries and adopts such mean, low, contemptible subterfuges as the placing of affidavits in the hands of innocent country postmasters to try and trap them. Far better for the Government to take the courageous course of dismissing officials because they are Liberals, than to put the country to the expense of sham investigations, which are causing such strife and ill-will and ill-feeling between the people in different parts of the country.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams, and other documents relating to the dismissal of Martin Johnston, preventive officer at Rea Islands, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Alexis Vigneau, captain of the patrol boat at Arichat, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Harry E. McDonald, assistant engineer at St. Peters canal, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Frederick Poirier, buoy contractor at Descouse, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of George H. Sampson, keeper of the storm signal at Lower L'Ardoise, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of David A. McLeod, postmaster at Cleveland, Richmond county, N.S. —Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Dr. C. P. Bissett, physician to the Indians at Salmon River, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of D. J. McKillop, postmaster at McKillop, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Norman Morrison, postmaster at Ferguson's Lake, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Michael Murphy, postmaster at Point Micheau, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Michael J. Sampson,

light keeper at Lower L'Ardoise, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Thomas Brymer, light keeper at Lower L'Ardoise, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Dominique Boudrot, buoy contractor, at Petit de Grat, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Kenneth F. McAskill, postmaster at Loch Lomond, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of H. J. Fixott, port physician at Arichat, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Leon N. Poirier, wharfinger at Descouse, Richmond county, N.S.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, complaints and other documents relating to the cancelling of the contract for conveying His Majesty's mails, entered into on the 1st day of January, 1912, beteewn the Honourable Postmaster General and Mr. J. C. Beeman, of Guthrie, county of Missisquoi; together with the reason for the cancellation of this contract, the price paid to Mr. Beeman, the name of the present contractor and the price paid to him.—Mr. Kay.

For return showing the number of postmasters that have been dismissed in the County of Missisquoi since October 1, 1911, the names of the postmasters who have been appointed to succeed them, the causes of the dismissals and a copy of all complaints and correspondence with respect to the same, and of all reports on investigations where such have been held.—Mr. Kay.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, complaints, and of the evidence given at investigation, if one was held, relating to the dismissal of Mr. A. J. Gosselin, acting preventive officer of customs at St. Albans, Vermont, through the Port of St. Armand, County of Missisquoi.—Mr. Kay.

For a copy of all letters, papers, documents, telegrams, and charges relating to a complaint against Neil Ross, sectionman on the Intercolonial railway at West river, County of Pictou, and of the evidence taken at the investigation of the report of the commissioner thereon, and of all letters, papers or other documents relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the dismissal of Allan Kinney, of Linwood, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, a sectionman on Intercolonial railway, and for a statement in detail of the expenses connected with the investigation of the charges against him.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the dismissal of John McDonnell, Afton station, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, a sectionman on Intercolonial railway, and for a statement in detail of the expenses connected with the investigation of the charges against him.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the dismissal of Huber Myatte, Tracadie, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, a sectionman on Intercolonial railway, and for a statement in detail of the expenses connected with the investigation of the charges against him.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against Jeffrey Crespo, sub-collector of customs at Harbour au Bouche, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, and of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and reports relating in any way to his dismissal, and the appointment of a successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against Angus A. Boyd, postmaster at Boyd's post office, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating in any way to his dismissal, and the appointment of a successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against John B. Macdonald, postmaster at Glassburn, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating in any way to his dismissal, and the appointment of a successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against Alex. G. Chisholm, postmaster at Ohio, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating in any way to his dismissal, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against John J. McLean, postmaster at Cross Roads, Ohio, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating in any way to his dismissal, and the appointment of a successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against Dougald McDonald, postmaster at Doctors Brook, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating in any way to his dismissal, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against Dan A. McInnes, postmaster at Georgeville, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating in any way to his dismissal, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the closing of the post office at Pomquet River, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, and the cancellation of the contract of the carrying of the mail between Heatherton and Pomquet River.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the dismissal of William P. Landry, of Antigonish, Nova Scotia, a sectionman on the Intercolonial railway.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the dismissal of William Landry, of Pomquet, An-

tigonish county, Nova Scotia, a section foreman of the Intercolonial railway, and for a statement in detail of the expenses connected witih the investigation of the charges against him.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the dismissal of Charles Landry, of Pomquet, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, a sectionman on the Intercolonial railway, and for a statement in detail of the expense connected with the investigation of the charges against him.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the dismissal of James Armstrong, of Heatherton, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, as sectionman on the Intercolonial railway, and for a statement in detail of the expenses connected with the investigation of the charges against him.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the dismissal of John Melanson, of Afton, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, a sectionman on the Intercolonial railway, and for a statement in detail of the expenses connected with the investigation of the charges against him.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, documents and reports relating to the dismissal of William R. Fougère, of Frankville, Antigonish county, Nova Scotia, a sectionman on the Intercolonial railway, and for a statement in detail of the expenses connected with the investigation of the charges against him.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Abner Carr, postmaster at St. Francis Harbour, Guysborough county, Nova Scotia, and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relating to the dismissal of John P. Meagher foreman dockhand on steamship Scotia, Mulgrave, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses on such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relating to the dismissal of W. G. Mathews, coxwain, lifeboat crew at Canso, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relating to the dismissal of D. S. Hendsbee, weigher, reduction works, Canso, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relating to the dismissal of A. B. Cox, superintendent of reduction works at Canso, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relating to the dismissal of H. L. Tory, fishery officer at Guysborough, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relating to the dismissal of Richard Conroy, postmaster at Cross roads, Country Harbour, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Murdock McCutcheon, postmaster at Sonora, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of Captain George Livingstone, customs officer at Big Bras D'Or, Cape Breton, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of J. A. McNeil, customs officer at Grand Narrows, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of D. J. McDougall, section foreman, Intercolonial railway, Grand Narrows, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of Hugh D. McEachern, customs officer at North side East bay, Cape Breton, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of Frank Dunlop, post-

master at Groves Point, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of Captain John Arsenault, telegraph line repairer at Alder Point, Cape Breton, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of George Burchell, custom house officer at Sydney Mines, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of John McDonald, freight handler and checker, Intercolonial railway at Sydney Mines, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by P. H. Duchemin, in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of A. R. Forbes, fishery overseer at North Sydney, Nova Scotia in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by P. H. Duchemin, in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of M. Wilson Lawlor, harbour commissioner at North Sydney, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of P. J. McDonald, harbour commissioner at North Sydney, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of William Hackett, harbour commissioner at North Sydney, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents, relative to the dismissal of A. T. Gannan, car repairer and inspector Intercolonial railway at North Sydney, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Richard Hickey, agent Immigration Department at North Sydney, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Henry Cann, customs official and preventive officer at North Sydney, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Mary Dunlop, telegraph operator at Groves Point, Cape Breton county, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Murdock McKenzie, postmaster a Milville, Boularderie, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Richard Dugas, storm signal attendant at Alder Point, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Mrs. John Arsenault, telegraph operator at Alder Point, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of James Grantmyre, preventive officer at Little Bras D'Or, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of William Marsh, preventive officer at Little Pond, Sydney Mines, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Joseph Shean, harbour master at North Sydney, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Abraham Astephen, of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, interpreter Immigration Department, North Sydney, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Dr. J. W. McLean, of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, medical examiner, Immigration Department of North Sydney, Nova Scotia, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a return showing in detail the number of dismissals from public office by the present Government to this date in the constituency of Qu'Appelle, with the names of the dismissed officers and the reason for their dismissal, the complaints against such officials, and a copy of all correspondence, petitions, papers and documents with respect to the same, and of all notes of evidence and reports of investigations in cases where they have taken place.—Mr. Thomson.

For a copy of all correspondence and other documents in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to the dismissal of Hormidas Lacasse as wharfinger on the Government wharf at Wendover, county of Prescott, Ontario, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Proulx.

For a return showing the number of commissions formed by the Government since September 21, 1912, the names and the occupations of the commissioners appointed, their duties, the duration of their services, and their remuneration.—Mr. Devlin.

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, &c., between the Department of Trade and Commerce and any company, person or persons, relative to the continuance and payment of a subsidy towards a steamship service between St. John, N. B., and Bear River, N.S., for the fiscal year 1912, and performed during the fiscal year 1911.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax.)

For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence, &c., between the Department of Trade and Commerce and Mr. Donnelly, late Canadian Trade Commissioner in Mexico, relating to the closing of the office of such Trade Commissioner in Mexico.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, documents, letters, &c., between the Government of Canada and the Commonwealth of Australia for the past twelve months relative to the matter of preferential tariff arrangements between the said two countries.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, documents, petitions, Orders in Council, memoranda, correspondence, &c., by and between the Government of Canada or any member thereof, and the Government of the province of British Columbia, or any member thereof, since May 1, 1912, relating to the subject to an increase of the provincial subsidy to the said province.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a return showing all the mail contracts made between the Post Office Department of Canada and any party or parties, and cancelled before the maturity thereof, from October 14, 1911, to November 15, 1912, designating such cancelled mail contracts by giving the name of the contractor, the amount of the contract, the period of the unexpired service, the name of the district or districts, and the county and province wherein the service was performed together with the reasons for such cancellation.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a return showing all changes made in the customs tariff of Canada by Order in Council since the close of last session of Parliament.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all advertisements, tenders, contracts, Orders in Council, memoranda, papers, letters and correspondence in any way relating to a subsidized steamship service between Canadian ports and any ports of the British West Indies, or any proposed improvement or extension of such steamship services since November 1, 1911, to the present time.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a return showing the quantity and value of molasses of cane, as defined in tariff item No. 137a, imported into Canada for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1912, from each island of the British West Indies which are parties to the Canada West India Trade Agreement.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, documents, appeals, decisions of the Privy Council of Canada, Orders in Council, letters, telegrams, &c., in connection with the appeal from the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada in relation to the location of the station of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway at Hazelton, B.C., and also for a copy of all telegrams, letters, papers and documents sent to or received from the Government of British Columbia or any member thereof, or any company, person or persons in relation to the location of said railway station at Hazelton, B. C.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence between the Department of Public Works and any person or persons relating to the placing of obstructions in the waters of South West Cove, Lunenburg county, N.S. —Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, memoranda, Orders in Council and correspondence relating to the dismissal of A. H. Stratton, late postmaster at Peterboro, Ont.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence, Orders in Council, &c., relative to the dismissal of S. A. Johnson, late postmaster at Petite Rivière, Lunenburg county, N.S. —Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all documents, papers, evidence and correspondence relating to the dismissal of Geoffrey Gorman, coxwain of the life boat station at Herring Cove, Halifax county, N.S.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, documents, evidence, reports, findings and correspondence relating to the dismissal of Mathew Boutilier, recently postmaster of Mushaboom, Halifax county, N.S.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all documents, papers, tenders, contracts, Orders in Council and correspondence in connection with the supply of castings for and the purchase of scrap iron from the Eastern division of the Intercolonial railway since May 1, 1912.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, letters, &c., relating to the matter of the establishment of a lobster hatchery at Spry Bay, Halifax county, N. S.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, letters, &c., relating to a strike of temporary employees of the Intercolonial rail-

way at Halifax in August, 1912.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, documents, petitions, memoranda, correspondence, &c., with the Government of British Columbia or any member thereof, with the fishery officers of the Marine and Fisheries Department resident in said province, with salmon canneries in said province, and with any company, person or persons, relating to the prohibition of the export of sock-eyed salmon from the said province of British Columbia since October 15, 1911.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all petitions, correspondence, memoranda, recommendations and ther papers or documents in the possession of the Department of Marine and Fisheries relating to the proposals to supply medicine or medical attendance free, or otherwise, to Canadian boat fishermen.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, letters, &c., relating to the dismissal of L. P. Carignan, forest ranger in the constituency of Champlain, Quebec.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence referring to the tenders received and the contracts awarded, if any, for the carrying of the mails between Antigonish and Livingstone Cove.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all documents, correspondence and telegrams relating to the dismissal of James Stewart, postmaster, at Middleton, Antigonish county, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all tenders received and the contracts entered into for the carrying of the mails between St. Andrews and Beauly, county of Antigonish, and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence on file in the Post Office Department containing any recommendation or advice regarding the awarding of such contract, or in any way referring thereto.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and correspondence referring in any way to the purchase or leasing of the property in Antigonish, N.S., now in use as a gun shed or store house for the equipment of the 18th Field Battery of Artillery.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of the report made by Mr. Tessier to the Department of Railways and Canals on a proposed line of railway from Orangedale to Cheticamp in the county of Inverness; and also of all petitions, memorials and correspondence referring to said proposed line of railway.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a return showing. 1. The names of all light-keepers in the province of Nova Scotia who were dismissed from office or employment since October 10, 1911, together with the date of each dismissal.

2. The names and location, by place and county, of lights from which such light-keepers have been dismissed.

3. The cause assigned in each case for the dismissal of such lightkeepers respectively. —Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For the copy of all papers, documents, memoranda, Orders in council, letters and correspondence, relating in any way to the closing of the Canadian Immigration office at Boston, U.S.A., in 1911, and its subsequent re-establishment.

For a copy of all papers, telegrams, letters and Orders in Council respecting the transfer of the property known as the Police Point reserve to the corporation of the city of Medicine Hat, Alberta.—Mr. Buchanan.

For a copy of all correspondence and other papers connected with the removal of Harry A. Drigg, from the position of postmaster at Grassy lake, Alberta.—Mr. Buchanan.

Copy of all complaints, accusations, inquiries, reports, correspondenec, and of all documents relating to the dismissal of Lucien O. Thisdale, a customs employee at Valleyfield, Quebec, and to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Papineau.

Copy of the accounts of Jean Baptiste Lona, and of his wife for work done to the public buildings at Valleyfield, Quebec, in May, 1912; also for a copy of all correspondence, reports and documents relating to the payment in full or a part of their accounts. —Mr. Papineau.

Copy of all correspondence, complaints, reports and all documents relating to the cancelling of lease No. 18778, consented to by the Honourable Minister of Railways and Canals, to Aurile Lebeuf on 12th December, 1910.—Mr. Papineau.

Copy of all complaints, accusations, correspondence, petitions and of all documents and reports respecting the dismissal of Antonin Leduc, postmaster of St. Timothé, in the county of Beauharnois and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Papineau.

Return showing the names of the employees on the dining cars of the Intercolonial railway and the nature of their employment; and also of the employees on the Pullman cars of the Intercolonial railway and the nature of their employment.—Mr. Boulay.

Return showing the detail and number of dismissals from public offices by the present Government to this date in the riding of Saskatoon, with the names of the dismissed occupants, the reasons for their dismissals, the complaints against such officials, and all correspondence with respect to the same, and of all reports of investigations, in cases where such were held.—Mr. McCraney.

Copy of all documents, papers, memoranda, rulings, findings, appeals and correspondence relating to any appeal asserted from any decision, ruling or finding of the Board of Railway Commissioners to the Privy Council of Canada, and the action taken by the Privy Council thereon.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Copy of all papers, documents, memoranda and correspondence relating to the application of the Banque Internationale to the Treasury Board for a certificate for the commencement of business.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Copy of all papers, documents, correspondence, &c., relating to the dismissal of John Ware of the Immigration Branch of the Interior Department at Halifax, N.S.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

Copy of all letters, papers charges and correspondence between the Department of customs and all other persons regarding the dismissal from office of Thomas Cameron, preventive officer at Andover, N.B., and also of all evidence and reports thereon with re-

ference to the dismissal of the said officer.—Mr. Michaud.

Return showing all the public officers of the Inland Revenue Department in the county of St Jean Iberville, removed by the present Government since 1st May, 1912, together with the names and duties of such persons, the reasons of their dismissal, the nature of the complaints against them, the names of the persons who brought these complaints; also a copy of all correspondence relating thereto, and of the reports of enquiries in the cases where such have been held.—Mr. Demers.

Copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams relating to the dismissal of J. N. N. Poirier, collector of Excise at Victoriaville, Quebec, and also of the inquiry made by N. Garceau, by the Minister of Inland Revenue, and respectively of two affidavits given by Ludger Frechette.—Mr. Brouillard.

For a copy of all correspondence, telegrams, and reports relating to the dismissal of Colin Macdonald, of James River Station, county of Antigonish as Intercolonial Railway sectionman, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

On motion of Mr. Borden the House adjourned at 11.08 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 10, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE SENATE—ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.

On motion of Mr. Borden, it was ordered that the House go into Committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide for two additional members of the Senate from each of the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, and for three additional members of the Senate from the province of British Columbia.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BOND PURCHASE.

On motion of Mr. White (Minister of Finance), it was ordered that the House go into Committee to-morrow to consider the following propsed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize and empower the Governor in Council to purchase at par from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company such of the three per cent bonds of the company the issue and sale of which is provided for by Chapter 98 of the Statutes of 1905, and the deed of trust set forth in schedule 'A' to said Chapter 98, as may be unsold at the time of the passing of an Act that may be founded on this resolution.

FREIGHT RATES ON HAY.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. EMMERSON: Has any action been taken in connection with the freight rates on hay from Quebec to the Eastern provinces? I have a telegram from the secretary of the Board of Trade from Sackville, New Brunswick, as follows:

Sackville, N.B., Dec. 9.

The Hon. H. R. Emmerson, M. P.
Ottawa, Ont.:

Insistent rumour current in Sackville and Amherst that Intercolonial recently has put in force greatly reduced rate on hay from Quebec points to Sydney; matter has provoked great deal of resentment among farmers in this vicinity; report from credible sources.

I desire to know if this is true, and what action has been taken by the Government with respect to freight rates on hay, either temporary or permanent.

Mr. BORDEN: No action has been taken up to the present time.

ROYAL NORTHWEST MOUNTED POLICE

Bill No. 24, to amend the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act—Mr. Borden—read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

On Section 1—appointment of comptroller and officers:

Mr. OLIVER: Has it been brought to the Premier's attention that there is a reason for the appointment of an assistant commissioner for each of the two provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, not necessarily to be specified in the Bill, but that there should be, in practice, an officer of the force actually resident at the capital of each province, such capital being, of course, the centre of the administration of the law for that province so that a more intimate touch could be kept between the force and the provincial administration of law?

Mr. BORDEN: That has not been brought to my attention, but, as my hon. friend now suggests it, I shall be very glad to discuss it with the permanent head of the force and with the commissioner.

Mr. OLIVER: I am surprised that the matter has not been brought to his attention, as it has been the subject of very considerable discussion between the provincial Government of Alberta and the late Government. It was represented that the absence of any high authority of the force at the centre of the administration of law in the province of Alberta had resulted in more or less serious delays in the transmission of requisitions and orders between

the provincial authorities and the police. I do not like to urge the matter, but I will be glad to have the Prime Minister looked carefully into it. I am satisfied there would be a great advantage in the administration of the force if that change were made.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not recollect this matter being brought to my attention, and I am informed by the acting head of the department that it has not been. He informs me, however, that the subject has been under consideration by the acting permanent head, and I think they have in mind at the present time the considerations which my hon. friend has urged. I would gather that these considerations have impressed themselves in a somewhat favourable way upon those who are responsible for the administration of the department. I cannot say more than that at the present.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I happen to be somewhat familiar with the question, because I was for some years responsible for the administration of this department, and I discussed it many a time with the comptroller. It is altogether a matter of discipline. As everybody knows, the discipline of the force has been maintained at a very high standard, and that is done simply because the organization is perfect in itself, and because the commissioner is absolutely responsible. There has been some local jealousy between Alberta and Saskatchewan. The headquarters of the force is stationed in Saskatchewan, and Alberta not unnaturally feels a little jealous. At one time the suggestion was made to me that there should be two commissioners, one for Alberta and one for Saskatchewan, a suggestion which I absolutely rejected and I suppose my right hon. friend would be similarly advised by his officers. Then, it was suggested that there might be a deputy for Saskatchewan and a deputy for Alberta. For my part, that is a suggestion to which I would not be favourable.

Mr. BORDEN: I would be very glad at some future time to consult with my hon. friend in a private way. I might be fortunate enough to gather something that would be of use from his experience as to the administration of the force.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—rank and duties of comptroller:

Mr. BORDEN: This is really for the purpose of making the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act conform with the existing practice. The salary of $5,000 has been voted from year to year, but the statute has remained unamended. This is to make it conform with the practice.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—pay of force to be fixed by Governor in Council:

Mr. OLIVER: In regard to the working pay to artisans and others specially employed, I take it that that is in addition to the regular pay.

Mr. BORDEN: Yes. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) asked me for some information as to the present strength of the force. At the beginning of September the strength of the force was 654. The estimates for the last year provided for a strength of 700, and the acting permanent head of the force recommended some time ago that authority should be given for increasing the force to 760. He bases that recommendation upon the existence of very numerous requests from newly settled portions of territory, with very few of which he has been able to comply. On that account he thought it desirable, and in his recommendation I concur, that the force should be increased to 760.

On section 4—subsection 2—extra pay:

Mr. OLIVER: When mention was made of this proposed amendment in the newspapers, the clause which has just been read was represented as being somewhat different in its scope from what it appears in the Bill. In order that there may be no mistake about its purport I would respectfully ask the Prime Minister for an explanation.

Mr. BORDEN: The change in the law in that respect is this: Section 21, subsection 2, as it stands in the Act at present, is as follows:

The Governor in Council may authorize extra pay and allowances to be paid to members of the force serving in the Northwest territories and the Yukon territory.

We have added a few words, so that the clause as proposed reads as follows:

The Governor in Council may authorize extra pay and allowances to be paid to members of the force employed as detectives, and to those serving in the Northwest territories and the Yukon territory.

As I stated the other day men who seem qualified for detective work are selected from time to time for that work. They are trained in that work, and acquire skill, but their renumeration is so inadequate, compared with what they can obtain elsewhere, after they become so trained and experienced, that instead of re-enlisting to serve the Crown in that capacity with very great effect, they go elsewhere, and other men have to be brought on and trained. Therefore, it was recommended by the acting per-

manent head of the force, whose recommendation was concurred in by the commissioner, that provision should be made so that these men can be remunerated more adequately in connection with the very important duties which they discharge. That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. OLIVER: This applies only to enlisted men?

Mr. BORDEN: Only to enlisted men.

Subsection agreed to.

Bill reported.

CANADIAN-WEST INDIAN TRADE AGREEMENT.

Hon. Geo. E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved that the House go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide as follows:

1. That the agreement of the ninth day of April, one thousand nine hundred and twelve entered into at Ottawa by representatives appointed by the Government of Canada and by the representatives of the West Indian colonies, parties thereto, be approved.

2. That there shall be levied, collected and paid after the said agreement is in accordance with its terms brought into operation, and so long as it remains in force, on all goods enumerated in Schedule B to the said agreement being the produce or manufacture of any of the colonies, parties thereto, when such goods are imported direct from any British country into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein if imported as aforesaid, duties of customs——

(a) At the rate of four-fifths of the several rates of duties, if any, imposed on similar goods when imported from any foreign country; or

(b) at the several rates of duties, if any, set opposite to each item respectively, or charged on goods as not enumerated in the column British Preferential Tariff, in Schedule A to the Customs Tariff, 1907, and in any amendment thereof whichever shall be the lower rate.

3. That nothing in the next preceding paragraph shall affect the rates of duties of customs payable on raw sugar when imported into Canada or taken out of warehouse for consumption therein, to which the rates of duties of customs provided by tariff item 135b in Schedule A to the Customs Tariff, 1907, as amended by chapter 10 of the statutes of 1909 apply.

4. That on and after a date to be named in a proclamation published at such time as the Governor in Council deems expedient in The Canada Gazette, the goods, enumerated in Schedule B to the said agreement shall only be entitled to the advantages or concessions provided for when such goods are conveyed by ship direct without transhipment into a sea or river port of Canada from any one of the respective colonies party to the said agreement or from one of the other colonies while entitled to the said advantages or concessions under the provisions thereof.

5. That before the discretion granted to the Governor in Council by the next preceding paragraph has been exercised provision shall be made for an effective control of rates of freight in all steamship subsidy contracts to which Canada is a party and under which steamers ply between ports in Canada and ports in the colonies which are entitled to the advantages or concessions hereby provided.

6. That the advantages or concessions granted to the colonies, parties to the said agreement, shall extend to the other colonies enumerated in Schedule D, to the said agreement for the period of three years from the date on which the said agreement shall according to its tenor come into operation.

7. That the advantages or concessions granted to the colonies, parties to the said agreement, shall extend to the United Kingdom and such of the other British colonies and possessions as may be admitted thereto by proclamation published in The Canada Gazette, so long as the colonies, parties to the said agreement, continue to be entitled to such advantages or concessions; provided, however, that nothing herein shall be held to diminish any advantages which the United Kingdom and British colonies and possessions enjoy under the British preferential tariff.

8. That the Governor in Council may make such rules and regulations as are deemed necessary to carry out the provisions and intent hereof and the said agreement.

9. That the operation of all laws inconsistent with the giving to the provisions hereof, and of the said agreement their full effect shall from time to time be suspended to the extent of such inconsistency.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce informs me, what I rather thought was the case, that the treaty has not yet been printed, and is not available for the general use of members of the House. In view of the importance of the matter I would ask my hon. friend if he would not think it desirable that the members should acquaint themselves with the terms of the treaty and that therefore it might be desirable that the resolution should stand over for a short time until the treaty has been printed and distributed.

Mr. FOSTER: The resolution is but a step in the routine and in its essential parts, is a transcript of the Bill. I suppose that it would be more businesslike and would perhaps be in accordance with the wishes of the House to defer the discussion until the Bill itself is before the House. I do not propose to go on with the second reading until the papers are printed and in possession of hon. members, but I would like to have the resolution passed. There were some copies of the agreement and of the doings of the delegation that met here printed privately and

these have been distributed as far as they would go. Some members on each side of the House have received copies, but I should think that we could go on with the resolution and pass it. Then, I will introduce the Bill and the Bill will be before members of Parliament and we will not go any further with it until all the papers are before the House.

Mr. CARVELL: That seems to be a reasonable suggestion but, in the meantime, would it not be possible for the minister to state what changes are proposed in the Canadian customs tariff except the general change on dutiable articles owing to the one-fifth preference which is granted? Unfortunately, we have not the text of the agreement in our hands and, as I understand, there are to be some additions to the general duties imposed by the Canadian tariff as well as some decreases. I would like if the minister could give us that information.

Mr. FOSTER: We are dealing now entirely with the agreement between Canada and the West Indies. All that is involved in the agreement, as far as the agreement itself is concerned, is contained in the agreement itself and is embodied as it is proposed in the resolution. As a result of the agreement, when it has been passed by the House, there are some few adjustments that will have to be made in the tariff on some three, four or five articles.

Mr. CARVELL: I thought that possibly the minister could give us those articles.

Mr. FOSTER: The article as sugar, for instance, will have to have some adjustment in the general tariff, the articles of cocoa, lime juice, arrowroot and may be one other will also require some slight reduction but the changes will not involve anything very extended.

Mr. EMMERSON: Adjustment downward or upward?

Mr. FOSTER: Well, that will depend. These adjustments will be made in a tariff Act that will be brought down later by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, but when we come to them we can discuss those branches of the subject. What we do is to give a preference to the West Indies in three other articles and, in order to give them a preference on those articles, which are now on the free list, we have to place a duty upon them when coming from foreign countries. On cocoa beans, for instance there will have to be a general duty of not less than 75 cents per 100 pounds and that will enable the colonies that raise cocoa beans to have an advantage of this market which they could not otherwise have. Lime juice, concentrated, not refined, now free, is to be not less than 5 cents a gallon. Limes, fresh, which are now free are to be not less than 10 per cent ad valorem when imported from foreign countries. With reference to these three articles, the duty will be arranged so that a preference can be given to the colonies, that produce these more as staples. Generally speaking, what we found was that there were different climatic conditions, differences of soil and, therefore, different productions. What we wanted to do and what the colonies wished to have done was to have, in each one of them, some interest in which they would get the advantage of a preference in return for the preference that they gave to Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think it would be better for the minister to allow the House to go into Committee of the Whole and to make his explanations then because I would like to ask him a few questions and it is very difficult to do it now.

Mr. FOSTER: Yes, when we go into committee we will have a chance for conversation, but I was answering the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell), who wished to know what the few proposed readjustments in the tariff would be. I was going on to explain with reference to sugar. The House will remember that there was an arrangement by which the refiners of this country were allowed to bring in at the preferential rate from foreign countries an amount equal to 20 per cent of the produce that they refined during the year. We propose to do away with that arrangement and that is why the adjustment in the sugar duties will be made necessary. Having answered these questions, perhaps my hon. friend will think it best that any other questions which he wants to ask should be deferred until we go into Committee on resolution.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee.

On paragraph 2:

Mr. FOSTER: I wish to insert in (b) the word 'tariff' before the word 'item,' so as to make it read: 'to each tariff item respectively.' After the word 'respectively' I wish to have stricken out the words 'or charged on goods as not enumerated,' which appear to be surplusage.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): This seems quite complicated and I desire information. As I understand it, when Canada in 1898 gave a preference to the British West Indies under the Canadian Customs Act of

that year, it was always expected that in consideration of that, the British West Indies would some day give us preferential treatment in her markets. I think it was always the expectation that we would get that without any further consideration than that contained in our own British preferential tariff. That is, that in the event of an agreement being made, all we would expect from the British West Indies would be a preference rate in their tariff and that ours would remain as it is, as under it the British West Indies were already getting special terms. Under this agreement, I am not quite clear whether it is the intention of the Government to ask for the establishment of a further preferential rate with the West Indies in addition to the British preferential rate. If this agreement comes into force, will it happen in connection with any item mentioned in the schedule, that the British West Indies will obtain a greater preference from Canada than is contained in our preferential tariff; or, will it be, with a few exceptions, our general tariff rate, minus the twenty per cent or the preference rate, whichever will be the lower ?

Mr. FOSTER: I will explain that. It is true as my hon. friend says that in 1889 Canada gave a preference to the West Indies and has continued it up to the present time. It is not intended by this agreement to take away from the West Indies the privilege of the preference which they have enjoyed for that time, and which they enjoy at present. They have agreed to give us a preference in return, and when the mutual preference came up alongside of it, there was the question as to how long the agreement should remain in force, and it was decided that it should remain in force for ten years.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is our present preferential tariff.

Mr. FOSTER: That is the preference provided in present agreement that we are now discussing. What is guaranteed is, that during that period of 10 years the West Indian colonies, parties to this arrangement shall not receive less preference than is stipulated for in this agreement which is 20 per cent, roughly speaking, less than the duties exacted from foreign countries. That is the guarantee in the agreement. At the present time they are receiving a greater preference than that, and it is not the intention that they shall be deprived of the greater preference they are getting now and have been getting for the last 15 years and which is being granted to Great Britain and numerous other parts of the Empire. By this agreement, they have the certainty that for ten years their preference shall never go below one-fifth; that is, that they shall not pay higher duties coming into Canada than four-fifths of what is paid on foreign imports. So much for that. That is provided for in (a).

(a) At the rate of four-fifths of the several rates of duties, if any, imposed on similar goods when imported from any foreign country;

To retain for them the advantages which they have been having for the last fifteen years and which we purpose they shall continue to have so long as this Parliament thinks it is right they shall, clause (b) is introduced:

(b) At the several rates of duties, if any, set opposite to each tariff item respectively, in the column British Preferential Tariff, in Schedule A to the Customs Tariffff, 1907, and in any amendment thereof whichever shall be the lower rate.

If four-fifths of the duty on the importation from a foreign country is lower than the preference rate, they get that; if the preference rate granted to a British country is lower than four-fifths of the duty imposed upon importations from a foreign country, they get the lower rate.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Then the agreement is merely an undertaking on the part of Canada to continue the British preferential rate to the British West Indies for a fixed period?

Mr. FOSTER: To continue the rates provided therein for ten years.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Our preferential rate now applies to a great many other British colonies.

Mr. FOSTER: Maybe my hon. friend might misunderstand my last remark. Did he mean to ask whether this was a guarantee that for ten years they should receive the present preferential rate?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, the preferential rate whatever it may be.

Mr. FOSTER: That is right.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is to be no further tariff schedule applicable to the British West Indies under this agreement; the present British preferential tariff will continue not as to rate but as to principle.

Mr. FOSTER: That is so, and conversely the West Indian colonies give a guarantee of preference on importations from Canada. The colonies or Canada may make such changes as they like in their own tariff laws provided the minimum preference is maintained.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There are other British colonies, such as British

India, Ceylon, the Straits Settlements, and the South African Commonwealth, which are entitled to the British preferential tariff——

Mr. FOSTER : And remain so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): They are entitled to the same preference in the British West Indian markets as Canada is under this treaty, and vice versa.

Mr. EMMERSON : As I understand it, they asked for a guarantee of ten years of the present preference, and that it was finally agreed on the part of Canada that the guarantee would be given with respect to the twenty per cent for ten years, but no guarantee would be given with regard to the greater preference which they now enjoy.

Mr. FOSTER : So far as the agreement concerning the ten-year period is concerned it simply goes this far, that during that ten years we shall always give them say, one-fifth preference, and during that time they shall always give us one-fifth preference. But during that time we may give them more than one-fifth if we like, and they may give us more than one-fifth if they like.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I asked a question a few minutes ago, and I think I may look for an answer here. I do not understand why Newfoundland is mentioned in Schedule 'D.' As I read it, that practically means that Newfoundland may send its sugar, coffee, cotton, sponges and things of that kind——

Mr. FOSTER : And bananas.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): ——and bananas, into Canada at the same rate that the British West India people do, and that Canada may send fish into Newfoundland at the same rate at which we send the same products into the British West Indies. I think that is the true interpretation of the agreement and schedule so far as Newfoundland is concerned, and it strikes me that there must be some error there.

Mr. FOSTER : We were not making a treaty with Newfoundland. This agreement is between ourselves and the West India islands participating in the agreement.

Mr. LEMIEUX : Can the hon. minister give us a list of the islands?

Mr. FOSTER : The hon. member means the islands concerned ? The list is Trinidad, British Guiana—which is part of the West Indies,—Barbados, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Antigua, St. Kitts, Dominica and Montserrat. The privileges of the arrangement for three years are extended to the Bahamas, Bermuda, British Honduras, Grenada and Jamaica. These colonies and Newfoundland are to enjoy for a limited time the benefit of the agreement so far as Canada is concerned.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I assume that they get it without any reciprocal arrangement on their part.

Mr. FOSTER: That would depend as far as the West India Colonies parties to the agreement. The delegates from the West Indies were not empowered to make an arrangement with Newfoundland nor were we making an arrangement with Newfoundland. But it is the intention of the West Indian colonies to admit British countries—I believe that is their intention —on the same terms as they admit Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is not expressed in the agreement.

Mr. FOSTER: It could not be expressed, because they were not making a treaty with Newfoundland. Now, my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) asks if Newfoundland was included here, because she would get much advantage out of this arrangement on her exports of like goods to Canada. Great changes in climate may take place, but of course it is not likely that in ten years Newfoundland will be in the banana belt. But Newfoundland was put in rather to show good will. I believe what is intended in the West Indies is that the products of Newfoundland shall receive the same treatment in the West Indies as the products of Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not object to putting Newfoundland in if it were put in the right place. If there has been an error, I merely wish to point it out so that there may be a correction. I would refer the hon. gentleman to clause 3:

> The conditions granted under section 2 by Canada to any of the above-mentioned colonies shall be extended to all the other colonies enumerated in Schedule B.

Now, the articles which are to be admitted into Canada at preferential rate under this agreement are enumerated in Schedule B, and they are altogether the products of tropical countries such as the West Indies. But reading this clause along with Schedule D, it means that Newfoundland shall be entitled to ship products such as sugar, sugar cane, cocoanuts, sponges, into Canada at the same rate of duty as the British West Indies under this agreement. That is obviously absurd, because Newfoundland does not produce any of the articles mentioned in Schedule D. I merely point it out, because if it was the intention of the parties to the agreement that Newfoundland products should enter the West Indies on the same terms as the Canadian

products it should be so expressed, and there is time yet to make that clear.

Mr. FOSTER: I do not think that could be expressed, because the West Indian delegates were here to arrange with Canada and not with Newfoundland. Whatever they did for Newfoundland——

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Why was it put in Schedule D then? Was it to show good intentions?

Mr. FOSTER: Let us say that it was to show goodwill and sisterhood.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Why not make another schedule?

Mr. FOSTER: It is not necessary to do that. My hon. friend does not pretend that it will work any injury to Canada. It may have a little effect in disposing the people of the West India islands all the more willingly to admit the products of Newfoundland to their countries at the same rates. However, as I said, Newfoundland was included in the agreement, and we here cannot change the agreement. If my hon. friend can show that there is any very great danger to Canada in the matter, it might be worth while to revise the agreement, but that would take a different process from what we can bring into force here.

Mr. BICKERDIKE: Is it the intention under the agreement that the preference shall only apply to goods coming to Canadian ports?

Mr. FOSTER: We will come to that a little later and my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) will see what we mean when we come to it.

Mr. LOGGIE: If I understand the minister correctly, we are to receive for three years the goods from Jamaica at a reduced rate of duty. Does Jamaica in turn receive goods from Canada at a lower rate of duty during that period than from foreign countries?

Mr. FOSTER: There are certain parties to this agreement. The West Indian colonies, the names of which I read to the committee, are the only ones in the West Indies that are parties to the agreement. Jamaica is not a party, and so is not bound by the terms of the agreement. We have for fifteen years been giving a preference to Jamaica, the Bahamas, Bermuda, and Honduras, and it would probably be a hardship if those colonies which are not parties to the agreement should have a continued preference in our markets without giving any concessions in return. But both parties to the negotiations were decidedly of the opinion that the door should not be shut at the present time, and that for three years the treatment accorded to Jamaica, the Bahamas, Bermuda, and Honduras, should be the same as it has been in the past.

On paragraph 3:

Mr. FOSTER: If my hon. friend (Mr. Pugsley) will refer to the Tariff Act, he will find that, as amended in 1907, section 135 (b) makes a provision by which the refiners of beet sugar manufactured from beets raised in Canada have the privilege of importing a certain quantity of sugar from foreign countries at a reduced rate. That legislation does not expire till 1914. and this agreement makes no change in regard thereto, the provision in section 3 being framed to meet that case. The undertaking of the Canadian Government is that when this legislation runs out in 1914, there shall be an adjustment to meet that case rather than the one provided for in section 135 (b).

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But you are under obligations not to renew it when it expires?

Mr. FOSTER: We guarantee that it shall not extend beyond the period of the present legislation.

On paragraph 4:

Mr. FOSTER: The proclamation referred to in paragraph 4 has reference to this item, and not to the whole Act. Sections 4 and 5 of the Act will not be operative until they are proclaimed to be in force. This proclamation may be issued some time during the period of the treaty, or it may not. If at any time it becomes apparent, after a consultation, that the traffic arrangements between Canada and West Indian ports are such as to form a reasonable foundation for the proclamation, then, if an agreement is reached in the matter, and control of rates is established, a proclamation may be issued which will make it necessary that to obtain the preference either in West Indian colonies or in Canada, the goods must come direct to a port in Canada, or go direct from Canada to a port in the West Indian Islands. This matter was fully discussed in committee, and it was felt that a good deal of care ought to be taken with reference thereto. It would not be advantageous to West Indian ports, under present conditions existing in regard to steam communication between those islands and Canada, that they should be denied the privilege of sending goods to Canada in bond through the United States. They were of the opinion, however, that as soon as these communications were reasonably established, the subject might then be taken up, and if concurrence was had—as Canada would not like to act without the consent of the West Indies, and vice

versa—and provided also that there was a fair and proper control of rates, it would be advantageous to both countries, and conduce to the benefit of traffic between them, if such a condition of affairs was brought about by proclamation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Mr. Chairman, agreeing as I do with the practice of limiting this preference, as well as the British preference, to goods coming by water direct to Canadian ports, I should have been glad if my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce could have held out to us the hope that at an early date this proclamation would be issued. But, on the contrary, my hon. friend suggests that the proclamation may issue at some time during the existence of this treaty, or it may not. As this treaty is to last for ten years, the promise is not a very satisfactory one. Why should it not be possible to secure an efficient and proper service between Canadian and West Indian ports, and to do so in the almost immediate future? Why should we have, year after year, an unsatisfactory service which renders it desirable for our people, when they want to go to the West Indies, to proceed to New York and take a steamer there, and makes it advantageous for them to ship their goods by way of New York? Why should not this freight and passenger business be done through Canadian ports? Is Canada too poor to inaugurate such a service as will be suitable for the conveying of passengers and freight under satisfactory conditions? We have millions of dollars to spend for other purposes; why should we not spend a few hundred thousand dollars, if need be, for the purpose of establishing a proper and satisfactory service between the principal ports of the Maritime provinces and the West Indies the whole year round, and St. Lawrence river ports during the summer months? It is provided in paragraph 5.

That before the discretion granted to the Governor in Council by the next preceding paragraph has been exercised provision shall be made for an effective control of rates of freight in all steamship subsidy contracts to which Canada is a party and under which steamers ply between ports in Canada and ports in the colonies which are entitled to the advantages or concessions hereby provided.

What is to hinder my hon. friend from having to-morrow an effective control of freight rates? This Government is to day giving a subsidy to steamers plying to the West Indies. Probably that subsidy is not sufficient to secure a good service but it is quite within the power of the minister to impose conditions which will give an effective control over the rates and compel the companies to make those rates just as satisfactory as the rates between the West Indies and the port of New York. Therefore it seems to me that unless my hon. friend has had this provision put in the treaty merely to hold out to the people of the Maritime provinces and to the city of Montreal, and Quebec, the hope that this preference will be given some time, I think my hon. friend ought not to be so vague in his statement as to when this proclamation is likely to be issued, and effective steps ought to be taken in the near future to so limit the preference as to give Canadian ports what I think is only a legitimate advantage. Too long has Canada allowed imports from England and the West Indies to come into Canada by way of American ports, Portland, Boston and New York, and I think the time has come, especially now that we have negotiated this treaty with the West Indies and Parliament is asked to approve of it, when effective and determined steps should be taken to secure, as far as possible, the bringing of imports from those islands through Canadian ports.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend has raised some interesting questions. I shall not use a tu quoque argument but I notice a few things as a reply to his questions: Why has not this been done, why has not that been done? That was a question which troubled my hon. friend during the whole time he was a member of the Government in power and the Government did take action, and had very strong support from Great Britain for ten or eleven years when Great Britain implemented the subsidy which Canada was giving by a very handsome amount, paying, I think, one half of the whole subsidy. That held for fifteen years, and at the end of the fifteen years there was still not only not an efficient service, but I am not characterizing it too strongly when I say an inefficient service between Canada and the West Indies. I go back a little further. When I was first Minister of Marine and Fisheries I took up the question of this subsidy with the West Indies; I was the first minister to subsidize a line there. I worked at the problem during the period I was in office and the Government of which I was a member worked at it, but it was not solved. For fifteen years after that, with a treasury overflowing, and a gentleman with just such strong sentiments on this point as my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley)—having a very strong influence on that Government he could not say, when that Government went out, that an efficient and proper service was carried on between Canada and the West Indies. I will not give way by a single letter or syllable to my hon. friend in saying that, if it were possible,

all the goods that come overseas to Canada should come through Canadian ports. I believe in that principle, and just as soon as and as fast as it can be done without doing injury to the trade of Canada—because we must recollect that we have certain climatic and geographical conditions which place us at some disadvantage, and which we have to overcome by greater energy and enterprise, and also by greater cost of service—I am strongly of the opinion that it ought to be done. But to-day the condition of the service between this country and the West Indies is not such as to warrant the proclamation issuing immediately when this agreement goes into effect.

My hon. friend, as he thinks of the service as it is to-day, must also be of that opinion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I complain of is the long delay my hon. friend seems to fore-shadow.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend complains of himself. He had fifteen years and did nothing effective and yet he complains of my year's delay. Fifteen parts of that complaint my hon. friend must direct to himself. The other one-part he may direct to me. But what has been done?

The committee will recollect that last year I brought down quite a large vote for improved steamship service and we debated the question in the House and practically agreed on what we thought ought to be the basis of an efficient service between this country and the West Indies.

The House willingly voted the amount I asked. I asked for tenders and the tenders came in some time in October. When those tenders were opened, for whatever reason I am not quite ready to say, but there must have been several reasons, they were not sufficient, to my mind, to insure us the required service. There was not a breadth of competition and there was not a detail of conditions which made those tenders to my mind what the department required and what I thought the country would require. I therefore extended the time to the fifteenth of December. I hope we shall then get wider and better tenders. We shall see what we can get at that time. Just at this present time it is a little more difficult than it was a few years ago, to get steamships to enter into a new contract for improved services between the West Indian islands and Canada. The position of the shipping trade to-day is so good that every one is occupied and every ship is loaded and there is not the same desire and facility to engage in new operations as outlined in the trade conditions between ourselves and the West Indies. But I hope we shall get effective tenders and if we do I can assure the committee that the service will be put into operation as soon as possible. But we may just as well open our eyes to it, there are difficulties in conducting a steamship service between Canada and the West Indies. I have met them, my hon. friends met them when they were in office and they are there to-day. The conditions under the preference will be more favourable than ever they were before and I hope we will be able to conquer these difficulties and get an efficient service. The West Indian people say: We get a preference from you but if you tie us down to direct shipments it is possible that the steamships will take all of that preference and we will get none; therefore, before we agree to direct shipment, we must have some control over the rates; we cannot control the rates in the West Indies, therefore we must ask Canada, which has an equal interest in the matter, to control the rates. My hon. friend says we have control of the rates. So we have; wherever we subsidize steamers we have a clause which gives the department or the minister a certain control over rates. It is a difficult thing to operate as my hon. friend probably knows, and I have been greatly puzzled to know what efficient modus operandi could be put into effect in order to get at the basis of information and to enforce that control. There must be some control or else we are likely to lose all the benefit of the preference because of increased rates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there only one subsidized line?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes. It goes around the rim of the islands, from St. John and Halifax down to British Guiana.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We all remember that when the late Government asked Parliament to ratify the treaty with France, there was a provision in that treaty that the preference given to France would apply only to goods brought direct through a Canadian port. Some people said that this was going to be very unsatisfactory to Canada because there would be difficulties about steamship service, and the Intercolonial railway was not competent to give quick dispatch, and so on. A great many objections were raised, but the treaty was put through with that clause in it, and to-day, as I understand it, the preference given to France applies only to goods brought direct through Canadian ports. Has my hon. friend heard of any special dissatisfaction resulting from that arrangement?

Mr. FOSTER: No. The arrangement is a little wider than my hon. friend makes it. It is not confined to shipments direct

from a French port to a Canadian port and vice versa.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Direct to a Canadian port.

Mr. FOSTER: They may come through Great Britain or through countries that have favoured nation treatment, which enlarges it somewhat. But I cannot say, so far as I have informed my mind upon it, that I have heard any expression of discontent. But that was a basic condition upon which the French treaty was made, and you could not have made a French treaty on any other condition. I think there is some difference between the position of France and Canada, and the position of the West Indies and Canada, taking into account our present methods of steamship service.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): While I am disposed to agree with the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) in saying, as I think he did say, that before goods imported from the United Kingdom could enjoy our preferential tariff these importations should enter through Canadian ports, I am also disposed to agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce that, for the present at least, it would be impossible and inadvisable to put into operation this particular clause of the West India-Canada agreement. The whole agreement is rather (an indifferent) value to this country, or, to put it in another way, by reason of this agreement I do not hope to see any abnormal development of trade between the British West Indies and Canada. Without this agreement, there would be a gradual growth in that trade, but the agreement will not in itself develop that trade very rapidly. Whether it is a success or not will largely depend upon the character of the steamship service in operation between Canada and the British West Indies.

Mr. FOSTER: Quite correct.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think our trade in the past has been injured, in some degree at least, by reason of the fact that the steamship service between Canada and the West Indies was not very well arranged and also owing to the uncertain ity of the tenure of subsidies held by steamship companies. It would seem almost imperative that the minister should let Parliament know, at least it is desirable that we should know, if possible what the steamship service between Canada and the West Indies will be before we can pass judgment upon this agreement. At all events, upon the probable effects of the agreement. It is unfortunate, of course, that the minister has had to postpone dealing with the tenders, or rather that he has delayed the period for the reception of the tenders until December 15. Had those tenders been received and dealt with by the minister prior to this date, it would have been much easier to gauge the possible results of this agreement. I do not think it will ever be possible for the Government to obtain from any person or persons or from any company tenders which will meet his desires under the conditions set forth in the tenders issued by the department. For instance tenders were asked for an alternative service between Montreal and the British West Indies. Now, with all due deference to the Minister of Trade and Commerce and to the officers of his department, I say it is utterly impossible for any steamship service operating between Montreal and the British West Indies to secure any traffic that will warrant any great expenditure of money, and such a service would not be of any special value to the western portions of Canada, Ontario and the provinces west. I wish to submit, not because I represent a constituency which has practically built up the greater part of the trade between Canada and the West Indies, namely, the port of Halifax, but for higher and wider considerations, that if ever a satisfactory steamship service is established between the West Indies and Canada it must be a service of steamships departing from and arriving at the port of Halifax.

Mr. FOSTER: Has not my hon. friend got into another discussion?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not going to elaborate the question at the present time I shall return to it on another occasion. Just at present, the steamship service which we have, provides for calls at St. John on the inward voyage before reaching Halifax, and for calls at St. John on the outward voyage after leaving Halifax, and the result is a service that is not satisfactory to either St. John or Halifax, nor can it ever be satisfactory so long as this system continues. It would be better for the Government to give a subsidy, of the same amount if necessary for a direct service from each of the ports of Halifax and St. John, and if the Government feels impressed with the claims of Montreal, it might give that service the same subsidy, or give no subsidy to any steamship service at all. Possibly by not giving a subsidy to any steamship line the difficulty would be solved all the more readily, and perhaps it would be better for the future. I had hoped that before this agreement was presented to Parliament in the shape of a Bill that we would have had some information from the Government as to the disposition made by the department respecting the tenders for

a steamship service between Canada and the West Indies.

Mr. CARVELL: I am sorry the minister does not see his way clear to bring into effect at once that portion of the agreement which provides that goods coming into Canada under this preference should come through Canadian ports. But I realize there are many difficulties in his way, and I think the minister has taken the House fairly well into his confidence, and there is a good deal of logic in everything he has said this afternoon. I was somewhat surprised in reading the report of the conference to find it stated by one of the delegates from Barbados, I think, that, there was really a difference of four cents on the 100 pounds in the freight rates on goods shipped via New York as compared with the Halifax or St. John route.

Mr. MACDONALD: Which way is the difference?

Mr. CARVELL: It is against the Halifax and St. John route, and in favour of the New York route. It seems to me that that is the crux of the whole situation. Of course the minister will pardon me if I say that all this agreement amounts to is a mere nothing because it is only trying to drive trade through unnatural channels, but I feel like assisting it in every way I can and I think the House should consider the matter as a business proposition and see how far that trade can be driven if we are going to drive it at all.

Mr. RHODES: Surely my hon. friend is not referring to reciprocity?

Mr. CARVELL: I have not referred to reciprocity and I do not intend to refer to it. It seems to bother my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes); it is probably a case of the guilty mind which knows no rest. I want to be fair to my hon. friend, and I have given the hon. minister credit for taking the real business-like, logical view of this matter. If we are going to drive trade into unnatural channels, let us drive it and drive it vigorously. In my opinion, it can only be done by an up to date, efficient steamship service in conjunction with the railway service. I do not believe my hon. friend can ever make a success of the effort to increase trade between Canada and the West Indies by his monthly—I think it is —circuitous steamship service which has been going on for the last fifteen or twenty years. I almost forget the particulars, but I know there is a service from Montreal in the summer time and one from St. John in the winter time. A steamer coming from the West Indies calls at St. John, discharges cargo, goes to Halifax, stays there for a week or two, discharges cargo, takes on some more, comes back to St. John, goes through the same operation there and goes on to the West Indies. If a man in the Barbados, or any of the West Indies, wants an ordinary article sent there, whether oats, hay, lumber, or potatoes, the difficulty is that the service is so intermittent and the time between sailings is so great that he says: It will take me so long to get these goods by Canadian ports that I will order them through United States ports. In the United States they have a splendid service. I have not been to the West Indies, but members of my family have, members of this House have been there, and the minister himself has also been there. Any person who has been there will tell you that they have an up to date service from Boston and New York. There are steamers running every three or four days and a man can cable an order for a shipment of hay, oats, lumber, fish or any other such product and get the goods immediately. If we are ever going to make a success of this thing we have to have, not only a better steamship service, but more steamships. I believe that the only efficient way is to give two services, one from St. John and one from Halifax. In the summer time it may be possible to go around by the circuitous route, but it takes too long to get goods forwarded from Montreal to the West Indies or vice versa in that way, except it be sugar or something that is being brought back in large quantities for manufacturing purposes. Within the last three or four years I have had a number of conversations upon this question with certain gentlemen representing the Canadian Pacific railway and, among them, the vice president of the Canadian Pacific railway himself. We have been trying to develop a business, not so much with the West Indies as with Cuba, in potatoes and we have succeeded to some extent. I was told by a representative of the Canadian Pacific railway that if a subsidy were given and a genuine up to date service were provided running direct from St. John there are many articles, such as hay, oats, and products of Ontario and the West, that are now going to the West Indies through American ports, that could be shipped straight from Canadian ports. If the minister would take this phase of the question into consideration and see if some agreement could not be made with the railway companies and if he could not bring himself to the conclusion that there ought to be two services instead of one provided at regular intervals, having it so arranged that there would be a service arriving in the West Indies every ten days instead of every three or four weeks, he would be in a better position to do business. But, I am afraid that if he keeps to the present antiquated steamship service with only one line following this circuitous

route between St. John and Halifax and vice versa, he will never succeed in diverting trade from American ports, because, after all, these American ports are our chief competitors for the West Indian business. I am not saying this in a fault-finding spirit, but I am giving the minister the impression that I have derived from talking with men who know something about this question. The solution of this question, and which would bring it back to the object sought to be attained by my hon. friend from St. John and others namely, that all goods, to be entitled to this preference, should pass through British ports, can only be attained by increasing the number of steamers and by providing a better steamship service.

Mr. MACDONALD: I was not in when the minister discussed this question with reference to the matter of limiting the preference on goods that come through our own ports. I regret that I did not have an opportunity of hearing him. I have on the Order Paper a resolution dealing with the question which I hope at a later period of the session to discuss. I, therefore, will not go into the question just now at any greater length. A remark made by my hon. friend from Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), struck me particularly, and that was that there is a difference of 4 cents per 100 pounds as between the cost of freight going through Canadian and American ports.

Mr. FOSTER: That may be occasional. It might be less or more just at that particular time to which the hon. gentleman's remark applied.

Mr. CARVELL: I think that referred to the winter season when the St. Lawrence was frozen over. I do not think that there is that difference in the summer time.

Mr. MACDONALD: I understood my hon. friend to say that the difference existed as between transportation from the Maritime provinces and American ports. If that difference does exist in any permanent way it is a matter which, wrapped up as it is with the solution of the larger problem, is very important and one that must be overcome. I really cannot understand how it is that such a difference should exist. It is a well known principle to the cost of transportation that you can carry products by sea a great many more miles than you can by land for the same cost, and the fact that there is a longer haul by water and therefore a less haul by land going through Canadian ports than through American ports ought to create an advantage by which trade ought to go through our ports as cheaply as it goes through American ports. The solution of this steamship problem must go with the treaty if it is going to be a success. I see no reason why we should not have two lines from the West Indies connecting with our maritime ports in the winter time at least. As to the difficulties which have been suggested on account of the closeness of the colonies to some of the American ports, as compared with Canadian ports, I do not think there is very much in that as far as our staple products are concerned. The staples of Canada which can be sold in the West Indies are usually purchased under the condition that they are not required for a week or two, and they must necessarily be purchased by parties in business, or parties who will arrange in advance for their receipt. Looking at the trade returns there must be a tremendous amount of Canadian goods of all kinds which can displace American products which go to the West Indies. I am sure that the minister will have the greatest possible interest and support from gentlemen on this side of the House in applying himself to really giving Canada, if he can, some substantial business as a result of the arrangement which he has made with the West Indies. But, business will not flow merely by writing this agreement in documents. It requires to be obtained by implementing efforts on the part of the minister.

On paragraph 7:

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): What is the purpose of that?

Mr. FOSTER: Whatever they give to each they will give to the United Kingdom, and so far as Canada is concerned that amounts to nothing more than we are giving now. On the part of the West Indian colonies it will be a distinct change with regard to the United Kingdom.

Mr. CARVELL: In what proportion of percentage will this preference allow these goods to come into Canada to a greater extent than they come in now under the British preference?

Mr. FOSTER: This agreement does not enlarge the preferences that are given already by Canada to any part of the British Empire.

Mr. CARVELL: That is not what I mean. The British preference to-day allows molasses, cocoa, fruit, &c., to come in under the preferential rate; to what extent, if any, does this increase the preference?

Mr. FOSTER: As a matter of fact, if you confine yourself to what is the minimum that must be granted to the West Indian

colonies, and still keep the agreement we are giving a much larger preference now.

Mr. NESBITT: This clause reads:

That the advantages or concessions granted to the colonies, parties to the said agreement, shall extend to the United Kingdom and such of the other British colonies and possessions as may be admitted thereto by proclamation published in the Canada Gazette.

To be entitled to the same conditions, would the United Kingdom have to be proclaimed in the Canada Gazette?

Mr. FOSTER: The United Kingdom has its preference now, a much larger preference than the one-fifth which may be the minimum preference to the West Indian colonies. That preference is not curtailed, nor is any action necessary by proclamation to continue it. But, we might go still further. There are certain parts of the British Dominions that have not preferential arrangements; for instance Australia has no preferential arrangement; our liberty is absolutely intact; we may to-morrow make an arrangement with Australia and admit her to preference, and we may take other outlying parts of the British Empire and admit them to preference in addition to these which we have now, which I think very probably will be done.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There is a provision that tariff item 137 (a) be repealed, and that item provides that: 'Molasses of cane, testing under 35 degrees by polariscope when imported for use in the manufacture of compressed food for live stock, is entered free in Canada.' I suppose the assumption is that something will take its place. The agreement, when contemplating the placing of a duty upon articles which are now free, places these altogether in Schedule C, and I wondered why item 137 (a) was not placed in that schedule. Is it the intention of the Government that a duty be levied upon imports under this item as against foreign countries, and that it be free to the British West Indies?

Mr. FOSTER: The contention of the British West Indian delegates was that if 137 (a) remained, their molasses of different kinds would be cut out from a considerable portion of legitimate export to this country. This molasses comes in from the United States for certain purposes. The contention of the delegates was that a great deal of real molasses came in free to Canada under the guise of being used in this way, and the statistics seemed to prove that. This is meant to give fair preference in favour of the molasses of the West Indies.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Has the minister made any progress with the matter of lessened cable rates which was much discussed during the conference?

Mr. FOSTER: I think I can say yes, but I am not prepared to give the details now. I took the matter up with the British Government and we had several conferences while I was in England. I am not at liberty to go into details, but I think I may say that there is every prospect of a diminution in the cable rates. These rates, owing to varied conditions which we can discuss when the matter comes up, are the highest in the world. I think they run up to seven shillings a word to British Guiana. The determination is that these rates are abnormally high and must be reduced, and I hope I shall be able to announce, before long, the details of a satisfactory reduction.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I understand from the Minister of Finance that the proposed changes in the tariff made necessary by this agreement—I have reference to the items in Schedule C—will not be made until he presents his budget, and therefore no part of the treaty will come into effect before that.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): That is my present intention. It is, I think, the proper way to deal with the matter. There will be a number of tariff changes, owing to the agreement, going into operation, and a convenient time to make these changes would appear to be on bringing down the Budget.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce tell me what is the difference in rates from Canada to the West Indies as compared with those from the United States to the West Indies? I noticed as compared with a report that there had been a break in the cable between the United States and the West Indies, and the announced rate of cabling to be done from Nova Scotia was very much higher.

Mr. FOSTER: If you take the line which runs from Halifax to Bermuda and from Halifax to Jamaica, which stands, so to speak, by itself, the rates are very reasonable. But for all communications to the West India Islands beyond these, whether they go by that line from Halifax or whether they go round by the United States, the rates are high, and they are all at the same height.

Resolution reported.

Mr. FOSTER thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 28, respecting an agreement between Canada and certain of the West Indian Islands. He said: I desire to lay on the table of the House in connection with this agreement a very exhaustive return of the trade transactions between the West Indies and Can-

ada, the United States and the United Kingdom, compiled from the West Indian blue books and statistics, in so far as they are available, and bringing the figures down to about 1911.

Mr. HENDERSON: Will that return be printed for the use of members?

Mr. FOSTER: I think it would be of use if it were printed. One copy is entirely insufficient, and to make typewritten copies would take a long time.

Mr. CARVELL: Does this return go very much further than the information in the Weekly Report issued by the department? That seems to be a very exhaustive report.

Mr. FOSTER: The document will be printed in the Weekly Report, and probably before the end of the year. I will make inquiry into that, and if what I have said is correct, there is no need to have two printed.

Mr. HENDERSON: I think that is sufficient.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Does the minister propose proceeding with the Bill?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. MACLEAN: There is not much satisfaction in waiting until the end of the year.

Mr. FOSTER: I suppose the House does not wish to go on with the Bill until it has the information before it. For my part I would like to pass the Bill and have it put through, but I quite understand that the House must have the necessary information. If we can get it printed before we rise for the Christmas holidays, I suppose there will be no objection to going on with the Bill, and if not, we will not press it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister) moved that the House go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient in connection with the Bill now before this House intituled An Act to authorize measures for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, to provide:

(a) That from and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada there may be paid and applied a sum not exceeding thirty-five million dollars for the purpose of immediately increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire;

(b) That the said sum shall be used and applied under the direction of the Governor in Council in the construction and equipment of battleships or armoured cruisers of the most modern and powerful type;

(c) That the said ships when constructed and equipped shall be placed by the Governor in Council at the disposal of His Majesty for the common defence of the empire; and

(d) That the said sum shall be paid, used and applied, and the said ships shall be constructed and placed at the disposal of His Majesty subject to such terms, conditions and arrangements as may be agreed upon between the Governor in Council and His Majesty's Government.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to say that, after looking over the Bill carefully, my judgment is that, according to our procedure, it should have been initiated by a resolution considered in Committee of the Whole. But as the Bill, with the consent and upon the instructions of the House, was formally introduced and read the first time, and will stand until this resolution is considered, and, I presume, referred to the Committee of the Whole House to which the Bill will be referred, I imagine that the present action on this resolution is the only proper one that can be taken, and that it will correct the procedure when we reach the stage of the second reading of the Bill. But I would like to say in connection with this that at least I hope it will not be regarded as a precedent for avoiding the introduction of money measures by resolution, as provided for under our procedure and practice.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee, (Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair).

Resolution reported.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the order for the consideration of the report of the committee upon this resolution be the first order after questions by members on Thursday next, and thereafter have precedence over all other business except questions by members until the House adjourns for Christmas recess.

Mr. MACDONALD: There are quite a number of motions for returns which will come up as a matter of course and which, if not reached to-morrow on account of any discussion that may arise, ought to be given an opportunity of going through before the Christmas vacation.

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend refers to motions for the production of papers?

Mr. MACDONALD: Yes.

Mr. BORDEN: I shall be quite prepared to call these up.

Motion agreed to.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Bill No. 22, respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal—Mr. Hazen—read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon. (Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Has this Bill been approved of by the Montreal Harbour Commissioners?

Mr. HAZEN: This Bill was prepared after consultation with the harbour commissioners; it was submitted to them for their consideration and approval. The Bill is of a very simple character. At the present time there is a divided control over the waters of the harbour, because the main ship channel of the St. Lawrence river runs through the harbour, and under existing legislation that ship channel is under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, while the rest of the waters of the harbour are subject to the control of the harbour commissioners. This Bill is introduced for the purpose of placing all the waters in the harbour under the control of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners.

On section 9—seizure of vessels:

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to explain this clause?

Mr. HAZEN: When that section was passed the harbour commissioners of Montreal acted also as the pilotage authority in connection with the waters of the Montreal harbour. Years ago they ceased to be the pilotage authority, and they have now nothing to do with pilotage dues or any proceedings in connection therewith; therefore, it is not necessary to embody that provision in the statute.

Bill reported.

CANADA SHIPPING ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill No. 27, to amend the Canada Shipping Act—Mr. Hazen—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon. (Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.)

Mr. HAZEN: This Bill was before the committee a few days ago, when its terms were very thoroughly discussed, and my attention was called, I think by my hon. friend the member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), to section 582, which gave the minister the power of appointment of persons to the Board of Steamboat Inspectors. The hon. gentleman directed my attention to the fact that there was no limitation as to the number of persons the minister might appoint. I thought the point was very well taken, and when we come to section 582 I intend to move an amendment to that clause, and to add after the word 'persons' in the third line, the words, 'not exceeding three in number,' so that the number of persons appointed by the minister will be limited. The clause will then read:

There shall be a board, to be called the Board of Steamboat Inspection, to be composed of the inspectors and such other persons, not exceeding three in number, as the minister may appoint.

Mr. SINCLAIR: How many steamboat inspectors are there at present?

Mr. HAZEN: In the whole Dominion?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes.

Mr. HAZEN: In most provinces there is one steamboat inspector. I think in the Maritime provinces there are two. The inspector for New Brunswick also acts as inspector for Prince Edward Island. There is an inspector for Nova Scotia. In the province of Quebec and Ontario there are more inspectors than that, and there are also inspectors for the Western provinces and British Columbia. There are ten or twelve inspectors altogether.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Then we are to understand that in addition to the 10 or 12 inspectors who compose the board, the minister proposes to limit the additional number to three, so that the board will be composed of 15?

Mr. HAZEN: Inspectors are always busy with their duties and sometimes it is difficult to get together enough of them to constitute a board, and the reason we are asking that the minister may have power to add several to the board who are not inspectors, is that in practice we have had difficulties actually occur. Last summer when I was in England, Mr. Adams, who had been chairman of the Board of Inspectors for many years, asked for leave of absence with a view to obtaining superannuation which he afterwards obtained. The department appointed another man to discharge the duties. That gentleman unfortunately got ill and the department was actually left in the position of having no one to appoint as chairman with the requisite qualifications. A man may be an admirable inspector and yet not have the necessary qualifications to act as chairman of the board. If we had then had this provision the minister could have at once appointed the deputy minister or the chief engineer to act as chairman, but it was impossible to do it under the existing law, and the department was actually hampered in its work because of the lack of some provision of that sort. This amendment is simply to overcome that difficulty. There is no salary fixed to be paid to the

persons so appointed, the idea being that departmental officers already in receipt of salaries would be appointed to that work.

Mr. SINCLAIR : I see no objection to the proposals of the minister in the Bill. The only criticism I would make is that the board appears to me to be of unweildy size. There is a member in each province, and as it has certain duties to perform the difficulty of getting these people to meet, or even of getting a quorum of them together, would be very great. While I have no suggestion as to how that can be remedied, it strikes me that it is a practical difficulty. Possibly some method might be devised by which an executive committee of this board might be so organized that it could deal with any questions that would arise. I am aware that when Mr. Adams was in charge he was practically the whole board, and he was so well posted in all matters coming up in relation to their duties that he did not require even to consult the other members of the board very often, and I can conceive that as he has retired it will now be necessary to make some new arrangement. I wish the minister would consider the importance of making the executive of the board smaller.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What qualifications are required for the position?

Mr. HAZEN: The inspector has to pass a technical examination at Ottawa, set by technical officers to show that he is fit for the position.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I heard some years ago inspectors were very easy in their inspections. I have heard some complaints in the city of Quebec about the inspection of certain boats. The question is a very serious one. Of course if you get good men you have to give them good salaries, and you must provide also that the examination is a very severe one. There have been so many accidents on the river of late that I would urge upon my hon. friend to be very careful in the selection of his inspectors.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. gentleman is absolutely right about that, and I think he is right in saying that years ago the qualifications demanded were not as high as in the last few years. My information is that the examination which the inspectors now have to undergo is of such a character as to insure the appointment only of men who are thoroughly qualified to inspect ships and grant certificates.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The inspection applies to sea-going as well as inland navigation?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the average salary of an inspector?

Mr. HAZEN: They begin at about $1,400 and run up to something like $1,800 or $2,000.

Mr. HEPBURN: Who examines these men as to qualifications?

Mr. HAZEN: The examination paper is prepared by the chairman of the Board of Steamboat Inspectors, and the answers are examined by the board. For years the paper was set by Mr. Adams who was referred to by the hon. member from Guysboro and he was, I think, a very capable man, technically speaking.

On section 1—wrecked ships may be registered:

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not aware that there is any general provision in the department through which the evidence required under subsections A, B, C can come regularly before the minister.

Mr. HAZEN: I think there is a provision for that now. Reports from the technical officer are approved by the Deputy Minister, and a report is made to council. The procedure is that the technical officer brings the matter to the notice of the minister, the minister looks into it, and the deputy minister passes upon it, and then the minister's report is sent to council recommending the change of name, or what ever is necessary. That is being done almost every week of the year. It has been done for years past, it is exactly the same machinery as has been in operation, and, so far as my information goes, it has been sufficient to safeguard the public interest.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Would it be different if the minister happened to be absent?

Mr. HAZEN: If the minister were absent of course there would be difficulty, for if there were no one acting as minister in his place, there would be nobody to sign the report to council, and council will never act except on the report of the responsible minister. As a rule, as my hon. friend knows, if a minister of any department is away for any length of time, he gets some other minister to act in his place, and that minister can sign his reports to council.

Mr. McKENZIE: Suppose there is a wreck at North Sydney, at St. John, at Halifax, or at any other port, the ship master, or those in charge, find that they have to furnish evidence to the satisfaction of the minister. There is no machinery through which they can furnish that evidence, so far as the Act shows on the face of it. There is what I might call a private practice which has grown up in the department, but of which the public generally know nothing, until they put themselves in communication with the department. If

this Act or some general regulation of the department provided that the captain or the owner could go with the proper proofs before the customs officer, the county court judge, a judge of the Supreme Court, or some other public official, that official would receive the evidence and pass upon it, and it could be sent to the minister without the party having first to make application to the department to ascertain what proofs there was and how it should be given. I have had some experience in connection with the law as it stood, and we had always to approach the department to ascertain how the proof should be given and what kind of proof would be recognized, and it was a very round-about way of getting what was necessary.

Mr. HAZEN: I understand the suggestion of my hon. friend to be this, that it would facilitate matters if the department passed some general regulation as to what it would regard as satisfactory proof in such cases, and if that regulation was placed in the hands of collectors of customs or other officials at the different ports, so that the captain or owner of a vessel in trouble could apply to them and find out at once what kind of proof it would be necessary to furnish to the department without his coming to the department. I think the suggestion is a very good one, and I will certainly call the attention of the officials of the department who have been dealing with this matter to it. I see no reason why it should not be acted upon.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

DISMISSALS AT DESCOUSE AND WEST ARICHAT.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Kyte for a copy of all recommendations, correspondence, letters and telegrams, relating to the dismissal of certain persons at Descouse and West Arichat, resumed from December 9.

Mr. BORDEN: I made some inquiry into the circumstances which were brought to the attention of the House yesterday by my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte). While my hon. friend the Minister of Justice desires that the debate should be further adjourned, he has some information bearing directly upon the matter which I may now give to the House. It appears that on the 8th of December, 1911, Mr. J. A. Gillies, who had been the Conservative candidate in the county of Richmond, recommended the appointment of Capt. Andrew Landry as wharfinger at Descouse. The previous occupant of that position, Mr. Leon Poirier, was charged with offensive political partisanship within the knowledge of Mr. Gillies during the then recent election and in the previous election. On the 19th of December, an Order in Council passed dispensing with the services of Poirier and appointing Capt. Landry as wharfinger. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has already explained to the House in the course of the debate that at the time that appointment was made it had not been brought to his knowledge, nor were the officials of his department aware, that Capt. Landry was the same gentleman respecting whom a certain communication had been made to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Capt. Landry had been recommended for the position of fishery officer, and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had declined to appoint him to that office by reason of the communication which had been made to him. However, on the 19th of December, he was appointed to the minor and petty office of wharfinger in ignorance of the fact that he was the person alluded to in the communication. On the 19th of June the agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the province of Nova Scotia brought it to the attention of the department that this man was then in prison, having been sentenced under a criminal charge. Accordingly, within a few days afterwards, on the 26th June, Mr. J. A. Gillies was advised that the department proposed dispensing with the services of Captain Landry and asked him to recommend a suitable successor. Under date of the 3rd of July, Mr. Gillies advised the department that the duties of the position were being very well attended to by Captain L. A. Langlois who was, he represented, a highly respected citizen. He was advised that the department would regard the appointment of Captain Langlois as satisfactory and that he could discharge the duties of the office until further action was taken. On the 19th of July instructions were accordingly issued for the preparation of a recommendation to council dispensing with the services of Captain Landry and formally appointing Mr. Langlois, and on the 26th of August an Order in Council dispensing with the services of Captain Landry was passed, and Captain Langlois was appointed in his stead. Therefore, it will be apparent to the House that as soon as possible after the information which I have alluded to was brought to the attention of the department, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took the course of dispensing with the services of Captain Landry and appointing another officer in his place. As a matter of fact, since some time in June, Captain L. A. Langlois had been performing the duties of the office which, I imagine, are of a very trivial character, and since the 26th

day of August last he has been discharging these duties under a formal appointment by the Governor in Council. I have also made some inquiry with regard to the circumstances under which Captain Landry was liberated under ticket of leave. I have examined the file and have ascertained that it is absolutely impossible to suggest that it was due to any political considerations whatever. My hon. friend who made the suggestion in this House could have ascertained the truth of what I am now saying if he had gone to the office of the Minister of Justice and examined the file. There is no suggestion in the file from beginning to end of any political pressure whatever. This man was released by reason of the representations of clergymen and others, including his own physician, that it was necessary for him to undergo a very severe operation and that for that purpose he should be removed to an hospital. The matter was dealt with by the then acting Minister of Justice, the Hon. W. T. White, in the ordinary course of routine and upon the usual report of the officers of the department who look into such cases. He was utterly unaware at the time that Captain Landry had been appointed to any public office. The matter was dealt with from first to last absolutely in the same way in which these applications for discharge upon ticket of leave are ordinarily dealt with—upon the report of the officers of the department who are appointed for the purpose and whose duty it is to examine, consider and report upon the representations which are made for that purpose. As to bringing down the papers, my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) will address himself to the House on this subject to-day. All I have to say is that it is entirely open to any hon. member, on either side of the House, to go to the Department of Justice, examine that file, and satisfy himself as to the absolute correctness of what I have stated. My hon. friend from Richmond, my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, or any other hon. gentleman on that side of the House or on this side of the House, is at liberty to take that course. I have deemed it advisable and proper, pending further consideration of bringing down these papers, that this information should be given to the House, in order that there might not be any impression throughout the country that the discharge of this man under ticket of leave had anything to do at all with political considerations. Any such suggestion is absolutely unfounded.

Mr. DOHERTY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, in regard to that portion of the motion which asks that all correspondence, papers and documents, including the report of the Minister of Justice and the order for the discharge of this man from prison, should be brought down, that there is absolutely no reason, nor have I any desire, to withhold anything in that connection from any member of this House or the public in general, if it be a proper thing to do. But, I believe I am correct in stating that it has been a well established practice not to bring down documents of this kind and I think that a moment's reflection will make every hon. member realize that there might, in very many instances, be serious objections to the bringing down and publishing of documents of this kind. The issuing of tickets of leave is a portion of the exercise of the prerogative of the Crown in extending clemency. Under the law, the Minister of Justice, not the Government, or Council, as a whole is made the adviser of the Governor General in regard to the exercise of the powers conferred upon him by this Act. The responsibility for what is done belongs, I submit, therefore, entirely to the Minister of Justice. I do not point that out as being a reason why the papers in cases of this kind should not be brought down, but one will readily understand, any one certainly who has to deal with these applications will know, that in connection with large numbers of them letters are written or petitions are submitted setting forth matters of a very peculiarly private nature which the parties writing them, from no improper motives, might very much regret to have laid before the public, and the laying of which before the public would serve no good end. I desire, therefore, before saying whether or not these papers will be brought down, to go more carefully into the question because I understand that if I should acquiesce in this motion and bring these papers down I would be establishing a precedent in the matter.

Mr. MACDONALD: What has been the practice of the Department of Justice with regard to an order of the House for papers in such cases?

Mr. DOHERTY: I am informed that the invariable practice has been to treat these documents as being confidential and, speaking subject to confirming my statement by careful verification, I am not aware that there has been a case of an order of the House for the bringing down of such papers. My impression is that the common sense and good judgment of the House have led it to the conclusion in the past that it is not desirable that papers of this kind should be brought down for publication. In that connection, what I pointed out a moment ago has a bearing—the dealing with these matters is a prerogative of the

Crown, and if hon. members will stop for a moment to reflect, they will realize that this House is not perhaps the proper tribunal to determine such. We have had it suggested that there were political motives in this matter and I do not think it would be any reflection on this House to say that perhaps there might be more danger of political influences creeping into this House than of their working upon the mind of a Minister of Justice even though he be a compassionate Minister of Justice, as my hon. friend from Richmond was good enough to describe me. Anyhow, whatever compassion may have been exercised in this particular case was not exercised by me; because, as a fact, I was 3,000 miles away when this transpired. I do not say that with a desire in any way to repudiate responsibility; I am just as prepared to stand responsible for the absolute impartiality and the absolute incapacity of the Minister of Finance, who was acting Minister of Justice, to be influenced in a matter of this kind by political considerations as I am prepared to stand responsible for my own conduct. I desire to add that it is a matter of great surprise to me that two hon. members of this House should, without taking the trouble to inquire, and before they have the documents—have thought proper to insinuate that I, as Minister of Justice, would be capable of allowing myself to be influenced by political considerations in dealing with applications for pardon. That is an insinuation that I have committed an offence which I frankly believe is as grave as any that could be perpetrated. I would be sorry to believe that any man, holding the position of Minister of Justice, would be capable of availing himself of that high position, to allow himself to be influenced by political consideration in the exercise of such a solemn duty. I venture the opinion that the two hon. members who made that insinuation do not believe in it themselves. I would be sorry indeed to believe that on serious reflection, any member of this House, without the most absolute and conclusive proof, would impute such utterly despicable conduct to any man elected by any body of constituents in Canada. I know of nothing I would be more sorry to impute to a representative of the people than such conduct. As the Prime Minister has said, these two hon. gentlemen (who are both members of the profession to which I have the honour to belong), are at perfect liberty to come to the department and peruse this file, and they will have demonstrated whether or not they, or either of them, have justification for sending broadcast the insinuation that the Minister of Justice had abused his position by determining the granting or the refusing of an application for pardon, upon political considerations. Personally, I feel that I can look upon such an insinuation with absolute contempt. I verily believe that no man whose respect I value would believe such a thing of me. As for those, who may be ready, without proof, to entertain such suspicion, and to give public expression to it—unless they did it in a moment of irreflection—I venture to say that what their opinion of me may be, is to me a matter of utter indifference. If these gentlemen should look over the files, they will find there is an entire absence of suggestion of political influence. The request for this discharge originated with a clergyman of one religious belief; it is supported by a clergyman of another religious belief; it is supported by a letter which comes from a lawyer, a gentleman whose political proclivities, I have not the slightest knowledge of; there is further a petition from this unfortunate man himself, and there is evidence of a certificate by a physician that this man was to be taken from the jail to an hospital that a serious operation might be performed on him. The whole procedure went through the ordinary routine, and the hon. the then acting Minister of Justice signed the advice to His Royal Highness, upon the report of an officer of the department who has served not only under this Government but under previous Governments, and who I believe has had the confidence of successive Ministers of Justice.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is that Mr. Archibald?

Mr. DOHERTY: It is Mr. P. M. Coté, who is the gentleman in charge of that particular duty, and who, so far as I have been able to observe, since I have been Minister of Justice, has fulfilled his duties to the very best of his ability and that is not little and I am absolutely convinced, with perfect impartiality. I believe that if my predecessors in office were here they would give Mr. Coté the same character as I am giving him now. I shall make quite certain whether it is proper to bring these papers down. If I deem it proper, in this particular case—though I may add that my view on first examination is that it would be a very undesirable precedent—I shall personally be very glad to bring them down. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate with a view of making a final statement later.

Mr. MACDONALD: The Minister of Justice has displayed an unusual amount of feeling in regard to this matter. It is quite clear that the hon. gentleman was not in Canada himself at the time the exercise of the power, which is a prerogative of the Crown, was carried out, and

consequently, the Minister of Justice need not have felt so keenly or complained so bitterly about suggestions made in regard to a case which could not by any possibility refer to him in any way.

I do not agree with my hon. friend in the assertion of the principle that Parliament has not the right to pass a motion of this kind. Hon. members who have been in Parliament a long time will recall the Shortiss case which was discussed in this House in 1896. Hon. Mr. Dickey, who was then the Minister of Justice, concluded, in reference to the matter, as 'Hansard' which I have here will show, that there was no doubt of the constitutional right of the House to call for papers in regard to any matter in which the prerogative of the Crown in relation to pardon had been exercised. But he goes on to say—what every hon. member who is accustomed to constitutional practice will agree with—and to quote Macaulay and Peel for it, that the House in any investigation they might make into the facts on which the Minister of Justice had advised the Crown should exercise the greatest care. The papers in the Shortiss case were brought down, and the facts were discussed preliminary to bringing them down. And hon. members who were in the House at that time will recall the attention given to the matter by the country. I will not discuss the facts of this case. I was not here when my hon. friend from Richmond (Mr. Kyte) brought the subject before the House. I only rose to express my dissent from the theory that this House has not the constitutional right to ask for papers in such a case. And while I am on my feet let me point out that—and I use a word which the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) used earlier in the session—a synchronism—the pardon of Captain Andrew Landry synchronised in a wonderful way with his appointment to a public office.

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend is mistaken. The appointment was made on December 11, and the pardon granted on August 12.

Mr. KYTE: May I be permitted to say that, on the 11th of June, Captain Landry was appointed in charge of the buoys in the harbour of Descouse, and that synchronized with his release.

Mr. MACDONALD: I would like to be allowed to conclude. I rose particularly to refer to the constitutional question, but I desire to remark that the Minister of Finance could find another 'synchronism' in this case to add to the one which he discovered early in the session.

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. member for Richmond has referred to the question of the buoy contract. I desire to give the facts in regard to that. They are in a memorandum of the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries:

MEMORANDUM RE BUOY CONTRACT, DESCOUSE, C.B.

The facts in connection with this contract are substantially as follows: On May 28th, 1912, Mr. J. A. Gillies advised the department that Captain Frederick Poirier's contract for attending to the buoys in that vicinity would expire on the 15th June. He recommended in that connection that the work be entrusted to Captain Andrew Landry, of Descouse, after the expiration of the contract. Without taking into consideration that this was the same Captain Landry against whom charges had been preferred, the deputy minister of the department recommended that the contract should be placed at the same figure that the former contractor was receiving.

On the 7th June the agent of the department at Halifax was directed to notify Captain Landry that the work of attending the buoys after the 15th June would be entrusted to him. On the 11th June a telegram was received from Mr. Gillies asking that action respecting this contract be withheld until he would advise further in the course of a few days. The agent of the department on the same day was directed to defer action. On the 12th June a telegram was received from the agent advising the department that the previous instructions had been carried out, and asking whether he should countermand them. He was directed at once to countermand the instructions.

On the 15th June Mr. Gillies wrote recommending that the work of attending the buoys be given to Captain Charles Fougère, of Descouse. On the 20th June the agent of the department at Halifax was advised to place the work with Captain Fougère. A formal contract was entered into between the department and Captain Fougère for the performance of this service for a period of three years from the 2nd July last.

Hon. members will see that the recommendation in favour of Captain Landry was made on the 28th of May, and the deputy minister says that without taking into consideration that this was the same Captain Landry against whom charges had been preferred, he recommended him that the contract be placed with him at the same figure that the former contractor had received. This recommendation was made before he was found guilty or before the department knew that he was accused of crime—before they realized that he was the same individual whose appointment the parish priest had opposed in a communication to the department; and the moment it came to the knowledge of the department that he was the same man against whom the parish priest made the protest, the department cancelled the contract with him and appointed another man to the position.

Mr. KYTE: I desire to say a few words, particularly in answer to what has been said by the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty). But first, a word with regard to the suggestion made by the right hon. the leader of the Government, that the files in the department were open to me to examine. I am bound to say that I adopted the usual course in this matter. It has been the practice, ever since we first had a parliament, for members to stand up in this House and move for papers that are of public record. I have some doubt of the wisdom of adopting the course suggested by my right hon. friend, having in mind the experience of a member of this House who did go to one of the public departments to examine a public file. He examined the file, and took some memoranda which would enable him to have accurate knowledge of the contents of the document, should he have occasion to use it. But a few days afterward he received notice from the department that the information must be regarded as confidential and not to be used publicly. Therefore, I assume, if I had gone to the department looking for information, I might have been embarrassed in the same way. The whole difficulty arose, not from any disposition, I am confident on the part of the Minister of Justice to do anything else than that which is right and proper, but from the new precedent established by this Government in accepting the recommendation for appointment to public office not from responsible members of this House, but from irresponsible defeated candidates who are not here to defend their recommendations.

Last year I intimated to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) that it was a highly improper thing for him to accept recommendations of defeated candidates for the removal of public officers and the appointment of their successors. It is improper for the reason that, while a member elected to this Parliament is here and can be looked to to defend his conduct and uphold the propriety of his recommendations, the defeated candidate is not here, he has no responsibility such as a member of this House has, and is likely to be actuated largely by feelings of revenge towards the men who have opposed him, and not by desire—in the same degree as a member who is here to be challenged for his conduct—to promote the public interest. Mr. J. A. Gillies, the defeated candidate in Richmond, is primarily responsible for the most extraordinary condition of affairs revealed by the reading of these documents. But, next to him, I hold the Minister of Marine and Fisheries responsible for the result of these extraordinary circumstances. That hon. minister says that if he had known that the Andrew Landry who was recommended by Mr. Gillies for the positions of wharfinger and buoy contractor at Descouse was the same Andrew Landry who had been charged with forgery, he would not have appointed him. I still say, however, he is responsible, having accepted the recommendation of Mr. Gillies, who is not here to defend his conduct, and therefore, cannot be held responsible for his action. My hon. friend the Prime Minister endeavours to minimize the consequences of this extraordinary procedure by stating that the salary of a wharfinger is a mere pittance, and therefore the matter is of no consequence. But the Minister of Marine and Fisheries states that the salary paid Landry as buoy contractor is not a mere pittance, although he has not stated the amount, I think it is in the neighbourhood of $200 a year.

With respect to the statement made by the right hon. Prime Minister, and repeated by the hon. Minister of Justice, to the effect that Landry had to undergo a serious surgical operation, I am bound to say that suggestion makes it all the more desirable and necessary that we should see the papers upon which the hon. Minister of Justice acted. Mr. Landry is a man not unknown to me. He lives in the county of Richmond, and I frequently visit the district in which he resides. I know that Landry has not been afflicted with any serious illness during the last twelve months, and I know that as soon as he was released from jail he proceeded to the city of Sydney and obtained employment there in the steel works.

I have only recited the facts as I gathered them from public documents, and I do not desire to impute to the Minister of Justice any improper motive with respect to his conduct in this matter. Information came to me yesterday to the effect that the Minister of Justice was not the responsible head of the Department when Landry's release was ordered, as that took place in the absence of the minister in the old country. That, however, does not alter the circumstances of the case, and the hon. Minister of Justice and the right hon. Prime Minister have given no substantial reason for the assumption that I acted otherwise than within my privilege in this matter. I read from public records in the department and stated succinctly the facts of the case. These facts have not been denied, and the statements made in regard thereto, show that I was amply justified in bringing them to the attention of the House.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. KYTE: I might remind the hon. gentleman that the case to which I referred before six o'clock was not the only case in which recommendations made by Mr. Gillies had to be cancelled by his department during the last six or eight months. I remember the case of the superintendent of the lobster hatchery at Arichat, who was dismissed upon the recommendation of Mr. Gillies and a man named Captain Terrio appointed in his place. I put a question on the Order Paper as to the circumstances under which Captain Terrio was appointed and his qualifications and asked his age and was told he was seventy-one years of age. I also learned from the papers which I moved for in the House of Commons last winter that as soon as the inquiry was made by the Minister of Marine from a source other than Mr. Gillies and he learned that this man's age was seventy-one years, he wrote to Mr. Gillies stating that he would not recommend the appointment and asked him for another nomination. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries reprimanded Mr. Gillies for giving him the name of so old a man who had had no experience in the duties that would be assigned to him as superintendent of the hatchery and was not likely to acquire the knowledge necessary to the proper discharge of his duties.

There is also the case of a light keeper in the county of Richmond who was dismissed in April on the recommendation of Mr. Gillies on the ground that he was an offensive partisan. I was astonished and amazed at this for as every one personally acquainted with the light keeper knew it was absolutely impossible for him to be an offensive partisan. He took no part in public affairs and had not interest enough in the last two federal elections to vote. I asked for an investigation and the minister was good enough to say that if the dismissed light keeper would make an affidavit setting forth that he was not guilty of the charges an investigation would be granted. Such an affidavit was forwarded and the minister was good enough to grant an investigation. The investigation took place in September before Mr. Duchemin, the commissioner appointed for that purpose, and not a syllable of testimony was adduced to prove that the man was guilty of partisanship. I am sure the Minister of Marine will rectify the wrong done in this case, and take the earliest opportunity to restore him to office.

I wish to remind the minister and other gentlemen of this Government that Mr. Gillies has not yet quite completed his work of dismissing officers in Richmond. While he has to his credit some 50 or 60 dismissals, there are still some few postmasters, collectors of customs and preventive officers in remote parts of the county who will, no doubt, receive Mr. Gillies' attention in due time. I wish to notify the Minister of Marine and other members of the Government that before accepting any other recommendations of Mr. Gillies as to the dismissal of officers in public employment and the fitness of others to take their places, they should institute a very rigid inquiry. There are some 80 other defeated Conservative candidates in Canada besides Mr. Gillies, and it is just possible that the minister may be misled by the recommendations of these defeated candidates as they have been misled by accepting the recommendations of Mr. Gillies, and I trust that the ventilation which this subject has received in the House of Commons will at all events have the effect of inducing the minister to institute some sort of inquiry before dismissing further officials on the unsupported statement of defeated candidates.

Mr. BLAIN : Did not the Government that the hon. member for so many years supported, adopt the same policy of asking recommendations from the defeated candidates and has that not been the policy in Canada for many years by both parties ?

Mr. KYTE : It never was the policy of the late Government to accept recommendations for dismissals from defeated candidates. They did accept from them recommendations for appointments after vacancies had occurred in the public service.

Mr. RHODES : I gave an instance within the last 2 or 3 days where the present hon. member for Pictou, then a defeated candidate in that county, had two men dismissed in the Railway Department on his mere recommendation by letter.

Mr. KYTE : I was speaking from my own experience in the county of Richmond during the 15 years the Liberal party were in power. I do not pretend to be able to say what happened in all the other constituencies in Canada. I have no doubt the hon. member for Pictou will be able to justify any dismissals which he caused to be made while the Liberal party was in power.

Mr. RHODES : It is not a question of justification, but of fact.

Mr. KYTE : As a further justification for moving in the House of Commons for the papers asked for in this resolution and having a discussion on this question, there is the fact that immediately after Landry was convicted of the offense for which he was sentenced to 12 months imprisonment, his friends stated that he would not be in

jail long, that they would make application to their friends in Ottawa for his discharge, and he would be discharged without any question. I do not mean to insinuate that any hon. minister is responsible in any way for the statement made by Landry's friends in the county of Richmond, but at all events when you take the result in connection with the expressed intention of his friends to apply for his discharge, the coincidence is very striking. Two defences have been set up by the right hon. the leader of the Government, and the hon. the Minister of Marine, which appear to be the only extenuation which exists for the appointment of Landry to these positions and his discharge from jail. The first is that the appointments were to offices of a trivial character and that the remuneration which Landry would have received was trifling indeed. I do not think that the Minister of Marine or the leader of the Government wish to have it understood that they intend to proceed in future upon any such principle. The whole principle for which we are fighting in this connection, a principle laid down time and again by hon. gentlemen opposite, was that no person should be appointed to office, no matter how trifling unless he was qualified in point of fitness and character. I pointed out before 6 o'clock that one of the positions to which Captain Landry was appointed was not of a trifling character, and that the remuneration was not insignificant. The contract for placing the buoys in the harbour of Descouse and Lennox passage was worth about $200 a year. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries states that it was on the 15th of May, 1912, that the department decided to terminate the contract with Capt. Frederick Poirier and to award it to Capt. Landry at the same figure. I would respectfully remind the hon. Minister of Marine and and Fisheries that such a practice has not existed in his department in the past. Whenever a contract for buoys in the Maritime provinces has been terminated, tenders have been called for, and the contract has been awarded to the lowest tenderer. I am not aware of any case in which on the termination of the contract it was awarded to another person at the same figure without calling for new tenders. Be that as it may, however, the fact is that Captain Andrew Landry was appointed to the position, which was somewhat lucrative, while he was under commitment to the Supreme Court on a charge of forgery.

The other defence put forward by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is that he did not know that it was the same Andrew Landry who had been recommended by Mr. Gillies for the appointment of fishery officer, and who was afterwards recommended for appointment to the position of wharfinger and subsequently to that of buoy contractor. I will refer for a moment to the recommendations received by the department from Mr. Gillies in regard to those three matters. Mr. Gillies said:

> The executive recommends the appointment of Captain Andrew Landry, of Descouse, to this position, and I now endorse that recommendation.

The position referred to was that of fishery officer. The next recommendation received by the department was with respect to the appointment of Captain Landry to the position of wharfinger. On December 23, the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries notified Leon N. Poirier that he was dismissed from the position of wharfinger, and that Captain Andrew Landry, of Descouse, was appointed in his place. There could be no mistake about that name. The Captain Andrew Landry mentioned by Mr. Gillies in his first recommendation on the 8th December, for the position of fishery officer was the same Captain Andrew Landry referred to by the Rev. W. A. Boucher in his letter of 12th December. Furthermore, there was a letter of June 11, 1912, addressed by P. C. Johnston, superintendent of lights to Mr. Frederick Poirier:

> It has been decided to appoint Captain Andrew Landry, of Descouse, to maintain the buoys which you have a contract for——

Now, there could be no room for misunderstanding or mistake in reference to that. If his name had been given with the initials only, or if some error had crept in as to his description, there might have been some excuse perhaps for the officials of the department not understanding that the Captain Andrew Landry referred to was the identical Andrew Landry who in June had been convicted of the crime which has been described. The hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries insinuated that there was, if not a defence, at least a justification for the action of the Government with respect to the case of Andrew Landry in releasing him from jail. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries referred to the case of Bruce McDougall who was released under the late Government. With all deference I say that if the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries believes that I charged him with having been actuated by political considerations in granting the discharge of Andrew Landry, it might be said that he even more broadly hinted a similar charge against the late Minister of Justice in connection with the release of Mr. McDougall. I understand that Landry has been released upon parole, and not by virtue of the prerogative of pardon which His Royal Highness the Governor General enjoys. When the hon. Minister of Justice read

the list of documents upon which he had been moved to release Landry from jail, I did not hear him state that he had a report from the judge who tried the case.

Mr. DOHERTY: There certainly was a report from the judge.

Mr. KYTE: The only other point I wish to deal with is as to the propriety of bringing down the papers. I think that all the cases that have been debated in this Parliament upon motions to bring down papers, have had reference to capital offences, or at all events, they were papers upon which was based an application for the exercise of the prerogative of pardon. The release of Andrew Landry was not brought about on any such principle. He was released by virtue of the statute which was passed some years ago, and which is known as the Ticket-of-Leave Act. Under that statute, power is vested in the Minister of Justice to discharge prisoners, and it is entirely different from the law referring to the prerogative of pardon. I think, therefore, that every precedent establishes my right to ask for the production of the papers in this case.

Mr. DOHERTY: Do I understand my hon. friend to suggest that the statute authorizes the Minister of Justice to discharge prisoners? The statute provides that he shall recommend His Royal Highness to discharge.

Mr. KYTE: The minister makes a report on which the discharge is granted. I do not purpose to argue that phase of the question at the present time, as the hon. Minister of Justice has intimated that he will look into the papers and precedents and give his decision later on. I very much regret if my cold statement of the facts has been taken to imply any reflection on the hon. Minister of Justice. I had no intention of doing so, because, as I stated before six o'clock, I was aware that the hon. minister was not in the country at the time. I venture to say that upon reading the report of the debate which took place yesterday, and the records which I laid before the House, the hon. minister must come to the conclusion that I abstained from making any undue reflections on any person, and that I contented myself with making a cold, plain, bald statement of the facts to which the papers brought down last year have reference, as well as the papers filed in the Supreme Court of the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House in connection with this matter, but I desire to make an explanation which I hope, and am certain will be accepted by my hon. friend. I was acting Minister of Justice at the time the recommendation was made upon which Landry was granted ticket-of-leave. I never heard the man's name before the occasion on which the application was dealt with by me in the ordinary course in the Department of Justice, nor have I heard his name until it was mentioned, I think, last evening by my hon. friend. Nobody has ever spoken to me at any time, either before or since the ticket-of-leave was granted with regard to Landry, and when my hon. friend was dealing with it last night it was not in my memory, nor had it been in my mind, until my attention was called to it by the hon. Minister of Justice that such a man had been released on ticket-of leave or had come in any way officially before me. The procedure that is followed in the Department of Justice is known to my hon. friend and to others in this House. The report of the keeper of the jail, the finding of the judge, and any report he may make, the report of the physician as to the physical condition, the behaviour of the prisoner during confinement—all of these matters are taken into consideration. I may say for the information of hon. gentlemen that there are continually applications by the hundreds before the Minister of Justice for tickets-of-leave. Out of those hundreds of applications a very small percentage is favourably considered, and they are considered only upon a favourable report being made by the experienced and trained officers of the department. The officer who dealt especially with this case was Mr. Coté. Mr. Coté has been in the department for a number of years and I think he makes a report on every capital and other important case which comes before the department. I formed a very high opinion of his impartiality and judgment in dealing with such matters. This particular case was taken up in the ordinary course and without any knowledge whatever on my part that the Landry in question was the Landry referred to by my hon. friend from Richmond. I had no communication with Mr. Gillies; in fact, his name was almost unknown to me at that time. The case was dealt with impartially as any other case would be in the ordinary course. I do not understand my hon. friend to suggest any impropriety with respect to the important matter of the administration of justice especially in connection with the prerogative of mercy, the exercise of which belongs to the Crown on the advice of the minister. But, I do desire, in justice to my hon. colleague (Mr. Doherty) and myself to make this explanation, and to set forth the facts precisely as they exist with regard to the liberation upon ticket-of-leave of this particular person.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

PRIVATE BILL—SECOND READING.

Bill No. 11, respecting New Orleans and Grand Isle Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to New Orleans and Grand Isle Railway, Light and Power Company, Limited. —Mr. Macdonell.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

APPOINTMENT OF MR. PANNETON, K.C.

* Mr. LEMIEUX:

I would like to know if it is true that Mr. Panneton, K.C., of Sherbrooke, has been appointed a judge at Montreal?

Mr. DOHERTY: Yes.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—CONNECTION WITH MONTREAL.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to connect the city of Montreal with the Grand Trunk Pacific by a branch line?
2. Have works been already undertaken in that connection, and to what distance?
3. Has the line been definitely located? If so, what part of the country is crossed by that line?

Mr. COCHRANE: The matter is engaging the attention of the Government.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. How many employees of the Intercolonial railway have been dismissed from their duties from the 23rd June, 1896, to the 1st January, 1901, from Lévis to Campbellton?
2. What are their names, duties and ages and the reason for their dismissal?
3. Who asked for their dismissal in each case?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. 150.

2 and 3. See statement filed with the Clerk of the House.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has Mr. J. H. Pelletier, locomotive engineer on the Intercolonial railway at Rivière du Loup been dismissed as such? If so, for what reason?
2. Was there an inquiry and who was the informer?
3. Who was the inquiry commissioner and what amount has been paid to him up to date?
4. Have complaints or information been sent to the Minister of Railways on the subject of the dismissal from office of Mr. J. H. Pelletier?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes. For offensive partisanship.
2. Yes, an investigation was held; there was no informant, Dr. Luc Lebel made complaints.
3. Emile Gelly. $101.80 paid him.
4. Yes.

RESIDENT ENGINEER.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Who was the resident or superintendent engineer of the Welland Canal in the month of October, 1911?
2. What position in the Department of Railways and Canals has he held since that date, and at what salary?
3. Did he draw his full salary for the month of October, 1911, and during June and July, 1912?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. J. L. Weller.
2. Held the position of superintending engineer of the Welland canal at a salary of $3,850 per annum up to December 31, 1911. Since that date he has held the position of engineer in charge of surveys, design and construction of the new Welland canal at a salary of $7,500 per annum.
3. Yes.

WELLAND CANAL CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. GERMAN:

When does the Government expect to advertise for tenders for construction work on the new Welland canal?

Mr. COCHRANE: Plans and specifications are in course of preparation but are not yet sufficiently complete to call for tenders.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—STATION AT ST. EDOUARD.

Mr. MARCILE:

Does the Department of Railways intend to build a station at St. Edouard, county of Bagot? If so, will tenders be asked for?

Mr. COCHRANE: It has not been decided to build a station at St. Edouard.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—SUBWAY IN NEW GLASGOW.

Mr. MACDONALD:

Does the Railway Department intend to build a subway at Forbes street crossing in the town of New Glasgow?

Mr. COCHRANE: The matter is under the consideration of the department.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—NEW STATION AT TRENTON.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Have any petitions or requests been received asking for the erection of a new station or improved station accommodation at Trenton on the Intercolonial railway?
2. Does the Government intend to provide a new station at said place?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Two letters were received.

2. The matter has not yet been considered.

SUPERINTENDENT PAPINEAU.

On the Order:

For a copy of all correspondence and other papers connected with the dismissal of Mr. Papineau, superintendent of the Sorel shipyards.—Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. HAZEN: I think the hon. member is under some misapprehension about this. Mr. Papineau was not dismissed from the position of superintendent in Sorel. He tendered his resignation, and is now employed as an engineer in the Department of Public Works. If the hon. member desires the papers regarding his resignation I will bring them down, but I think the only paper in the case is the resignation itself.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Dropped.

DES PRAIRIES RIVER DREDGING.

Mr. WILSON (Laval) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, recommendations and reports respecting the dredging of Des Prairies river, the work done, depth, length and width of channel dredged, the list of men employed to perform that work, their salaries, and the amount of money spent on that work since the 1st of October, 1911, up to the 21st November, 1912.

He said: The only object I have in asking for this return is to get the information about this dredging. I may speak on this subject later on, after the return has been brought down, and with that view I shall probably make notes on paper, and on perhaps more than one sheet of paper. But, as I am not Prime Minister, and as my speech will not be an announcement of a naval programme, I give you my word of honour, Mr. Speaker, that I will not read those notes.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY AND THE VALE ROAD.

Mr. MACDONALD moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents received since the 1st day of January, 1912, asking that the line of railway known as the Vale Road, should be taken over by the Intercolonial railway.

He said: The line of railway referred to is about six miles in length. It belongs to the Acadia Coal Company, and is operated as a coal road, not as a passenger road, between the town of New Glasgow and the town of Thorburn in the county of Pictou. A year and a half ago, arrangements were made by the then Minister of Railways with the Acadia Coal Company by which the Government were to lease this road for a period of ninety-nine years at a nominal rental. Everything was in readiness for the completion of that arrangement—a Bill was introduced into this House for the purpose of enabling the Government to carry it on—when dissolution came in 1911, and matters came to a standstill. In pursuance of the understanding which had been arrived at between the Government and the company, though it had not been ratified, the Railway Department proceeded to give to the people who live along this line and in the town of Thorburn necessary railway accommodation by running passenger trains to that point from New Glasgow twice a day. After my hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) came in as Minister of Railways, the Railway Board stopped the accommodations which had been afforded under the previous minister, and the result is that since that time the people who live in this progressive village of Thorburn, while they have this railway running into their town operated for the transportation of coal, they have no means by which passengers can go from there to the centre of the county. Along this line of railway are various industries which have increased in size and importance to a very great extent. A portion of the enterprise of the Drain Pipe Company of St. Johns, Quebec, is in operation along that road, and arrangements were made during the past autumn to duplicate their present plant and double its output, and immediate means of transportation are needed in order to provide for the extension of that industry. There are also undeveloped coal areas within that district which can be dealt with satisfactorily only by the taking over of this road by the Government, and the carrying out of the arrangements perfected by the late administration, thus giving to the people interested the facilities they desire. I directed the attention of the Minister last year to this fact, and pressed upon him very strongly the desirability of taking over this road. I pointed out to him then—and I desire to reiterate the statement now—that whatever his view may be as to the general branch-line policy of the Government in connection with the Intercolonial railway, the conditions in regard to this particular matter vary so absolutely from those ordinarily existing that there are no difficulties in the way of his assuming control and operation of the road. Nothing is sought for by the company in the way of rental. It is practically a case of their giving over the road, provided certain provisions are made with regard to freight charges upon coal transported over that line. For over a year the people in this growing town have been lacking the privi-

leges of communication which at one time had been given to them. The minister has received representations upon this subject from a number of people, and I am sure he must have been impressed by the strength of the case, and the desirability of bringing the matter to a definite conclusion. I make the motion for the purpose of getting the information contained in the papers which I am sure have been brought to the attention of the hon. minister during the past year, and of impressing upon him the necessity of carrying out the arrangement effected in 1911 by assuming the control and operation of this road, giving to the people and industries affected those facilities of transportation of which they have been too long deprived.

Mr. COCHRANE: There is no objection to this motion being carried. I may say the matter has been delayed pending the development and taking over of the branch lines. We have not yet reached a stage at which we can formulate a definite policy, and I am not sure whether we will be able to do so this session, but the matter is receiving attention.

Mr. MACDONALD: Dealing with this question does not necessarily involve the establishing of any principle in regard to branch line railways. All the other branch line propositions involve payment by the Government of sums of money, or assuming some obligation in regard to which a general policy ought to be established, but this case does not interfere in any way with such a general policy. It can and should be treated by itself. I think it would be unfortunate if the minister should continue to deprive the people interested of the desired means of communication.

Mr. COCHRANE: One point which has to be considered is whether or not the branch lines are paying running expenses. Speaking from memory, I am under the impression that the line referred to by my hon. friend was put in operation as an experiment, and I do not think there was any definite arrangement as to continuing its operation.

Mr. MACDONALD: Has the minister investigated that feature of the matter.

Mr. COCHRANE: I can make no statement to-night in reference to that.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. MACDONALD moved:

For a copy of the different freight tariffs in force on the line of railways from Sunnybrae to Ferona Junction, on the Intercolonial railway, and of any requests that have been received in regard to the change in the same, and also a copy of any requests, petitions, letters or other documents complaining of the said tariff.

He said: About a year ago the Intercolonial railway purchased a line running from Ferona Junction to Sunnybrae, a distance of about 30 miles. Since that time that road has formed a part of the Intercolonial railway, and has been operated by the hon. minister through officials of his department, but the hon. minister and his officials have been charging the people special rates for freight carried by that line, treating it as if it were a separate road, and not a part of the Intercolonial. I am informed by railway men that the practice followed by other railway companies when dealing with conditions such as this is to avoid unduly antagonizing the interests of any community along the branch line and to give them the same rates as on a main line. I make this motion for the purpose of calling the attention of the minister to this fact; to ask him to remove this discrimination, and to treat all freight carried along the line referred to in the same manner as that transported on any other part of the Intercolonial railway. I am sure the minister could not have been seized of the facts, or, if the matter was called to his attention, he could not have appreciated the discrimination that was being carried on in this respect. Now that the matter has been brought to his attention, I trust he will take steps to remedy this state of affairs, which undoubtedly ought not to exist.

Mr. COCHRANE: We get $2 for every $4 we spend in the operation of this line. That is one of the difficulties which exist in respect to many of these branch lines—the high cost of maintenance and operation—and it is one of the most difficult questions we have to deal with. We have not come to any conclusion in the matter, but there is no objection to the motion being carried, and we will bring down any papers in connection therewith.

Mr. MACDONALD: Evidently the hon. minister does not intend to remove this discrimination?

Mr. COCHRANE: I did not say I would not.

Mr. MACDONALD: The answer given by the hon. minister is not a fair one. Certainly he is not encouraging the development of these branch lines by thus penalizing all the business attempted to be carried on in connection with their operation. I do not wish to open up this question, but if my hon. friend had carried out the policy contemplated in respect to the line of rail-

way so purchased, and had proceeded to construct a line to Guysborough, then this complaint would not have arisen. I submit the position which I have outlined in respect to this matter is a grossly unfair one, and I regret the minister has taken such an attitude in regard to it. I shall take advantage of another opportunity to bring the matter to his attention.

Mr. COCHRANE: The same policy has been pursued as that which I found in force when I took office.

Motion agreed to.

ERNEST PAQUIN DISMISSAL.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, investigations and papers generally concerning the dismissal of Ernest Paquin, postmaster of Ste. Cécile de Levrard, county of Nicolet.

He said: I was surprised the other day to receive a letter from this unfortunate postmaster. He was an old elector of mine when I had the honour to represent the constituency of Nicolet, and in those days he was supposed to be a Conservative. In fact I received many letters and petitions from the parish of Ste. Cécile de Levrard to dispense with his services. He was supposed to be an active partisan. However, I went into the matter pretty deeply and found out that while it was true that he was a good Conservative he was a good postmaster, and I did not care to dismiss him. Now, after four or five years, I find that he has been declared to be a Liberal and has been dismissed for cause. I suppose it was because I was so good to him when he was a Conservative that he gave our government some support, some evidence of his gratitude. If I had thought at the time that it would turn out that way, perhaps I might have followed another course. At all events, I am sorry that this postmaster was dismissed, because I happen to know the man personally, and he was highly recommended to me by a gentleman whom my hon. friend knows very well, Senator Shehyn, of Quebec. I suppose that the papers will disclose something extraordinary to justify the course that has been taken, because he had the support of the parishioners of Ste. Cécile de Levrard as well as of the pastor, and I am really surprised to find that he had been found guilty of some political offence, for he is a gentleman who did not take part at all in elections.

Mr. PELLETIER: The papers will be brought down. I have not the facts in my memory at present. I see that this gentleman occupied the position when my hon. friend was in office.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. MACDONALD.

MARTIN LANIGAN DISMISSAL.

Mr. EMMERSON moved for:

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, reports, and all other papers, relating to the dismissal of Martin Lanigan, postmaster at Rexton, county of Kent, New Brunswick, and of the minutes of evidence of any investigation of inquiry held relating to the said dismissal, and of all and any charges and recommendations connected therewith; as well as a copy of all letters written to the Postmaster General, or to any official of the Post Office Department, by F. J. Robidoux, M.P., or by any other person relating to the said dismissal.

He said: This is a case that need not occupy the attention of the House at any length. It would seem that during the past year my hon. friend the Postmaster General has indulged in a carnival of decapitation with a glee which outside of this House, and if it had had reference to the animal kingdom, would be called ghoulish. Personally I am not cognizant of all the facts and circumstances of the case, but they have been brought to my notice in a letter addressed to me by Mr. Lanigan the decapitated postmaster of Rexton in the county of Kent, in the province of New Brunswick. Mr. Lanigan, writing me under date November 25 last, says:

I am inclosing you notice I received from Post Office Department with declaration attached for me to fill out and signed by a justice of the peace, which I did with a note attached, saying I had taken no part in the elections nor had I attended a meeting of any political party for twelve or thirteen years. I said I represented the Hon. D. J. LeBlanc in 1896 in Rexton booth; and in 1900, in Richibucto, I was returning officer in the local election about that time. Since then I took no part, did not ask any person how they were going to vote or how to vote. I went to vote and did not deny that my sympathy was with the Liberal party. It was the only party I was under any obligation to.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. EMMERSON: It is not everybody who discharges his obligations. (Reading):

I heard in the winter that they were going to take the office from me, so I wrote Mr. Robidoux if such was the case as I had taken no part in the election any more than vote, which I thought was my right. I told him I was an old man going on 73 and had a heavy charge depending on me for a living, but it made no difference. Without consulting any of his supporters outside of Brait and Carson and two or three more on the south side of the bridge where the post office was removed to, at the inconvenience of the bank and others on the north side of the bridge that made up seven-eights of the revenue to the office.

If there is a mark standing against me in the Post Office Department while in my official capacity, fifteen years and two months, I

will say nothing, but I think it very hard to be dismissed without some reason and without any investigation. I also inclose you Mr. Robidoux's reply to my letter.

It would seem that, in addition to the executioner in chief, there are local, subordinate county officials who have the privilege of saying what shall be done and when it shall be done. Before reading this letter from the local executioner for the county of Kent, I will refer to the document first made reference to in the letter of Mr. Lanigan:

Ottawa, 23rd April, 1912.

Sir,—It is reported to this department that since your appointment as postmaster at Rexton, N.B., you have taken an active part in federal and provincial elections.

I am, therefore, directed to request that you will be good enough to say whether this is true.

If the accusation is not well founded, I presume that you will have no objection to sign the solemn declaration herewith inclosed, which should be attested before a justice of the peace.

An early reply is requested.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
HECTOR B. VERRET,
Asst. Deputy Postmaster General.

This declaration which was to be sworn to and attested before a justice of the peace was made by Mr. Lanigan and returned to the Postmaster General. All these accusations were denied, pursuant to the terms of the declaration which, I may say, is a most unique document in itself. The postmaster executed that document, returned it, and the next that he heard was that the office had been transferred from him to his successor. This post office, for many years, was located on the south side, I think, of the Richibucto river. Rexton is quite an important community, separated by the Richibucto river and the different sections of the village or town are connected by a bridge. There are large business interests on both sides of the river, and on the one where the post office was heretofore located are situated the bank and other large business establishments. By the removal of Mr. Lanigan from the office and its transfer to another section of the town very great inconvenience was occasioned to the business community. Let me explain that the section of Rexton from whence this post office was removed was the section which contributed more than seven-eighths of the total revenue of the post office. Mr. Lanigan, in his letter, refers to having written to Mr. Robidoux, who has the honour of representing the county of Kent in this House. The letter of the hon. member for Kent in reply to that of Mr. Lanigan, is as follows:

House of Commons,
Ottawa, Jan. 18, 1912.

Martin Lanigan, Esq.,
Rexton, N.B.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of the 15th inst. duly received and contents noted. I can only say, in reply, that I have your case under consideration and that it will be considered on its merits.

I remain,
Yours very truly,
FERDINAND J. ROBIDOUX.

I am not objecting at all to the tone or phraseology of the letter, but it does seem to indicate that this is not a matter of judgment on the part of the Postmaster General, that it does not depend upon the exercise of his discretion, but that, under the system which now prevails, the responsibility and the exercise of discretion are placed upon the member in support of the Government representing the constituency, or in the hands, as we have had evidence in this House during this session, of the gentleman who was the candidate in the Conservative interest at the last election, but who was defeated and now stands as sponsor for the acts of the Government in all matters relating to patronage. To me the matter of these dismissals in connection with these small post offices throughout these different ridings is one of amazement and I cannot fully appreciate the action that has been taken. I can say this, in so far as the county which I have the honour to represent is concerned, that the appointment of country postmasters, from one end of the county to the other, has not been in the hands of patronage wielders, but has been in the hands of every individual patron of the office in the district which the office serves. All these appointments were made on petition from the residents or inhabitants. I have never heard of the dismissal of a country postmaster because of participation in elections either on one side or the other. But, perhaps the Liberal party are responsible for it all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON: My hon. friends say: 'hear, hear', but perhaps not for the reason which I ascribe. When the Liberal party came into power they found a Post Office Department with a deficit of nearly a million dollars. They found postmasters throughout the country receiving the paltry pittance of about $10 or $12 per annum and they increased the pay from $10 to about $35 per annum. Now, the bait has been too rich. The Liberals should never have furnished the bait so that there would not have been so many applicants. I know that the tender heart of the Postmaster General revolts against these decapitations. I know it is no pleasure to the Postmaster

General to dismiss any employee, but he tells us himself, he is so hounded from one end of the Dominion to the other, with demands for dismissals, and that he only wavers to a small extent in proporotion to the demands made upon him. The facts disclosed in this case prove that the treatment accorded Mr. Lanigan was very unfair. After the charge was made in the first instance, the minister should have given Mr. Lanigan an investigation. I would not call in question the word of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Robidoux), but I do say that he could not be expected to have a personal knowledge of the facts, and he no doubt had to depend upon the representation made to him by parties who were interested in securing the reversion of the office. I venture to think there must be something in the report to the department setting forth that there were wide differences of opinion in the community, not only with respect to the individual who should occupy the office, but also as regards the convenience of the location of the office. If the papers disclose facts which support the representations made to me by Mr. Lanigan, I hope justice will be done him even at this late hour. I have no objection to the adjournment of the debate until the hon. member for Kent is in his place.

Mr. PELLETIER : When the Postmaster General is attacked he is supposed to be able to take care of himself, but in the present instance the attack is against another hon. member who is absent. The hon. member for Kent has gone to St. John to be present at the consecration of the bishop, and it is only proper that the debate should await his return.

Mr. EMMERSON : I am not attacking the hon. member for Kent; I am attacking the system.

Mr. PELLETIER : The papers will be brought down. The hon. member is mistaken if he thinks that I dismiss officials simply because I am told to; that is not at all the line of action I have been following.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

Mr. BURNHAM moved :

That, in the opinion of this House, a Select Special Committee should be appointed to make an inquiry into an old age pension system for Canada, with power to send for persons, papers and records and to report from time to time.

Mr. WHITE (Minister of Finance): A resolution similar to this was adopted last session and I understand that the hon. member desires to continue the same committee for the purpose of obtaining the information required. There is no objection to the motion.

Motion agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF Dr. J. POMMINVILLE TO THE ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. C. A. WILSON (Laval) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, recommendations and reports concerning the appointment of Dr. J. Pomminville as surgeon at the penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul, in place of Dr. A. Allaire.

He said: I wish to draw the attention of the House, and more particularly that of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), to the matter of the dismissal of Dr. Pomminville as surgeon at the penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul, considering that the change was effected during the absence of the hon. minister in Great Britain last summer.

I must say to the credit of the hon. Minister of Justice that in his administration of the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary, he has not indulged in wholesale dismissals as other ministers have done in various departments. In bringing this matter to the attention of the House, my object is to acquit myself of a duty towards my constituents and towards Dr. Allaire.

I understand Dr. Allaire was appointed in the month of February, 1902. He never meddled with politics. He was recommended by myself and by the late Mr. Tarte, who owed him something. When I say that he owed him something, I do not mean money or anything of the kind. He was an old friend of the Conservative party. For a period of ten years Dr. Allaire discharged the duties to the satisfaction of the department. For seven years past, Dr. Allaire has been a widower with a family of six children to support, and I may add that he is very poor. His youngest child was educated at the expense of the Reverend Mr. Harel, chaplain of the penitentiary, who died a year or two ago.

Mr. Allaire never took part in elections; he even never attended public meetings. Unexpectedly, without a quarter of an hour's notice, and while the hon. Minister of Justice was absent, he was dismissed, deprived, and his six children as well, of their only means of subsistence, to make way for Dr. Pomminville, brother-in-law of Mr. Sévère Laviolette, the chief organizer at St. Jérôme of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel). Mr. Sévère Laviolette is a brother to Dr. Camille Laviolette, of Montreal, a well known Conservative, whom the Liberal Government of Quebec retain in their employ as physician at the Longue Pointe lunatic asylum, at a salary of $1,200 per annum.

As for Dr. Pomminville, he was formerly Conservative candidate in the county of Laval, and has attended all political meetings for a number of years. He was Mr. Léonard's organizer in that constituency. He was always ready for a fight—I say so advisedly—; I shall abstain from referring to his private conduct, as that would lead me too far. At the last election he represented Mr. Léonard, the Conservative candidate. For the last fifteen years to say the least, Dr. Pomminville has always taken a very active part in elections. He even once requested the returning officer to expel me from a polling booth when I was a candidate.

Mr. Pomminville has a revenue from personal sources of above a thousand dollars per annum. He is married, but has no children. I beg to draw the attention of the Minister of Justice, as a father of a family, to these circumstances, and would like to inquire why Dr. Allaire has been deprived of his position in favour of Dr. Pomminville. What has the latter done to earn that position?

As for Dr. Allaire, who has been dismissed, he never interfered in politics. You will not find a man in the county of Laval to contradict me on that point, and I may even appeal to Dr. Pomminville himself as to that. I shall leave it with him to say whether or not Dr. Allaire has deserved the treatment which is being meted out to him on the grounds of having meddled in politics.

Mr. DOHERTY: I have not in memory the grounds for the action that was taken in this matter, but if my memory serves me well it was not in connection with any political partisanship on the part of Dr. Allaire that the change was effected. With regard to Dr. Pomminville I am not aware whether he was or was not a very active supporter of the party to which he belonged. I would be willing to accept the hon. member's statement to that effect. But I would not consider that the fact that a gentleman occupying no position as a government employee had concerned himself with politics would be a reason why, if he were otherwise qualified, he should not be appointed to office. In his present office, of course, he will be expected to abstain from party politics; but I am free to confess that I cannot follow the hon. member's contention that past participation in politics should have prevented the appointment of Dr. Pomminville. The hon. member shall have the papers.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Henry Burrell, postmaster, Yarmouth North, Yarmouth county, N.S., and the same information regarding the appointment of Henry Burrell's successor; and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by Charles Lane in regard to the same, also a detailed statement of expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents relating to the appointment of Charles W. Hatfield, fishery office on the Tusket river, Yarmouth county, N.S.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Captain George Wetmore, harbour master at Yarmouth, Yarmouth county, N.S., and the same information regarding the appointment of Captain Wetmore's successor; and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by Charles Lane in regard to the same, also a detailed statement of expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Norman L. Trefry, shipping master at Yarmouth, county of Yarmouth, N.S., and the same information regarding the appointment of Mr. Trefry's successor.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Dr. Charles A. Webster, port physician at Yarmouth, county of Yarmouth, N.S., and the same information regarding the appointment of Dr. Webster's successor.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of D. Morin as postmaster of St. Pie de Bagot, county of Bagot.—Mr. Marcile.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents respecting the dismissal of J. E. Phaneuf, postmaster of St. Hugues, county of Bagot.—Mr. Marcile.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, requests, telegrams and other documents relating to the appointment of Louis Nadeau as postmaster at Ste. Christine, county of Bagot.—Mr. Marcile.

For a copy of all correspondence, papers, &c., in connection with the recent reduction in cable rates between Canada and Great Britain.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all documents concerning the dismissal of Charles Meunier, customs preventive officer at Marieville, Quebec.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a return showing (a) each mail contract awarded since the 15th of October, 1911; (b) the name of the tenderer in each case; (c) the figures of each tender; and (d) the name of each party to whom such contract has been awarded.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all correspondence and other papers, in the Department of Public Works, concerning the awarding of a contract for a Welsh coal supply to the various Dominion public buildings in Montreal.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions and other papers received by the Prime Minister, or any member of the Government,

since the 1st April, 1912, in connection with the school system established in that portion of the Keewatin territory annexed to the province of Manitoba.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a return showing the detail and number of dismissals from public offices by the present Government to this date in the riding of Saltcoats, Sask., together with the names of the dismissed occupants, the reasons for their dismissals, the complaints against such officials, and a copy of all correspondence with respect to the same, and all reports of investigations in cases where such were held. —Mr. MacNutt.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, complaints, petitions and other documents relating to the investigation of A. W. Salsman, postmaster at Middle Country Harbour, N.S., and to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all correspondence, evidence and papers generally in connection with the dismissal of James Murphy, postmaster at Tweed, Ont.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a return showing the number of dismissals from public offices by the present Government to this date in the constituency of Regina, together with the names of the dismissed officials, the reasons for their dismissals, the complaints against such officials, and a copy of all correspondence with respect to the same, and of all reports of any investigation held in respect to the same.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

For a return showing all the public officers dismissed by the present Government in the district of Kamouraska, with the names and duties of such persons respectively, the reason for their dismissal, the nature of the complaint brought against them, also of all correspondence relating thereto and reports of inquiries in cases where such have been held.—Mr. Lapointe.

For a copy of all evidence, plans, reports, correspondence, &c., respecting an inquiry held concerning an accident on the Intercolonial railway at St. André de Kamouraska on the 7th October, 1912, caused by train No. 33, the Maritime express, going west.—Mr. Lapointe.

For a return showing all public officers removed by the present Government in the district of Portneuf, together with the names and duties of each person, the reasons for their dismissal, the nature of the complaints brought against them, also a copy of all correspondence relating thereto and reports of inquiries in cases where such were held.—Mr. Delisle.

For a copy of the original contract granted to Messrs. Corry & Laverdure by the Hon. Mr. Haggart, Minister of Railways, the instructions given to the contractors by Mr. Schreiber, the daily, weekly and monthly reports of Engineer Rogers, charged by the Government to superintend the works; a copy of the correspondence exchanged between the contractors or their lawyers and the department respecting the extras on the work; of the instructions given by the department to Engineer Rogers and the contractors respecting the said extras; of the first claim of Messrs. Corry & Laverdure; of the Order in Council referring this claim to arbitration; of the correspondence exchanged between the department, the Minister of Railways or any of his officers and the contractors and their lawyers respecting this claim and this reference; of the instructions given by the department to the arbitrators; of the report of valuation and the proof presented to the arbitrators; of the award of the arbitrators, and their report to the department; of the correspondence exchanged between the department and the contractors or their lawyers after the award up to the payment of the arbitration; of the Orders of the Governor General in Council relating thereto; a copy of the minutes of the Treasury Board respecting the matter; of the report of the Minister of Justice, Hon. Mr. Mills, on the award of the arbitrators, &c.; of the correspondence exchanged between the department, the contractors and their lawyers after the payment of the first arbitration; of the second claim; of the Order in Council referring the said claim to the arbitrators; of the letter of the Minister of Railways allowing such reference; of the minutes of the deliberations of the arbitrators; of the proof produced before them; of their report to the minister and their award; also a copy of the correspondence exchanged between the minister, the department, the contractors or their lawyers since the award; a copy of the reports made to council at different times respecting this award of the different reports of the Minister of Justice on the subject; of the suggestions made by the Minister of Justice that the matter be submitted to the Exchequer Court; of the minutes of the Treasury Board respecting the claim; of the reports made on different occasions since 1895 on this claim by Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals; and of the special reports made by Engineer Rogers on the same matter; finally, a copy of all the correspondence exchanged between the contractors or their lawyers and the present Minister of Railways and Canals.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a return showing the detail and number of dismissals from public offices by the present Government to this date in the riding of Strathcona, together with the names of the dismissed occupants, the reasons for their dismissal, the complaints against such officials, and a copy of all correspondence with respect to the same, and of all reports of investigations, where such were held.—Mr. Douglas.

For a copy of all correspondence, reports and other documents and papers relating to the dismissal of H. Lacasse, as postmaster at Wendover, county of Prescott, Ontario, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Proulx.

For a statement showing (a) the name of each counsel retained by the Dominion Government in connection with the marriage reference case to both the Supreme Court and to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; and (b) the fees paid to each counsel before each tribunal.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all papers, documents, tenders and correspondence relating in any way to the construction of a wharf at Krant Point, Lunenburg county, N.S.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, recommendations, and reports concerning the

dismissal of Miss Eugénie Dorion, an employee in the office of the post office inspector at Quebec; the reasons for her dismissal, the nature of the complaints brought against her, if any, the names of the persons who brought these complaints, also a copy of all correspondence relating thereto, and the report of inquiry, if there was one held.

For a copy of all correspondence, documents, recommendation and other reports respecting the dismissal of Dr. A. Allaire as surgeon of the penitentiary of St. Vincent de Paul, and also respecting the payments of his gratuities, superannuation or retiring allowance.

On motion of Mr. Pelletier, House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 11, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS

Bill No. 29, to incorporate Canada Western Trust and Mortgage Company.—Mr. Meighen.

Bill No. 30, to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters, and to change the name to 'The Independent Order of Foresters.'—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 31, to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Guarantee Company of North America.—Mr. Baker.

THE IMPROVEMENT OF HIGHWAYS.

Mr. COCHRANE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 32, to encourage and assist the Improvement of Highways.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Are we to assume that this Bill is the same as that introduced last year, or are we to expect that it has been improved?

Mr. COCHRANE: There were some amendments agreed to in the House last session that I thought of putting in when we come to them.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FOREIGN FISHING VESSELS IN CANADIAN WATERS.

Mr. HAZEN moved for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Customs and Fisheries Protection Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. HAZEN: While United States fishing vessels, in common with British fishing vessels, have liberty to fish in the waters that are mentioned in the treaty of 1818, other foreign fishing vessels have no such liberty; but there is nothing in the existing legislation to deny them this privilege, and to-day, if other foreign fishing vessels came to fish in those waters described in the treaty, we have no power to prevent them from doing so. The purpose of this Bill is to remedy that state of affairs.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Does the hon. minister say that, under the conditions now existing, foreign vessels cannot fish in those waters mentioned in the treaty of 1818, other than United States fishing vessels?

Mr. HAZEN: I did not say that. Under the treaty of 1818, fishing vessels belonging to the United States have undoubtedly the right to fish in the waters described in that treaty, but other fishing vessels have not that right. Under the legislation that exists, however, if other fishing vessels did come in and fish in those waters which are described in the treaty of 1818 we have no power under the statute at present to prevent them from doing so. In drafting the Act, the drafter was evidently under the impression, or whether he was under the impression or not, the idea is conveyed by the Act that the fishing vessels of foreign powers have the right to come and fish in those waters, while it was clearly the intention of the treaty that that privilege should belong to fishing vessels of the United States.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We understand it now. I could not realize why it was thought necessary to prohibit the vessels of other nations from fishing in our territorial waters, but apparently it is to correct a mistake in the statute.

Mr. SPEAKER: It seems to me that the Bill is of a character which affects trade or customs duties, and, if so, it requires to be preceded by a resolution. I do not know whether the hon. minister's attention has been drawn to that point.

Mr. HAZEN: My attention has not been drawn to that point, and it did not occur to me that any resolution was necessary. But if you, Mr. Speaker, have any doubt about the matter, we could let the Bill stand, and I shall look into it. I do not think it deals with trade and commerce, in the sense that trade and commerce are usually referred to. The Bill is really for the purpose of correcting a mistake in the existing legislation. However, there will be no harm in allowing the Bill to stand for the present.

Bill allowed to stand.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. BURNHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 33, to amend the Dominion Elections Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. BURNHAM: This Bill simply contemplates making the Dominion Elections Act conform to the various provincial election Acts. That is to say, instead of there being a deposit of $200 as is now required in all Dominion elections, the deposit in Dominion elections should conform to that required in the particular province in which the elections take place. For example, in Ontario no deposit is required under the provincial Act, and, therefore, under this contemplated legislation no deposit would be required in the Dominion elections in that province, and so on.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MEIGHEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 34 to amend the Railway Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill is in the exact wording of the Bill introduced last session, which was explained to the House. The only difference is that the first clause of last session's Bill is omitted in this Bill. There is no attempt in the amendment now proposed to compel the submission to the Board of Railway Commissioners of any plans for cattle guards or fences. The clause that remains is the important and vital clause of last session's Bill, and it provides for a different character of burden to be borne by the railway company before they escape liability for the killing of animals on the track.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

ADMIRALTY ORDERS FOR CANADA.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with questions, may I call the attention of my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) to a despatch from London which appeared in the Citizen of yesterday, and which is addressed to the Canadian Associated Press. It is in these words:

Replying to Hon. Mr. Lee, former Civil Lord of the Admiralty, Hon. Mr. Asquith said that certain arrangements of a general character had been agreed upon between the Admiralty and the Dominion Government with regard to the transfer of certain warships of the Royal Canadian Navy after sufficient notice had been given to allow of them being replaced, by placing in Canada of an order for some light cruisers. The papers would be laid before Parliament after the Dominion Government Bill received the Royal assent.

This states positively that Mr. Asquith said yesterday that, besides the agreement we have now under consideration between the Admiralty and the Dominion Government, there is another which is to take effect later on, and which has not yet been submitted to the House.

Mr. BORDEN: I am under the impression that Mr. Asquith is alluding to what I stated in my speech, namely, that I am assured that the Admiralty are prepared to give orders for the construction in Canada of some small ships, such as cruisers, oil tank vessels, and auxiliary craft. I do not know to what the reference could be unless it was to that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I noticed very carefully, when my right hon. friend delivered his speech the other day, and when I read it afterwards, that he made several rather vague statements; for instance, he said that he had the assurance of certain things, amongst others, that Canadians would be allowed to become officers on board the Canadian ships; and when there were certain orders to be given by the Admiralty, the cost being defrayed by the Canadian Government. I understood from the speech of my right hon. friend that nothing definite had been agreed to, but that certain conversations had taken place in that direction. I would have supposed that, if there had been a concrete understanding, such understanding would have been brought before the House. The statement of Mr. Asquith would rather indicate that there has been such an understanding. If my hon. friend says that Mr. Asquith was not properly advised, that will, as far as I am concerned, end the matter, but what I would like to know is whether or not the despatch is accurate. May I read it again?

Replying to Hon. Mr. Lee, former Civil Lord of the Admiralty, Hon. Mr. Asquith said that certain agreements of a general character had been agreed upon.

These arrangements are different from the arrangements we have before us now, and I understand that there are such arrangements in form between the Admiralty and my right hon. friend.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not vouch at all for the report of Mr. Asquith's observation which appears in the press. It is beyond question that whatever he did say in regard to it is absolutely in conformity with the fact. At the moment I have nothing more to say about it than that which I stated in my speech. We have the assurance to which I alluded. Further than that, if my right hon. friend will observe the terms of the last clause of the Bill, he will see provision made for stating these matters in a more concrete form, if necessary.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: If these arrangements are simply vague and not reduced to writing, I have nothing more to say; but if they are in the form of an agreement which has been reduced to writing, certainly it would be the duty of my right hon. friend to give communication of them to the House.

Mr. BORDEN: The assurance to which I have alluded has been given, we rely upon it, and we have no doubt whatever that it will be carried out. Further than that, definite arrangements can be made under the clause to which I have alluded.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is evading the point. I want to know if there is such an arrangement as that in writing. I have no doubt that, whether verbal or in writing, it will be carried out; but I want to know if there is such an agreement in writing.

Mr. BORDEN: I want to tell the right hon. gentleman that I was authorized to make the statement I did make in this House, and that is all the information I am able to give to him at the moment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear; we are to understand that it is a verbal arrangement.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

GOVERNMENT SHIPYARD AT SOREL.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. How many employees have been dismissed from the Government shipyards at Sorel, Quebec, since January 1, 1912?
2. What was the date of dismissal in each case, and the name and salary paid to each?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The superintendent of the shipyard at Sorel reports that since the 1st January, 1912, the services of three hundred and eighty-five persons have been discontinued. Of this number three hundred and fifty-nine have been retired, to make the number of men employed conform to the amount of work on hand. Of the number thus retired, fifty-four have been taken back from time to time as employment has been found for them. Twenty-one have been dismissed for insubordination. In the case of the remaining five, no cause has been assigned by the superintendent for their retirement.

2. Statement filed with the Clerk of the House.

MINISTERS' PRIVATE SECRETARIES.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. What are the names of the ministers' private secretaries, and what is the rank and salary of each?
2. What was the occupation and salary of each such private secretary at the time of his or her appointment?

Mr. CODERRE:

Department of Agriculture:

1. William Ide, B.A., sub-division 'B' of the first division, salary, $2,400 per annum, with an allowance of $500 per annum as private secretary.

2. Clerk, copyrights and trade marks branch, salary, $1,850 per annum.

Department of Customs:

1. James Sydney Rowe, is private secretary to the Minister of Customs; his rank is that of clerk in the first division, subdivision 'B' and salary $2,100 a year and private secretary's allowance of $600.

2. Occupation at the time of his appointment, press correspondent, salary unknown.

Department of Finance:

1. R. B. Veits; rank, subdivision 'A' of second division, salary $2,100, and private secretary's allowance of $600.

2. Clerk in Department of Finance and private secretary. Rank, subdivision 'A' of second division, salary $1,800 and private secretary's allowance of $400.

Department of Inland Revenue:

1. Joseph Leon Kemner Laflamme, first division, subdivision 'B' $2,100, plus $600 as private secretary.

2. Not previously in the service.

Department of Justice:

1. Private secretary to the Minister of Justice, John T. Hackett, B.A., B.C.L., rank, first division, subdivision 'B' salary $2,800 per annum and $600 allowance.

2. Barrister.

Department of Labour:

1. J. G. McKellar, second division, subdivision 'A,' $1,600. No extra allowance, as private secretary.

2. Not previously in the service of the Government.

Department of Marine and Fisheries:

1. Gustav Heidmann, first division, subdivision 'B' $2,100 plus $600 as private secretary.

2. Assistant to the secretary of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission, salary $1,800.

Department of Militia and Defence:

1. A. B. Goldwyer-Lewis, B.A., subdivision 'B' first division. Salary $2,400. Private secretary's allowance $600.

2. A clerk in the Department of Militia and Defence.

Post Office Department:

1. Position at present vacant.

2. Answered by number one.

Privy Council Office:

1. A. E. Blount, first division, subdivision 'B' $2,800 and $600 allowance. Private secretary to the Premier.

2. No information.

Department of Public Works:

1. George F. Buskard, 1 B., $2,400 and $600 private secretary's allowance.

2. Private secretary to Minister of the Interior at same salary as above.

Department of Railways and Canals:

1. Mr. George W. Yates, first division, subdivision 'B' salary $2,400 and $600, total $3,000.

2. Private secretary to Mr. Cochrane who had been Minister of Lands, Forests and Mines for Ontario.

Departments of the Interior and Secretary of State:

1. No appointment of private secretary to the present Secretary of State yet made, and no one paid as such.

Mr. J. G. Mitchell, private secretary to Honourable Dr. Roche when Secretary of State is now acting private secretary to Dr. Roche, Minister of the Interior.

Mr. Mitchell is still on the pay list of the Department of the Secretary of State as an officer of subdivision 'B' first division at $2,100 and private secretary's allowance of $600.

Department of Trade and Commerce:

No appointment made.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MR. ESDRAS MORIN.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has Esdras Morin, of St. Aubert, been appointed to any position on the Transcontinental railway?

2. Is he employed by the Government in any position? If so, what are his duties and his salary?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. No.

2. On the 30th September 1912, by Order in Council, Ernest Taschereau, Commissioner of Police of Quebec, was directed to appoint Esdras Morin of St. Aubert, to serve as a police constable within his jurisdiction. No salary has been fixed.

GOVERNMENT LIGHTSHIP AT ST. ROCH.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. For what reasons has the Government taken away the care of the lightship at St. Roch, from Captain Andrews, to give it to David Bourgault, of St. Roch des Aulnaies?

2. What complaint is made against Captain Andrews?

3. Does the Government know that complaints are said to have already been made against David Bourgault, at the time he was lightkeeper at the entrance of the Saguenay?

4. Does the Government know that the said David Bourgault, as alleged, has publicly declared that he had paid $500 to one of the political organizers of Dr. Paquet, at St. Roch des Aulnaies, to be appointed in the place of Captain Andrews?

5. If not, will the department cause an inquiry to be made on this subject?

Mr. CODERRE:

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Speaker, I would call the attention of the hon. member for Temiscouata to the above question in which he asks, 'Does the Government know that, as alleged,' and so on. There is no allegation in any part of the question, and I do not know what allegation my hon. friend refers to. There is nothing alleged in the question as being a fact. Possibly some mistake may have been made in the translation of the question. I am answering the question, but I want to say in answering it that it must not be considered in the future that there has been any allegation made because we are not aware of any such allegation. The answer is as follows:

1. It would appear that the member refers to Capt. Andrew Christensen instead of Capt. Andrews. The change was made so that each captain would be situated in his own county.

2. None.

3. During the first year of his service it was reported that he did not appear 'to have the required commanding power to control his men.' Since that time he has given satisfactory service.

4. No.

5. No charge of the nature specified in question four having been made to the department it does not consider it necessary to cause an inquiry to be made, but if any member of the House on his own responsibility makes such a charge an investigation will be ordered without delay.

PORT HOOD HARBOUR.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness):

1. What was the estimated cost of the closing of the entrance to Port Hood harbour?

2. How much money has been expended to date on this work?

3. What was the amount spent each year since the project was undertaken?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to complete the work?

5. Will there be an appropriation in the estimates this year for this work?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. $285,000.00.

2. $133,653.68.

3. 1903-04, $2,968.85; 1904-05, $19,942.43; 1905-06, $9,999.91; 1906-07, $14,885.13; 1907-08, $14,999.37; 1908-09, $15,000.98; 1909-10, $15,012.31; 1910-11, $22,412.35; 1911-12, $18,432.35; total, $133,653.68.

4 and 5. The matter will be carefully considered when the Estimates are being prepared.

OFFICIAL HISTORY OF CANADA.

Mr. ETHIER:

1. Has the Government appointed a commission charged to prepare an official history of Canada?

2. If so, is it true that this commission is composed of Messrs. Pope, Doughty and W. Jarvis, and what are the powers of the commissioners?

3. Why has the Government not added to this commission a man of letters or a French historian?

4. Is it the intention of the Government to fill this position by making such appointment?

Mr. CODERRE :

1. No.

2. By a commission dated the 9th November, 1912, Sir Joseph Pope, K.C.M.G., and Messrs. E. F. Jarvis and A. G. Doughty were appointed commissioners for the purposes of an investigation with respect to the records of the different departments of the Government of Canada, with a view of ascertaining their nature and extent and their state of preservation, the use made of them in conducting public business, the state of the buildings wherein such documents are deposited, the space they occupy, the facilities of access thereto by such departments and by the public, and the control exercised over the said records.

3 and 4. Answered by No. 1.

SUPERINTENDENT OF DOMINION PARKS.

Mr. OLIVER :

1. Why was Howard Douglas, superintendent of Dominion parks, dismissed?

2. Who has been appointed in his place?

Mr. ROCHE :

1. Because he was unreliable and was using his official position to advance his personal interests.

2. P. C. Barnard-Hervey.

HUDSON WHARF ROAD.

Mr. BOYER :

1. Who has the superintendence of the repair works of the road between the wharf at Hudson and the railway, and what amount has this overseer received?

2. Who are the other persons who have worked on this road, how much has each received, and what kind of emp'oyment?

3. Who are the different furnishers of material for this work, what are their names and the amount of their accounts respectively?

4. How many days work was required on this work?

5. What is the extent of this road and how many tons of stone have entered into its construction?

Mr. ROGERS :

1. Nap. Mallette, 28th May to 31st August, 1912, 83 days at $3....$249 00

2. Wilfrid St. Dénis, teaming, 29th May-8th June, 1912, 10 days at $4.00.. .. .. $ 40 00

Stephen Daoult, teaming, 29th May-24th July, 1912 (double team), 41½ days at $4.00, $166.00; 8th July-31st August, 1912, 36½ days at $3, $109.50..$ 275 50

Daniel Daoult, labourer, 10th June-16th August, 1912, 52 days at $2.00.. .. .. 104 00

Alfred Daoult, teaming (single), 8th July-31st August, 1912, 39½ days at $3.00.. .. .. 118 50

Antoine Leroux, labourer, 12-17th August, 1912, 5½ days at $2.00 11 00

Achille Bertrand, teaming (double), 6-17th August, 1912, 11 days at $4.00.. .. .. 44 00

Total.. .. ..$842 00

3. George Pearson, Hudson, Qué., 1st July, 1912, 55 loads of stone at 10 cents.. .. .. $ 5 50

Nap. Mallette, Fils, Hudson, Que., 1st July, 1912, 190 loads of stone at 10 cents, $19.00; 1st August, 1912, 62 loads of stone at 10 cents, $6.20; 1st August, 1912, 189 loads of earth at 15 cents, $28.35; 31st August, 1912, 303 loads of earth at 15 cents, $45.45; 31st August, 1912, 55 loads of stone at 10 cents, $5.50.. .. .. .. 104 50

Geo. Parsons, Como, Qué., 1st August, 1912, 79 loads of stone at 10 cents, $7.90; 1st August, 1912, 106 loads of earth at 15 cents, $15.90; 31st August, 1912, 158 loads of earth at 15 cents, $23.70.. .. .. 47 50

Total.. .. ..$157 50

$999 50

4. 28th May to 1st September, 1912.

5. 605 by 20 feet; 756 loads of gravel; 441 loads of stone.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY KINDLING WOOD.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. On what date or dates were tenders called for the supply of kindling wood on the Intercolonial railway during the past calendar year, for the eastern division of the Intercolonial railway, or for all the divisions?

2. How many tenders were received, what are the names of the tenderers, and at what dates respectively, were the tenders received, and what were the prices named by each tenderer?

3. Was the lowest or any tender accepted? If so, whose tender, and at what figures was the contract entered into?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. On the 24th April, 1912, for the divisions of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and the province of Quebec.

2. See abstracts of tenders and memoranda filed with the Clerk of the House.

3. See abstracts of tenders attached and memoranda filed with the Clerk of the House.

ISAAC'S HARBOUR LOBSTER HATCHERY.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Was Charles G. Giffin, Isaac's Harbour, N.S., dismissed from the employment of the Department of Marine and Fisheries as an employee of said department in connection with the lobster hatchery at that place? If so, why?
2. Was an investigation held?
3. Who was appointed in his place?
4. Were public tenders asked for?
5. If so, what is the name of each tenderer and the amount of each tender?
6. Was the contract or employment given to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not?
7. Why was Charles G. Giffin's contract cancelled?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Charles G. Giffin was at no time a regular employee of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but had an agreement with the department to supply a gasoline launch for the collection of lobster eggs at $12 per day, during the season of 1911.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. The service during the past season was performed by Captain P. McArthur, of Goldborough, N.S.

4. Yes.

5. Captain P. McArthur, Goldborough, N. S., offered to supply boat 34 ft. over-all, 8 ft. 6 in. wide and 50 ft. deep. Fitted with sails and 8 horsepower Fairbank's Morse engine. Boat and engine new, for $5.75 per day.

Captain Charles G. Giffin, Isaac's Harbour, N. S., offered to supply boat 32 ft. long over-all, 8 ft. 2 in. beam, with 10 horsepower double cylinder, for $5.95 per day.

6. Yes, the lowest tenderer.

7. No regular contract existed.

DAVID MURRAY'S SERVICES.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

What salary or remuneration yearly or otherwise is David Murray, of Mulgrave, N.S., receiving for the services being rendered by him as a preventive officer at that place?

Mr. WHITE: The salary of Mr. David Murray for services at Mulgrave and other points in Nova Scotia, on Customs Preventive Service, is $400 a year.

LABOURERS' PAY.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What is the minimum rate of wages per day payable to common labourers employed by the Department of Public Works respectively when the work is being done by contract or when being done by a foreman appointed by the department?

Mr. COCHRANE

Mr. ROGERS: There is no fixed minimum rate of wages for common labourers employed by the Department of Public Works, as the rate varies in different parts of the country. In the case of contract work, the Fair Wage Schedule inserted in the specification, upon which contractors tender, is furnished by the Labour Department after an investigation of local conditions. In cases where the Public Works Department carries out work by day labour under a foreman, the rate of wages current in the locality is paid.

POPULATION OF CANADA.

Mr. MACDONALD:

What was the date of the completion of the enumeration of the population of Canada under the last census?

Mr. BURRELL: The census of Canada for the year 1911 was tabulated and published on the 25th February, 1912. Since then reports have been received for the census of Riggolet and Northwest Arm posts of the Hudson Bay Company for date of July 24; and in November last the census of Fort Chimo and for the posts of Cape Wolstenholme, Wakenham bay on Hudson straits and for Hopes Advance bay on Ungava bay were received. This is believed to complete the whole work.

STELLARTON PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has the Department of Public Works purchased any land at Stellarton for the purpose of erecting a public building thereon?
2. Has said department authorized or arranged with any one to take any option or options upon land in said town?
3. If so, to whom was the authority given or with whom was the arrangement made?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes; acquired by expropriation.

2 and 3. The department instructed Mr. D. H. Waterbury, Superintendent of Public Buildings, St. John, to visit Stellarton and secure options on suitable properties for a public building site.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND CAR FERRY.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. When were tenders called for the car ferry between the mainland and Prince Edward Island?
2. Who were the tenderers?
3. What was the amount of each tender?
4. Has the contract been awarded?
5. If not, does the Government propose to award it or to call for new tenders?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Tenders were invited on June 10, 1912.

2. Tenders are still under consideration by the department.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. Answered by No. 2.
5. Answered by No. 2.

TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has the report of the Commission of Technical Education been received?
2. If not, when is it expected?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.
2. The minister is informed by the chairman of the commission that the preparation of the report has involved the careful examination of an immense mass of important material collected in countries outside Canada, that every diligence has been used, that the report is in the final stages of arrangement and consideration, and that it may be expected early in 1913.

PICTOU LIFE BOAT CREW.

*Mr. MACDONALD:

1. What are the names of the life boat crew at Pictou island in the county of Pictou, in the year 1911?
2. How many of the said crew of 1911 were removed or changed in 1912?
3. What were the grounds or reasons for such removal or change respectively?
4. What are the names of those appointed to fill the vacancies?
5. On whose recommendation were said changes made?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Alex. Currie (coxswain), Angus MacDonald, Hugh McCallum, Robt. McFarlane, Chas. A. McCallum, George D. Rankin, Torquil McLean.
2. The whole crew.
3. The coxswain, Alex. Currie, had ceased to reside permanently on Pictou island.
4. Duncan McCallum (coxswain), Allan McFarlane, John W. McDonald, John A. Rankin, J. Ward McCallum, Charles McIver, Dan Hector McLean.
5. The superintendent of the life saving service recommended the coxswain, who secured his own crew.

MR. MONK'S PRIVATE SECRETARY.

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Since the resignation of the Hon. F. D. Monk as Minister of Public Works, what duties have been assigned to his former private secretary?
2. What is the name and the present rank and salary of the said official?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Hon. Mr. Monk's former private secretary has been retained on the staff of the present Minister of Public Works in connection with the French correspondence of that office.
2. Miss Louise Sarault, 1B, $2,400.

TRACADIE LOBSTER HATCHERY.

*Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish):

1. What are the names of, and what was the remuneration paid to each of the employees of the lobster hatchery at East Tracadie, Antigonish county, during the operating season of 1912?
2. When was the hatchery opened and how long was it in operation?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Michael J. Boudreau, $3.00 per day; Wm. S. Archibald, $3.00 per day; A. Scott Dawson, $2.50 per day; Michael Coté, $1.75 per day; Hubert Coté, $1.75 per day; Normand Beshong, $1.75 per day; Frank Coté, $1.75 per day.
2. Opened May 25, and in operation until July 10, 47 days.

STE. ADELAIDE DE PABOS BREAKWATER.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has a contract been awarded for an extension of the breakwater at Ste. Adelaide de Pabos, county of Gaspé?
2. If so, to whom and at what figure?
3. Who were the other tenderers, if any, and what were the figures of their tenders?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Yes.
2. Arthur Nadeau and Edmond Nadeau, for $6,485.
3. J. E. Bernier, $6,950; J. Wilfrid Bégin, $7,200; David Duguay, $9,000.

SELKIRK ELECTION.

Mr. NEELY:

1. Who was the returning officer for the electoral division of Selkirk at the Dominion election of September 21, 1911?
2. By whom was this gentleman recommended for this appointment?
3. Is this gentleman now in the service of the Government? If so, when was he appointed, and by whom was he recommended for appointment?
4. What salary does he receive?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Frederick Walter Robert Colcleugh.
2. No information.
3. Yes, as agent for the Department of Indian Affairs at Selkirk, since 1st June, 1912. There is no information respecting his recommendation for appointment.
4. $1,200 per annum.

ST. PETERS CANAL IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. KYTE: I desire to call the attention of the Secretary of State to certain replies

which he brought down on Monday to questions put by me, and which do not constitute answers to the questions put. My questions were:

1. Has the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals received any protests from the harbour master or any residents of St. Peters against the contractor in charge of the St. Peters canal improvements using the harbour for a dumping ground?

2. Has any communication on the subject been received from the resident engineer? If so, has any action been taken thereon?

The answers of the Secretary of State were:

1. A complaint was received from the Department of Marine and Fisheries on July 8, 1912, that clay is alowed to roll down the slope into the waters of the present canal. The matter was referred to the Department of Railways and Canals.

2. On July 20, 1912, a report was received from the resident engineer stating that every precaution was being taken to prevent clay rolling down into the present canal, principal assistant engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals also made personal observations at St. Peters on the 15th of July, and he noted that every precaution had been taken to prevent any clay dropping into the canal.

My questions had reference to the dumping of clay in the harbour of St. Peters by the contractor, and had no reference whatever to the canal. The canal is under the Department of Railways and Canals, and I was not as much concerned as to the use made of that by the contractor, because the contractor was the servant of the department. I say that the contractor has been using the harbour of St. Peters as a dumping ground for the last six months.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is out of order in debating the question at this stage.

Mr. KYTE: Will the Secretary of State say whether or not protests were made to the department against making the harbour of St. Peters a dumping ground?

Mr. CODERRE: I presented to the House the answers given by the several departments; I will make further inquiry.

Mr. KYTE: The Secretary of State will observe that my question has reference to the dumping of clay in the harbour.

Mr. CODERRE: I will make inquiry as soon as possible.

ROYAL NATIONAL SANITARIUM ASSOCIATION.

Mr. W. A. CHARLTON (Norfolk): With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I desire, without the usual notice, to call the attention of the Postmaster General to a matter which is very urgent. A few years ago the National Sanitarium Association, of which Lord Strathcona is president, obtained the privilege from the Post Office Department to use what were known as Christmas stamps, and last year they sold about $16,000 worth of these. At present they have $20,000 worth of these stamps on sale in every city, town and village in the Dominion, and it now appears that the use of these stamps is to be forbidden. I had a telegram last night and a letter this morning from the chairman of the executive committee, stating that instructions had been given by the Post Office Department to discontinue the use of these stamps. I might point out that in the United States the American Red Cross Society is using these stamps on the back of the letters. If it is possible for the Postmaster General to do so, I would ask him to let it be known publicly, as soon as possible, that these sanitarium stamps may be used on the back of the letters in Canada.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): The matter is one of considerable importance, and, as my hon. friend says, somewhat urgent in view of the printing of the stamps which has been going on, and which has been to a certain extent justified by a previous decision of the Post Office Department. It has been found in practice that anything appearing on the face of the letter which resembles in shape or colour the usual post office stamp, hampers to a great extent the work of the officials in the post office, more especially in large offices like Montreal and Toronto. The officials work in these offices under high pressure at times, and the appearance of these special stamps on the letters becomes confused with the regular post office stamps. This has caused considerable loss and trouble. Moreover, the countries which belong to the Postal Union have prohibited these special stamps, and Germany, Austria, Italy, Great Britain, return the letters, even if properly stamped, should they bear these special stamps. The Post Office Department in Canada always refused this privilege up to a certain date, when the late minister actuated no doubt by laudable and benevolent motives permitted their use for the first time. I have received protests from some of the countries belonging to the postal union, and we think it better to follow the same policy as other countries. However, I understand that the case to which my hon. friend refers is one which will appeal to everybody in this House, from its very excellent character. As a great deal of expense has already been incurred, we have come to the conclusion after some consultation with my officials that if the board of directors of the

hospital in question will undertake to have those stamps used only for sealing purposes on the back of the envelope, and not on the face of the envelope where the postage stamp will be, for this year we will depart from the rule of the department, and will allow it for the very excellent purpose in view, with the clear understanding, however, that next year we shall have to adhere strictly to the rule.

Mr. SPEAKER: This seems to me to be distinctly out of order. I understood it was a direct question and a direct answer. In such cases it would be better to put the usual notice on the Order Paper, because if one member departs from the rule, it only leads to others availing themselves of the same privilege, and you can scarcely decline to one what you grant to another.

THE PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysboro) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, Orders in Council, despatches, memoranda and other papers and documents in the possession of the Government, or any department thereof, relating to rates proposed to be charged by the Government of the United States to shipping passing through the Panama canal.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware that this is an Imperial as well as a Canadian matter, and that it is now under the consideration of the Government of Great Britain. Our interest, however, is very great in this matter, as the Panama canal will affect the trade of Canada both in the East and in the West. For example, the use of the canal will bring Montreal some 3,000 miles nearer to Australia than it is to-day. It will also very materially affect the trade of our Pacific coast and will bring British Columbia many thousands of miles nearer to Halifax and Europe than at present. The Panama canal is so closely related to the shipping of Canada that I do not think the present situation should be allowed to pass without some reference to it in this House. The point I wish especially to discuss is the freeing of the coasting trade of the United States from tolls and the imposing of those tolls upon foreign shipping. This affects particularly the coasting trade, but it will affect the deep sea trade as well.

Our shipping in Canada is not very large at present, and it is not growing to such an extent as we should like, especially our deep sea shipping. That shipping tends to rather disappear from the sea of late years. We have some 800,000 tons of shipping at present on the Canadian register. Everybody knows that our people are ambitious to build ships. The people of Canada are a proud people, and they will not long be content to see their flag disappear from the sea. In the province from which I have the honour to come, we boasted years ago of the tonnage owned in that province. At one time the people of Nova Scotia owned more than one ton of shipping to each inhabitant of the province. That is a greater average, I believe, than has ever been attained by any other country, including Great Britain. There never was a time in the history of Great Britain—and the same is true of the United States—when the people owned the average of one ton of shipping for each person in the country. We, in Nova Scotia, are ambitious to restore the old position and to take our places again upon the sea. We have the men and we have the material at hand. We are a maritime people and, owing to the great progress that has been made in recent years in our iron and steel industries, the time ought to be opportune for the people on the coast of Canada to embark upon the building of ships. My purpose, as I have said, is to draw attention to the action taken by the United States which I regard as a breach of an agreement made between Great Britain and the United States some years ago. I called attention to this matter last session, and the Prime Minister was good enough to say that it was having the best attention of the Government. I have no doubt this is the case, but since that date the Congress of the United States has taken action and an Act has been passed by which they have freed the coast trade of the United States from all dues for passing through this canal and imposed considerable dues on the tonnage of foreign ships. I am aware, of course, that this matter has been taken up by the Foreign Office in London and everybody has read the very able presentation of it which was made the other day by Sir Edward Grey. No one in Canada objects to the people of the United States subsidizing their own ships; if they choose to pay a subsidy to promote the shipping of the United States we cannot object, but what we object to is that this should be done at our expense, because the whole cost of paying the interest on the money invested and maintaining this canal is to fall on foreign shipping, and if the coastal shipping of the United States is to be relieved altogether then, as a matter of fact, we will have to pay our share of the subsidy which is being given to the ships of the United States. The terms of the agreement made between the two countries are familiar to everybody, that there should be no discrimination between the tolls charged to ships of the United States and to ships of Great Britain. An agreement was made as far back as 1850 between the United States and Great Britain called the Clayton-Bulwer treaty in which the United States and Great Britain bound themselves that they would take no action in regard to the

construction or operation of this canal. Permit me to quote a sentence of this treaty:

> The Governments of the United States and Great Britain hereby declare that neither the one nor the other will ever obtain or maintain for itself any exclusive control over the said ship canal.

That treaty made in 1850 stood in the way of the United States when the Panama Canal Company fell through, and they resolved to undertake the construction of this important work themselves. It therefore became necessary for them to go back to Great Britain and make a subsequent agreement as they could not go on with the construction of the canal and with its operation because the terms of the Clayton-Bulwer treaty stood positively in their way. Then, in order to avoid the difficulties in regard to that agreement, a subsequent treaty was made in 1901 which is known as the Hay-Pauncefote treaty. This treaty was concluded on the 18th November, 1901, and proclaimed on the 22nd February, 1902. Permit me to quote the 2nd and 3rd articles of that treaty:

> 2. It is agreed that the canal may be constructed under the auspices of the Government of the United States, either directly at its own cost or by gift or loan of money to individuals or corporations or subject to the provisions of the said treaty. The said Government shall have and enjoy all the rights incident to such a construction as well as the exclusive right of providing for the regulation and management of the said canal.
>
> 3. The United States adopt as the basis of a neutralization of the said ship canal the following rules, substantially as embodied in the convention of Constantinople filed on the 28th October, 1888, for the free navigation of the Suez canal, that is to say: 1. The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and of war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality, so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation, or its citizens or subjects, in respect of the conditions of traffic or charges on traffic, or otherwise. Such conditions and charges on traffic shall be just and equitable.

This gives the United States authority to construct the canal and maintain it, but under the very specific and clear condition that it shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing the rules, on entire equality. President Taft, I understand, holds that 'all nations' does not include the United States, though this treaty was obviously made to create a condition by which equal terms would be given to the vessels of the United States and Great Britain, and the construction that President Taft has put on it is that the words 'all nations' do not include the United States, and consequently they are at liberty to allow the ships of the United States to pass through the canal free and to make the ships of all countries foreign to the United States pay the whole expense of maintaining the canal. The whole point is that the Government of the United States surrendered the right to build the canal at all, or to operate it by the treaty of 1850, and they recovered this right under the treaty I have just quoted, the Hay-Pauncefote treaty in 1902; but they did so under the express conditions which I have also quoted, and I contend that they are now failing to keep that condition.

I wish also to quote the statute passed by the Congress of the United States since our last session in regard to this important matter:

> Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled that, from and after the completion of the Panama canal no tolls shall be charged or collected from any ship or vessel for passing through said canal which flies the American flag and which is engaged in coastwise traffic of the United States.

That Act of the Congress of the United States was passed on the 16th of December last year, but it was not ratified at that time, as I understand, by the President. The ratification, however, took place at a later date. The Act further provides:

> That in fixing the charges for the use of the canal any vessel engaged in the coastwise trade of the United States, which is owned in whole or in part by any railway company, or which is owned by any company the stock of which is owned in whole or in part by any railway company, shall pay the highest charges prescribed for any vessel.

There is a question as to whether this applies to ships owned by railway companies in Canada, or whether it simply applies to ships owned by railway companies in the United States. That question is being dealt with by the Foreign Office.

I submit that the terms of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty have been violated by the action that has been taken by the Congress of the United States. There is more or less difference of opinion on this question in the United States itself. Prominent newspapers there have come out strongly against the action of President Taft and Congress in regard to this treaty. For example, the New York Evening Post uses the following language:

> That pledge, in both its spirit and its letter, the pending Panama Bill proposes coolly to break. It would do it by allowing American vessels to pass through the canal free of tolls, while charging them upon all other ships. This is the Congressional idea of 'entire equality' and 'no discrimination'! The glaring bad faith of this has been repeatedly pointed out, both in and out of Congress.

Strong language of that kind has been used by the press both in the United States and Great Britain, and I think it

is justifiable. The clause that concerns the coasting trade of the United States, to my mind, clearly conflicts with the treaty, in the first place, because it places the entire cost of maintaining the canal on foreign ships, and, in the second place, it places the American coastwise trade in a preferential position, which was prohibited by the agreement. It may be that Canada holds the key to this matter, as ships of the United States are using the St. Lawrence route, and, I understand, are passing at present through our waters free. I am not very well posted as to what rights they possess, or whether their rights are such that no change is possible. But it is quite possible that in Canada we might be able to impose some terms upon the shipping of the United States passing through our waters that would have the effect of securing fair play and respect for our treaty rights with regard to the Panama canal. This question is of very great importance to both the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast. I have nothing further to say except that I do not think it advisable to allow this condition of affairs to pass without some protest being entered by the Canadian Parliament.

Mr. BORDEN: The subject to which the hon. member for Guysboro has called attention is no doubt a very important one. I had the opportunity of discussing that subject with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs during the past summer, and of placing before him the views which the Government of Canada entertained with regard to it. As the Foreign Secretary has lodged with the government of the United States, through the British Ambassador at Washington, a note embodying the views of His Majesty's Government on the subject, and, as I am not aware that the reply of the United States to that note has yet been given, it is not desirable for me to-day to enter into a general discussion of this question. Not only orally, but otherwise, the views of the Government have been placed before His Majesty's Government, and, in addition to that, the Department of Trade and Commerce has taken steps to secure from boards of trade, shipping associations, railway companies, and other important interests in Canada, their views as to the probable effects of the legislation of the United States in that regard. There is no reason why the papers should not be brought down, except in so far as any of them may be of a confidential nature at the present time. I am very glad that my hon. friend has brought the subject to the attention of the House; and I entirely concur in the view which he has expressed as to the cogency and force of the memorandum which has been submitted by Sir Edward Grey, Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, to the Government of the United States, for their consideration.

Motion agreed to.

PURCHASE OF WHARF AT SOREL.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all petitions, letters, telegrams, &c., in connection with tht purchase by the Public Works Department of the Pontbriand wharf at Sorel, Quebec.

He said: I hope the facts which will be divulged by the production of the documents will not be as grave as I am informed they are. This wharf was offered some years ago to the late Government for the sum of $6,000. In answer to a question which I put on the Order Paper the other day, I was informed that the present Government had paid the enormous amount of $15,000 for that wharf. I have seen that wharf myself, and, although I am not an expert, the little I know about wharfs warrants me in saying that, if it is not a mistake, that the Government has paid $15,000 for this wharf, it is a scandal of the purest water.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto): That is rather a contradiction in terms.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I repeat, it is a scandal of the purest water, so as to make it clear, and to wash, if possible, those who may have been guilty of this purchase. One thing you will notice, Mr. Speaker, is that the wharf was purchased just a few weeks before the last election in the county of Richelieu. Several names are mentioned in connection with the purchase. It did not go through very quickly, apparently, and some people intervened. Some others complained. Some said that the patronage belonged to them. Mr. Morgan, who was the Conservative candidate, repeated all over the county that some one would have to pay for it, and that the patronage belonged to him, and not to gentlemen who represented neighbouring counties. At all events, I have no hesitation in saying that the purchase by the present administration just on the eve of a by-election for $15,000, of the wharf which was refused at the price I have mentioned $6,000, by the late Government, seems to be a rather shady transaction. At all events, we will see the papers, and if the Government is not guilty, I will say so in the House.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto): It might have been better, perhaps, if my hon. friend had not introduced so much presumptive evidence that the Government was guilty before he received the papers.

Motion agreed to.

EXPROPRIATION OF LANDS AT ST PETERS, N.S.

Mr. KYTE moved:

For a copy of all papers, letters and telegrams in the custody of the Department of Railways and Canals, or any other department, since October 1, 1911, relating to the acquisition or expropriation of lands at St. Peters, N.S., for canal purposes, and relating to the appointment of valuators to appraise the value of such lands, the instructions to such valuators, the report or reports of such valuators, the area of land taken, and the price paid for the same, and also the amount paid to each valuator for his services.

He said: I desire to place the House in possession of certain information that prompted me to place this motion upon the Order Paper. Some two years ago it was determined by the late Minister of Railways and Canals to effect certain improvements at St. Peters canal in the county of Richmond. A part of the scheme was to divert the course of the present canal with the view of eliminating, as far as possible, the curve that existed in the old canal and which prevented the accommodation of the larger class of vessels which are now seeking access to that very important waterway. For this purpose it was necessary to expropriate a certain piece of property which, by the way, is owned by Mr. J. A. Gillies, defeated candidate in the county of Richmond in the last election. When the item was up for consideration in supply I put some questions to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) which I shall now read from 'Hansard':

Mr. KYTE: Has the minister any report as to the amount of additional land that will be necessary for improving the canal?

Mr. COCHRANE: I have not. They are expropriating lands there now.

Mr. KYTE: Does the minister intend to have the value of those lands fixed by the Exchequer Court?

Mr. COCHRANE: I may say that some parties wrote me the other day, and I sent Mr. O'Dwyer down there to value the lands. That is as far as I have gone.

Mr. KYTE: I think the value should be fixed by the Exchequer Court.

Mr. COCHRANE: The department sent somebody to value and then made an offer to the owner. If the owner did not see fit to accept the offer then it went to the Exchequer Court.

That statement was perfectly satisfactory to me. I felt that if the owner refused to accept the valuation placed upon this land by the expert valuator sent down there by the Department of Railways and Canals and he would be obliged to go into the Exchequer Court, there would certainly be no ground for assuming that any excessive or extravagant value would be placed upon the land by that tribunal. It is true that a gentleman by the name of O'Dwyer was sent to St. Peters in April last for the purpose of valuing the land and that Mr. O'Dwyer made a report upon the value of the land, but the Minister of Railways and Canals did not carry out the plan which he assured me would be carried out, that is, to compel Mr. Gillies to go into the Exchequer Court if he wanted more money than the amount recommended should be paid to him by Mr. O'Dwyer. The fact of the matter is that when Mr. O'Dwyer's report was made and sent to the Department of Railways and Canals the owner of the land did not accept the valuation. What was done was that Mr. Gillies recommended the appointment of a commission down in the town of St. Peters to act as a court of appeal from the appraisement made by Mr. O'Dwyer. The commissioners recommended by Mr. Gillies were two defeated candidates in the provincial election in Nova Scotia and the third was his campaign manager in the last election. These three men were appointed by the Minister of Railways and Canals to constitute a court of appeal, if I may so speak of it, from the independent valuation placed upon this property by Mr. O'Dwyer. Well, Sir, these valuators met, their award was made some time ago, and they awarded Mr. Gillies $3,750 for the amount of land required by the Department of Railways and Canals, the quantity taken being 3·8 acres. So, you will see that Mr. Gillies was awarded $1,000 an acre practically for the quantity of land which was appraised by his commissioners and which was required by the Department of Railways and Canals.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many acres?

Mr. KYTE: Three decimal eight acres of land, for which these commissioners awarded him $3,750, or practically $1,000 per acre.

Mr. EMMERSON: What was Mr. O'Dwyer's valuation?

Mr. KYTE: I have not been able to see Mr. O'Dwyer's valuation, and that is one of the reasons why I have placed this motion on the Order Paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the value of property there?

Mr. KYTE: I have some evidence which I shall place before the House as to what was the fair value of this property. Mr. Gillies has been the owner of the land since 1900. In the year 1906 Mr. Gillies was assessed the sum of $8,800 for 90 acres of

land which he owned at that time, the assessors thus placing a value of about $100 per acre upon the land. According to the rule by which the assessment of property is made in Nova Scotia, the valuation to be placed upon property for assessment purposes is that which it would bring at a cash sale, and the assessors in 1906 assumed that $100 per acre would be a reasonably fair valuation to be put upon this property and they so assessed it. But, Mr. Gillies was not content with that assessment, so he made a motion before the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, by way of certiorari, for the purpose of having that assessment quashed. I will read the affidavits that were made in connection with that motion.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is that the same Gillies who appointed Landry?

Mr. KYTE: That is the same man. I shall first read the affidavit made by Mr. Gillies himself in the Supreme Court, and then I shall read the affidavits of two of the commissioners who awarded him $1,000 an acre for the property.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was Landry one of them?

Mr. KYTE: No, he was not. Landry was not available as a commissioner at that time, as he was in jail. (Reading):

In the Supreme Court—Crown Side.
In the Matter of the Assessment Act, and in the matter of the assessment of Joseph A. Gillies, of Sydney, in the county of Cape Breton, barrister, of lands at St. Peters, in the county of Richmond.
Affidavit of J. A. Gillies.

I, Joseph A. Gillies, of Sydney, in the county of Cape Breton, barrister, make oath and say:

1. That I am the applicant herein:

2. That I am the owner of land on the western side of the canal at St. Peters, in municipal district number seven, in the county of Richmond, which contains less than ninety acres, and is the only land that I own in the said district of St. Peters, in the said county of Richmond.

3. That I acquired the said land in the year 1903, by purchase from Charles Archibald, of Halifax, Esquire, paying him therefor the sum of one thousand dollars——

That is, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Gillies paid $1,000 for the whole 95 acres which he then purchased.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How long ago?

Mr. KYTE: In 1903. (Reading continued):

—said tract or piece of land then contained ninety-five acres; and that since its purchase its area has been diminished by over six acres, by expropriation for railway purposes and by sales.

4. That said land has not increased in value since I purchased it, and has been cut up into several lots of different areas by a railway, which runs through it since 1902.

5. That the sworn assessment of this block or lot of land was returned by the municipal assessors for the district in which it lies, at the sum of twelve hundred dollars for the years 1902, 1903 and 1904.

6. That herewith produced and marked as exhibit 'A' to this my affidavit is a plan of the said property, upon which is shown the portion of said land taken for the Cape Breton railway right-of-way, and for other purposes in connection therewith.

7. That the land taken for said railway purposes consists of five acres and a third of an acre, and is near the centre of the whole block and extends from its western to its eastern boundary.

8. That a large portion of this lot or block outside of the area taken for railway purposes is injuriously affected by virtue of the severance; besides cutting off the frontage of my land on St. Peters harbour, and depriving me entirely of a water front of over five hundred feet on the waters of this harbour.

9. That this land was taken for this railway some time after I had purchased it from Mr. Archibald, and was taken under chapter 123 of the Acts of the province of Nova Scotia 1902, and the five acres and a third of an acre so taken, including all damages done to the balance of the lot by virtue of the severance, and including the damages done by depriving me of access to the frontage on St. Peters harbour, were valued and appraised at one hundred and sixty dollars, which was the award made by the arbitrators, James H. McKichan, Simon H. McKenzie and Alexander E. Morrison, all residents of the county of Richmond, as I verily believe.

10. That I am residing at Sydney, in the county of Cape Breton, where I have my office and place of business. That there is no occupant of my land at St. Peters nor is there any house or building of any kind upon it, nor is it fenced or enclosed in any way, nor is there any one in actual possession thereof; that I have no office or place of business at St. Peters, nor in any part of the county of Richmond, nor have I any agent there, nor have I any place of residence in Richmond county.

11. That only on the 20th of April last did it come to my knowledge that the assessment of my property at St. Peters was returned by the general assessors for the county of Richmond for the present year at the sum of eight thousand eight hundred dollars. That I had no notice of any kind from the assessors or any other person of this assessment; that I had no knowledge whatever of it until after the time for appealing had elapsed, or I would have appealed therefrom. That I had no notice before assessment was made, nor was I furnished with any schedule to fill up, nor was I asked for information. That I had no idea that the assessors would return this property at an amount greater than it was assessed for in 1902, 1903 and 1904, namely, twelve hundred dollars, as this figure was in the opinion, and from my knowledge of the value of property at St. Peters a high valuation for assessment purposes.

12. That no property at St. Peters, near, nor about, nor adjacent to my property has had its assessment increased over

the assessment of the past three years, to any but a small extent, if at all.

13. That there is no demand for property at St. Peters, and since I acquired this tract in February, 1902, I have had it in the market, but have succeeded in selling only four small lots for building purposes to St. Peters people; and although I have made every possible effort to make sales, both by the lot and by the acre, I could not effect a sale in either way, nor have I had any offer to purchase at any price.

14. That a large portion of this lot or tract is wet, boggy and unfit for use, and could not be sold I verily believe at any price; that a large part is covered with bushes or light wood of no value; that the statement of the assessors returning this property as containing ninety-five acres is incorrect, as it contains less than ninety acres, and out of this several acres are practically unsaleable, by reason of the proximity of the railway, the shape and size of the lots and their being cut off from access to the road as will appear by reference to plan exhibit 'A.'

15. That the assessment of eight thousand eight hundred dollars made upon this property is largely and extravagantly excessive, and altogether wrong, and I believe if I had had an opportunity of appealing therefrom I would have been able to establish these facts conclusively.

16. That I am informed by the municipal clerk of the county of Richmond that the council did not appoint any date for the completion of said rolls, other than that prescribed by chapter 73, Revised Statutes 1900.

17. That I am informed by William Levesconte, Esquire, who lives near St. Peters, and who is a real estate holder in said county of Richmond, and from such information I verily believe that the assessment roll for district number seven was posted up in said district not earlier than January 8, 1906.

18. That a grave miscarriage of justice will be had, and grave injustice done me if this assessment be allowed to stand, as the amount for which it is assessed is far in excess of its market value, and far in excess of the amount that could be obtained for it if sold at auction, and far in excess of the amount that I would gladly accept for the whole property.

Sworn to at Sydney, in the county of Cape Breton, this 17th day of December, A.D., 1906.

Before me (Sgd.) A. D. GUNN.
A Commissioner of the Supreme and County Courts, in and for the county of Cape Breton.

JOSEPH A. GILLIES.

This affidavit is filed on behalf of Joseph A. Gillies, the applicant.

I have affidavits here from eleven leading citizens in the town of St. Peters setting forth that the value of the land is less than $100 an acre and that the assessment of $100 an acre made upon the property was grossly extravagant, excessive and unjust. I will, for the moment, content myself with reading two of the affidavits made by two of the commissioners who awarded Mr. Gillies $1,000 per acre in May or June last.

Mr. KYTE.

This is the affidavit of John Morrison which is to be found at page 8 of the printed record.

In the Supreme Court—Crown Side.

In the matter of the Assessment Act, and in the matter of the assessment of Joseph A. Gillies, of Sydney, in the county of Cape Breton, barrister, of lands at St. Peters, in the county of Richmond.

Affidavit of John Morrison.

I, John Morrison, of St. Peters, in the county of Richmond, hotelkeeper, make oath and say:

1. That I am and have been a resident of St. Peters aforesaid, for over forty years.

2. That I am the owner of real estate at St. Peters, and have a good knowledge of the value of lands there.

3. That I know well the land assessed to the said Joseph A. Gilles at St. Peters aforesaid; that there are no buildings on said land, nor is it fenced or cultivated or improved in any way, but is a common, and portions of it are wet and boggy, and unfit for use.

4. That there is no demand for small building lots at St. Peters, nor has there been, and while a lot might be occasionally sold, I verily believe it would be impossible to sell any considerable number of lots, nor do I think the demand has increased, or if it has it has been very slight within the past few years.

5. In my opinion the assessment of $8,800 on this lot of land is far in excess of the market value of said lot if sold at auction, and from my knowledge of this lot of land and in land in the district of St. Peters, I do say that the valuation of $8,800 placed upon this lot is excessive, extravagant and unjust.

Sworn to at St. Peters, in the county of Richmond, this 3rd day of December, A. D. 1906.

Before me,
(Sgd.) JOHN D. MATHESON,
A commissioner of the Supreme and County Courts, in and for the county of Richmond.

(Sgd.) JOHN MORRISON.

This affidavit is filed on behalf of Joseph A Gillies, the applicant.

The following is the affidavit made by Donald Y. Stewart, another of the commissioners, who allowed Mr. Gillies $1,000 an acre for this land in the month of May or June last:

In the Supreme Court—Crown Side.

In the matter of the Assessment Act, and in the matter of the assessment of Joseph A. Gillies, of Sydney, in the county of Cape Breton, barrister, of lands at St. Peter, in the county of Richmond.

Affidavit of D. Y. Stewart.

I, Donald Y. Stewart, of St. Peters, in the county of Richmond, merchant, make oath and say:

1. That I have been residing in St. Peters and carrying on mercantile business there for a period of about twenty years, that I own several pieces of real estate at St. Peters, and that I have a good knowledge of the value of real estate at St. Peters and its vicinity.

2. That I know well the property at St. Peters assessed to the above named Joseph A. Gillies for $8,800, and I do say that said valuation in my opinion is far in excess of the sum that said lot would bring at auction.

3. That the said lot is unfenced and is used as a common, and a large part of it is wet and boggy, and in its present condition unfit for use.

4. That there is no demand for small building lots at St. Peters, and while a lot might be occasionally sold, it would be impossible to sell any considerable number of lots for building purposes.

5. In my opinion the assessment of $8,800 on this lot of land is far beyond its market value, and from my knowledge of the value of land at St. Peters and its vicinity, I do say that the assessment of $8,800 placed upon this lot of land is excessive and unreasonable and unjust.

(Sgd.) D. Y. STEWART.

Sworn to at St. Peters, in the county of Richmond, this 7th day of December, A.D. 1906. Before me,

(Sgd.) JOHN D. MATHESON.

A Commissioner of the Supreme and County courts in and for the county of Richmond.

This affidavit is filed on behalf of Joseph A. Gillies, the applicant.

I will not delay the House to read more of the affidavits which appear in this printed case, I content myself with making the statement of the facts as they appear from these records. I will make no further comment, except to say that in view of the statement and assurance given me by the Minister of Railways at the last session of Parliament that if the owner of the land was not content with the value placed upon it by Mr. O'Dwyer, who was sent out for that purpose, he would be obliged to go to the Exchequer Court, I was astonished that that procedure was not carried out. I was extremely disappointed that the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals did not allow the matter to go into the Exchequer Court, instead of having accepted the decision of three of Mr. Gillies' own personal and political friends in the town of St. Peters, who were constituted a court of appeal from the award given by Mr. O'Dwyer. I have no doubt that the hon. minister has in his department several documents referring to this matter, and I am anxious to see them before making any further remarks. In the meantime I will leave these facts to the House and hope to return to the subject at a later date in the session.

Mr. COCHRANE : I have no recollection of making any such statement about what the hon. gentleman says I agreed to last session. I do not dispute it, because I have not looked it up. It is true that I sent Mr. O'Dwyer down there, as I understood that he was familiar with the values of land through that section of the country, and his valuation was $3,780.90, which I myself thought was high. They refused to pay on that valuation, and I appointed, as my hon. friend states, the three arbitrators. I did not consult Mr. Gillies in any way as to whom I should get. Their valuation was $3,750. The hon. gentleman has made some rather strong remarks in reference to this, and I beg to move the adjournment of the debate until I get further information.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

DISMISSAL OF LEMUEL BENT.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) moved :

For a copy of all papers, documents, Orders in Council, telegrams, letters, &c., relating to the dismissal from office of Lemuel Bent, late collector of customs at Oxford, N.S.

Mr. RHODES : This is the case to which I made an ineffectual attempt to refer the other day. It has been the subject of considerable attention by the Opposition press throughout the country. This man was dismissed upon my recommendation, on the ground of offensive partisanship. It is true that he is minus one arm and a portion of one leg, but I hope it is not necessary for me to say that no one regrets more than I do his unfortunate physical condition. In view, however, of the nature of criticism in the Opposition press, one might very well believe that I had been guilty of amputating this man's arm and leg, and, by way of completing my work, that I had then thrown him out of a position which constituted his only means of livelihood. The Opposition press have attempted to make political capital out of his dismissal, and to level criticism against the Prime Minister and the Government for not keeping their promises in regard to the spoils system. With respect to this case the Opposition press have shed crocodile tears copiously and continuously. Most of the criticism has been by way of editorial reference; but one man has published a letter in the Winnipeg Tribune. I will give him the credit of saying that he writes over his own name. He makes reference to this subject, and criticises my record as the representative of the county of Cumberland, comparing it unfavourably with the record of my predecessors, and then follows this paragraph:

No, but it was left for the present member of Parliament to be a party to one of the most brutal acts of political partisanship ever heard of in Canada.

I may say with respect to this man, that his tears are not crocodile tears; they are simply blind tears, because he does not know what he is talking about. And let me here point out that the bulk of criticism

in regard to this dismissal has been made by the press outside of the province of Nova Scotia. In that province the subject has been referred to only by one newspaper, the Halifax Chronicle, and in it reference has been made on two occasions, by reason of letters written to that paper by the man who was dismissed. I do not believe he was a fit subject for appointment; in the first place, because a man with one arm and one leg is hardly competent to handle the packages coming into and going out of a customs house, and dealing with the various papers, incidental to the duties of his office. Bitter complaints have been made to me on many occasions by residents of the town of Oxford, that this man was not competent for his duties by reason of his physical unfitness, but I do not propose to justify my action in the matter upon that ground. I propose to justify it purely and entirely on the ground of offensive partisanship. Shortly after the elections of 1911, this matter was brought to my attention by several of the leading men of Oxford, a town of some 1,400 inhabitants. They told me, that he was a partisan not in the ordinary sense of the word, but that he was a very bitter partisan, that his partisanship was of such a nature that he was a partisan in season and out of season, at elections and between elections. I took the precaution to go to the town of Oxford, and there consult with practically all the leading citizens, many of them being Liberals, and the statements of those people went to verify my information. As an evidence of the correctness of the statements I have made, I beg to submit only two affidavits with respect to the conduct of this man.

Canada,
Province of Nova Scotia,
County of Cumberland, N.S.

In the matter of Lemuel Bent, of Oxford, in the county of Cumberland, customs house officer, charged with being an active political partisan.

I, Oliver King, of Oxford aforesaid, farmer, do solemnly declare that:

1. I am a resident of and a voter in the town of Oxford aforesaid.

2. That during the political campaign ending September 21, 1911, the aforesaid Lemuel Bent, continuously and persistently advocated in public the policies, principles and character of the Liberal party and belittled and condemned the Liberal-Conservative party, their platform and followers, and in the course of his advocacy and discussions in public was most blatant, outspoken and abusive towards members of the Liberal-Conservative party.

3. That his team was on the streets on election day and was used for the conveyance of voters to and from the polls.

4. That the said Lemuel Bent was and has always been most insolent and abusive in his discussions of the Liberal-Conservative party and has always appeared ready and willing to so discuss such party.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing it to be true and knowing it is of the same force, virtue and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the 'Canada Evidence Act.'

OLIVER KING.

Declared before me at Oxford aforesaid, this 25th day of October, A.D. 1912.

C. H. OXLEY,
Barrister-at-Law of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia.

I have also the affidavit of John S. Thompson, as follows:

Canada, Province of Nova Scotia, County of Cumberland.

In the matter of Lemuel Bent, of Oxford, in the county of Cumberland, customs official, charged with political partisanship.

I, John S. Thompson, of Oxford, aforesaid, farmer, do solemnly declare that:

1. I am a resident elector of the town of Oxford aforesaid.

2. The said Lemuel Bent carried on and allowed to be carried on political discussions upon the premises used as a customs office, wherein he and others indulged in outspoken attacks and abuse on and of the platform, policies and adherents of the Liberal-Conservative party, and upheld the policies and members of the Liberal party.

3. He was most bitter, sarcastic and offensive in his arguments and remarks against the Liberal-Conservative party, and his voice has frequently been heard on the street corner either arguing with, agitating or agravating some friend of the Liberal-Conservative party, and at times has been extremely bitter and offensive in his denunciations of such party.

4. His team was on the street carrying friends of the Liberal party to and from the polls on election day, September 21, 1911.

5. I am informed on good authority that he contributed to the campaign fund of the Liberal party at the September 21, 1911, election.

The fifth paragraph, is a matter of hearsay. I may explain that these affidavits were not prepared by me, but I read them as they were submitted to me by friends in the town of Oxford. (Reading continued):

6. Several of his intimate party (Liberal party) friends say that he cannot stand an investigation.

7. He has for many years been a most blatant, argumentative, tantalizing upholder and supporter of the Liberal party.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing it to be of the same force, virtue and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

JOHN S. THOMPSON.

Declared before me at Oxford aforesaid this 26th day of October A.D., 1912.

Before me,

C. H. OXLEY,
Barrister-at-Law, Supreme Court, Nova Scotia.

It will be observed that these affidavits—

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Who signs that affidavit?

An hon. MEMBER: Shut up.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not want the hon. gentleman to tell me to shut up. I refer to the hon. member for Simcoe. I wish to ask the name, residence and occupation of this person who signed that declaration.

Mr. RHODES: It is signed by John S. Thompson, of Oxford, farmer.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Who prepared that declaration?

Mr. RHODES: I cannot say.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It is not likely the declarant did. Does not the hon. member know who prepared it?

Mr. RHODES: I do not.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No suspicion?

Mr. RHODES: I have a suspicion, but I would not be justified in giving a positive answer on suspicion. The facts are that these affidavits came to me from a very reliable man in the town of Oxford, and I took particular pains to ask him and other citizens of the town as to the character and standing in the community of the deponents, and, as the result of my interview with them, I have no hesitation in saying that the deponents are men worthy of confidence. It will be observed that this declaration is dated as having been sworn on October 26, 1912. That is some time after Mr. Bent was removed from office. But I desire to explain that I had in my possession, at the time I made the recommendation for the removal of Mr. Bent, an affidavit from the first of these deponents, Mr. Oliver King, and a statement purporting to be an affidavit of John S. Thompson, covering substantially the same ground. But these documents were not in proper form; and, in view of the prominence of this case, I wrote to the town of Oxford and asked that these men have their statements put into the form of regular declarations. I do not think there is any question that this man has been a partisan of the most offensive class.

We then come down to the question of his unfortunate physical condition. If we lay down the principle that a cripple is not to be removed upon any account whatever, for partisanship or anything else, then it would be the obvious duty of the party in power to gather as many cripples as possible and appoint them to the public service. They would be paid by the state, and immune from the regulations laid down as to partisanship and they could be turned loose as offensive partisans, and so we should have the most effective political machine of any country enjoying representative institutions. But, where I have been called upon by force of circumstances to ask for removals, I have always been very careful to make inquiries, first as to the financial position of the person affected—as to whether he was dependent in any degree upon the money he received from the public service as a means of livelihood,—and second, as to his physical condition. In the case of this man Lemuel Bent, I took particular pains to inquire as to his material condition. I have a letter, written to me by one of the most representative men of the town of Oxford, in which he makes a statement of the circumstances of this man. I will give it briefly as he gave it to me:

He (Bent) had been in Oxford over twenty years as a dry goods and grocery merchant; and was fairly well off when he came and has been doing a very good business ever since. The eldest son, Dr. F. D. Bent, is practising in Oxford, is worth over $5,000; Ernest (his other son), 24 years of age, assists in the store; his wife is living and also clerks in the store. Mr. Bent is about 60 years of age, his real estate is worth $4,000, his stock in the store about $5,000. I have it on good authority that he is drawing interest on $8,000 invested and in the bank. He has lost one leg and his right arm, and customers often have to make out the customs papers, as he is very awkward with his left hand. (I have done this.) While he is a very good neighbour and friend of mine, I believe all that Oliver King and John S. Thompson have said, as he is very insulting at times. About three weeks before he was dismissed, I had occasion to go to his store. He was at his customs desk, and he insulted me without the least provocation on my part, so much so that I do not consider him a proper man for a public office of that kind.

Mr MACLEAN (Halifax): Is that letter from Mr. Patton?

Mr. RHODES: Yes. And I may say that Mr. Patton is one of the representative citizens of the town of Oxford and one of the best-known men in the whole county of Cumberland. I was satisfied, first, that Mr. Bent had been an active partisan and, second, that his financial position was such that he would not be a sufferer if he lost the sum of money he received as a custom officer, which was, I believe, $500 a year. But to be absolutely just to Mr. Bent, on September 5, 1912, I wrote him this letter.

Amherst, N.S., Sept. 5, 1912.

Dear Mr. Bent:—

I regret to have to advise you that it has become necessary for me to ask for your removal from the position of sub-collector of customs at Oxford.

The matter of dismissals is a most unpleasant one for me and if I were to consult my own wishes none would be made except in the most flagrant cases. A public man must in many such cases listen to the advice of his followers.

This letter is not written to excuse myself, as I am prepared to take the full re-

sponsibility in the matter. I wish, however, in justice to you to advise you in advance.

Yours very truly,

Lemuel Bent, Esq.,
Oxford N. S.

That letter was written on September 5, 1912. Mr. Bent was not removed from office until October 16, or within one or two days prior to that date. In other words, he was not removed from office for nearly six weeks after I wrote giving him positive notice that I proposed to call for his removal from office. Here is a significant fact. Mr. Bent made no reply to that letter, nor did anybody on his behalf. He did not make the perfectly obvious answer, if he had not been a partisan: I have not been a partisan, I am a poor man, I would like to have an investigation—any one of these things which a man not guilty of charges laid against him would do. He remained absolutely silent until after he he had been removed from office, and then he, or, as I prefer to believe, some one on his behalf, wrote a letter which he signed to the Halifax Chronicle, in which the pitiable circumstances and conditions were detailed at large. He makes the statement in his letter that he was not a partisan. To that statement I wish to give unqualified denial. After his letter appeared in the Halifax Chronicle I gave a statement which appeared in the form of an interview in the Halifax Herald on November 4. The heading of that interview, which takes over two columns was: 'A poor man, but worth $17,000.' It goes on to relate the various steps that I took prior to his dismissal and the grounds upon which I acted in making the dismissal. I said I believed that Bent had been a partisan. Having been a partisan he is not entitled to sympathy because of his physical condition, owing to the circumstances that he is a man well-to-do, but if he believed that injustice had been done him, I would be very happy to recommend that he be granted an investigation. That interview appeared on the 4th of November, and was seen the following day by Mr. Bent, to my knowledge. That was well over a month ago. Mr. Bent, since the publication of that article has not asked an investigation. He has been dismissed from office for three months and still has not asked an investigation, and it seems to me that that circumstance alone is sufficient evidence of the assertions that I have made, with respect to both his partisanship and his circumstances.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): There will soon not be much left of him. He had an arm and a leg off before you met him, and you took his head off.

Mr. RHODES: His head must be in fine condition physically because his organs of speech are in first class condition. As for the offensive partisanship, it is not necessary that he should have two arms and two legs or any arms or any legs in order to constitute a breach of the rules laid down, with respect to the public service, because certainly this man has been a violent and most offensive talker. If we are going to take sympathy and physical condition as the basis which shall govern in these cases, the man I recommended is far more worthy of consideration than is the man who was removed from office. The young man whom I recommended to be appointed, Charles D. Blair, is, I am sorry to say, suffering from a chronic disease which carried off his father in early manhood, and he has been advised by his physican that he is apt to go in the same way as his father. His wife is a delicate woman and he has children to support. The opportunities to make a living in his profession, that of photographer, are not very wide in the town of Oxford. He was at one time offered good positions in Edmonton and in the adjoining town of New Glasgow, but was compelled to decline by reason of his unfortunate physical condition. When I ascertained the circumstances I felt I was amply justified in recommending his appointment, and while I regret on his account to have to make public reference to his physical condition, I feel compelled to do so in view of the criticism levelled against me in connection with the case.

The party press of the Opposition are pleased to draw conclusions from premises based entirely upon the ex parte statements of the accused in this case. They take his letter and, upon the strength of that, strong editorials have been written by the opposition press and published broadcast by the press of this country. I gave my reply showing that there was a fair side and a just side, namely my side, in the Halifax Herald of November 4, but to this date I have yet to find that one Opposition paper has had the manhood to publish the fact to their readers that there is another side to this case. It is possible that this matter may be referred to at a later stage in this House. There are other facts and circumstances to which I could refer at greater length but I will content myself with this brief statement at this time.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) is indebted to me, I think, for the opportunity afforded him this afternoon of discussing the matter of the dismissal of Lemuel Bent, customs officer at Oxford, Nova Scotia. This is a matter which is of very little interest to me politically. The motion appears under my name owing to the fact that a request was made to me by

a party in the county of Cumberland for the production of these papers. I cannot understand why the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes) rushes so madly and earnestly to his own defence at this stage, because he might very well have waited until a production of the papers was made to the House. I sometimes fear that a guilty conscience impels my hon. friend for Cumberland to make a defence this afternoon.

Mr. RHODES: Do not give yourself any anxiety on that ground.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I read recently a very interesting article in a magazine in which the writer upon a rather abstruse and scientific subject, which he designated 'The New Psychology,' laid down this proposition, that when a man wished to forget a thing, he never succeeded; he always placed the idea which he wished to get rid of, somewhere, where it was continually coming up before him. I fear that the idea which my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), desires to put away is held by him sub-consciously and is very easily summoned up. I have little or no knowledge of the facts concerning the dismissal of Mr. Bent, other than those contained in the one or two letters which were published in the press of Halifax, and those presented to the House this afternoon by the hon. member for Cumberland. On a later occasion I may possibly return to the discussion of this subject. I fear that my hon. friend from Cumberland is hardly correct in his analysis of the criticism made by the press of this country concerning Bent's dismissal. He submits the defence that because Mr. Bent, was, in his judgment, a partisan his dismissal was justified. Now, I think the position that the press has taken is that whether or not Mr. Bent was a partisan was immaterial, but that owing to his unfortunate physical disabilities, he should have been permitted to remain in office. I think that was the basis of the newspaper criticism concerning this dismissal, and I think it was a fair criticism. It is unfortunate for hon. gentlemen opposite that in another case in the province of Nova Scotia, where they have been so very free with dismissals of public officials, they recently dismissed from office, a person in the county of Guysborough, who was in receipt of the munificent salary of $20 per year, and who did not even have one leg. This dismissal was made only a few weeks ago in the county represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) I do not know, nor do I care, whether this person who held a $20 office in the county of Guysboro' was a partisan or not. I submit that once that official received office and was capable of discharging the duties pertaining to it, it was the bounden duty of the person having charge of the patronage of that county in all the circumstances to allow him to remain in office; and I say the same concerning Mr. Bent who was dismissed in the county of Cumberland. I wish to read, so that it may be on record, the first letter written by Mr. Bent in connection with his dismissal. The letter was addressed to the Halifax 'Chronicle,' and was as follows:

I was appointed collector of customs for the port of Oxford in 1903. In fact, I took the initiative, circulated a petition which was signed by Liberals and Conservatives, and was instrumental in every way in having the office installed in this town. During my incumbency I have always received high commendation from inspectors, and have served the public in a competent and efficient manner. I have taken no political part whatever in either federal or provincial elections, but today find myself dismissed from the customs service on the pretext of 'active political partisanship.'

It will be noticed that Mr. Bent takes issue with the member for Cumberland.

Mr. RHODES: I take issue with him.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): And Mr. Bent takes issue with my hon. friend, and therefore, the facts being at issue, they should have been determined in some other way.

Mr. RHODES: I ordered an investigation two months ago.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That was after Mr. Bent had been dismissed, and his case had been prejudged. I do not suppose any good purpose would have been served by an investigation after he had been dismissed.

Mr. RHODES: What about the notice I gave?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax) (reading):

I am one of those to whom fortune has been quite unkind. I am sixty-three years of age, and am not blessed with an abundant supply of this world's goods. Fifteen years ago I was forced to have my left leg amputated above the knee, and ten years ago a similar operation was performed on my right arm, at the shoulder joint (the bone being removed from the socket). So you see that my condition as far as the performance of manual labour is concerned is a sorry one.

The above facts were known to our representative, Mr. Rhodes, who for a time seemed loath to advise a dismissal, but seemingly in their desire to be drunk with the satiety which only the trough can produce, they became destitute of feeling.

I am glad to observe the tribute to my hon. friend from Cumberland (Mr. Rhodes), that he was driven and pressed sorely by his political friends in the town of Oxford to make the recommendation for the dis-

missal of Bent. I have no doubt that if my hon. friend had been left to his own discretion he would have been only too pleased to leave this unfortunate man in office.

I wish also to put upon record a brief statement made by Mr. Bent in answer to the interview or letter of the hon. member for Cumberland. That hon. gentleman urged that the financial position of the dismissed official was of such a nature that his livelihood was not impaired by the loss of income from the office which he had held, and he also urged that by reason of his physical disabilities Bent was incompetent to perform properly the duties of the office. Upon that point the hon. member for Cumberland and Mr. Bent are at issue. In answer to these points raised by the hon. member for Cumberland, Mr. Bent denies that he is worth $17,000. He says:

I am positively worth not one-fourth of $17,000.

If that be true, and Mr. Bent is unable to pursue any other occupation which will give him an income, the question of his livelihood is one that must naturally give him and his family some concern. He says in answer to the charge that he was physically incapable of performing the duties of the office:

It is not the duty of customs collectors to make out important papers, but I have often performed this service as an obligement.

The hon. member for Cumberland in his interview or letter stated that Mr. Bent was very awkward in making out those papers with his left hand, which is, of course, an obvious truth, but Mr. Bent makes the reply that under the customs regulations he was not obliged to make out those papers, that the person making the entry at the customs, was supposed to do it himself. In answer to the further charge that somebody in the town of Oxford had been insulted without provocation by Mr. Bent, the latter says that the person who claims to have been insulted was one Mr. Patton whose letter was read this afternoon by my hon. friend, and who was an applicant for the office from which Mr. Bent was dismissed.

Mr. RHODES: No.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member cannot be the only judge on that point, and if Mr. Bent is correct, he, of course, was a prejudiced witness, and his evidence should be received with due caution——

Mr. RHODES: You are referring to Mr. Bent's evidence now?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No.

Mr. RHODES: If the hon. gentleman will permit me—I am sure that he wants to have an exact record—I want to say positively that Mr. Patton was not an applicant for this office, and that he concurred in the appointment of Mr. Blair.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I have seen it happen on many occasions that applicants for office were obliged to concur in the appointment of somebody else.

Mr. RHODES: He was never an applicant.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Well, I am not going to dispute that point with the hon. member for Cumberland, but I merely say that Mr. Bent alleges that Mr. Patton was an applicant for the office.

Mr. RHODES: It is not true.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I hope it is true that the hon. member for Cumberland did not have personal knowledge of the great number of applicants there were for appointment to office in this particular town of Oxford. Mr. Bent said:

Mr. H. A. Patton and I, however, indulged in a few warm words, which had nothing to do with customs or political affairs. He (Patton) is president of the Conservative Association here, boasts an annual income of $2,500 on investments and was an applicant for the customs position, which is good evidence of the fact that my friends, the enemy, were not actuated by sympathy (just the crocodile tear brand, perhaps, about which they make mention in the Herald) towards my successor.

He proceeds:

To make a rather long story short, I can assert from a most reliable source, that a prominent member of the patronage committee there admitted the many absurdities in the letter to which I have just referred, and added that 'it was necessary as Mr. Bent had published a very stiff letter.'

I do not propose reading the balance of this letter of Mr. Bent's. I merely wish at this stage to put the contribution made by Mr. Bent to the newspapers on record, and when the papers have been brought down, pursuant to this motion, I shall have an opportunity of seeing them, and, if I deem it necessary, I shall return to a discussion of this matter.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF ALEXANDER MACDONALD.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish) moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence, reports, and other documents relating to the dismissal of Alexander Macdonald, of Doctor's Brook, Antigonish county, as subcollector of customs.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I have just a few observations to make before the motion is put. The motion which I have the

honour to make has reference to the dismissal of a sub-collector of customs in the county which I represent. This sub-collector, is not like the collectors in the county of Cumberland or like the late collector at Oxford. This man has sound legs, sound arms, a good head and a strong mind. The only complaint that he has to make is that he has been deprived of his official head without any just cause. There was an investigation before Commissioner Duchemin. I was present at that investigation but I was not accorded the privilege of taking any part in the examination of witnesses. Mr. Duchemin distinctly told me that, as there was no counsel on the other side, he was not going to permit the accused either in this case or in any of the other cases that he was considering at that time, to be represented by counsel, and that, be it noted, in the face of the Inquiries Act which provides that not only may he allow counsel but shall allow a man accused an opportunity of conducting his defence by counsel if he so desires. Although I was not permitted to take part in the examination of witnesses, I took particular note of the evidence on that occasion and I have a short synopsis of it which I propose to read. Before referring to the evidence, let me state that, as I understand, these investigations should be conducted in the same way as they would be conducted before a judge of the county or supreme court. The Inquiries Act provides all the machinery for the conduct of these investigations in the same way as procedure is carried on in the civil courts. I say, too, that it is not part of the duty of the investigator to find that because an accused person does not go on the stand himself there must be a presumption of guilt against him. It is the bounden duty of the commissioner conducting these investigations to be guided by the evidence adduced in support of the charges. We complain in this case that the charge was not specific, that it was a general charge of partisanship, so that the commissioner, when the inquiry began, went over the whole field. You will observe from the nature of the evidence given by the witnesses how wide the scope of the inquiry was. The first witness called was Alex. MacInnis :

Alex MacInnis sworn:
Alex. MacDonald had no talk with me during last election. Did not meet him—did not see him election day.
Don't know of any political meetings attended. I can't say whether he attended nomination.
Don't know of his attending any of committee meetings. All I know is that I saw him go to Angus MacIsaac's house, and saw him with committee men. Don't know what he was doing. These were M. D. MacDonald, L. A. Gillis, D. M. MacDonald, D. A. MacDonald and himself These men have been the leading workers. I can't tell what they do only they meet there.
I saw him drive a candidate around—A. J. MacGillivray, councillor.

The commissioner ruled that that was not evidence and I do not think it is down in the evidence that he took. (Reading continued):

I have not seen him drive men election day. Angus R. MacIsaac is a neighbour? MacDonald has been going there on other occasions? He goes there two or three times a week outside of election times.

You will observe that all the evidence that could be adduced from Mr. MacInnis, a strong Conservative in the district, was that he had a suspicion that the accused sub-collector was a Liberal partisan because he noticed that had been going to the house of Angus R. MacIsaac on the eve of the election. But, he had been going to that house two or three times a week outside of election time and it was only natural that he should go to the house of his next door neighbour. The evidence of Alexander MacInnis was not given much weight by the commissioner. Then we come to the evidence of Angus H. MacQuarrie :

Angus H. McQuarrie sworn:
I don't know him as a worker at polls or attending conventions.
I don't know him to have canvassed any one or to have engaged in political discussions with any one at any election.
I presume he is a political worker because he was the reviser in 1919 and because he struck my name off the voters list in 1910. I did not say it was for party reason. I know of no reason unless a political reason. When I spoke to him about it he said it was a mistake if his name was left off and that he would go to Antigonish to rectify it. He went to Antigonish.

All that the evidence of Angus McQuarrie amounts to is, that Alexander McDonald was one of the revisers for the district in which they both live, and that inasmuch as the name of Angus H. McQuarrie was left off the voters' lists by this reviser, he concludes that Mr. McDonald was a liberal partisan. Mr. McQuarrie is a strong Conservative, and he is a thoroughly honest and conscientious man, but in this case he certainly draws a conclusion which the facts do not warrant. There being no evidence whatever against him, Mr. McDonald was asked if he wished to go on the stand and he replied that he did not, and Mr. McDonald afterwards finding that there was a rumour in the district that he had left a name off the voters' lists improperly, and seeing in that rumour a reflection upon himself as an officer sworn to do his duty, he made the following declaration as to the circumstances of the leaving of the name off the list:

Dominion of Canada,
Province of Nova Scotia.

I, Alexander McDonald, of Doctor's Brook, in the county of Antigonish, farmer, being reviser of electoral lists for polling districts No. 1, Arisaig, and No. 14, Maryvale, for the year A.D. 1910, do solemnly declare that the fact of the name of Angus H. McQuarrie not appearing on the electoral list for that year was not through any political bias on my part or for other reason whatever, but the omission occurred inadvertently, and I further solemnly declare that I did all in my power to rectify the error as soon as the fact was brought to my notice, to which the present municipal clerk and the sheriff for this county can testify. And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and knowing that it is of the same force and effect as if made under oath and by virtue of the Canada Evidence Act.

Declared before me at Arisaig this 3rd day of August, A.D. 1912.

D. M. McDonald,
A justice of the peace in and for the county of Antigonish.

ALEX. McDONALD.

It will be seen that Mr. McDonald did everything in his power to endeavour to rectify the mistake; he went to the sheriff, who, in Nova Scotia is the Court of Appeal from the Revisers' Board, and he asked to have the name put on in district No. 14, but the sheriff informed him that he could not hear the case unless it came to him in the regular way as an appeal from the Board of Revisers. He also saw the municipal clerk with a view to having his mistake rectified. When Mr. McDonald made the declaration, which I have read, he gave it all the publicity he possibly could, and if any one doubted the truth of it, there was an opportunity to proceed against him for perjury. But, any person who knows Alexander McDonald would accept his statement apart altogether from an affidavit. Mr. McDonald is known to be an absolutely truthful and honest man, one of the most respectable men in that part of the country. A copy of this declaration was sent to the Minister of Customs, so that the Minister of Customs, before making this dismissal, without any evidence whatever to justify it, was aware of the facts. But, the Minister of Customs seems to have laid down the principle that no matter how an officer conducts himself at election times or any other time, if he is a Grit he has to go. The action of the Minister of Customs in this matter bears out my contention that these investigations are purely a screen and a cloak for the purpose of diverting responsibility from the proper shoulders, and that they are intended to deceive and mislead the people. On August 7, 1912, I was handed a copy of this declaration of Alexander McDonald, and I sent it to the Minister of Customs accompanied by the following letter:

Antigonish, N.S., August 7, 1912.

Hon. J. D. Reid,
Minister of Customs,
Ottawa.

Dear Dr. Reid,—I am asked by Mr. Alexander Macdonald, preventive officer at Doctor's Brook, in this county, to send you the inclosed copy of declaration made by him. Mr. Macdonald was investigated by Commissioner Duchemin last week, and the only evidence against him was that of one Angus H. McQuarrie who said that some years ago Mr. Macdonald, when reviser of electoral lists, left his name off the voters' lists for Maryville district in which he had property, although he lives in Arisaig district. From this circumstance and this alone, the witness believed McDonald to be a Grit worker, although he had no knowledge of the latter attending meetings of the party organization, or doing any work at election times. Mr. Macdonald did not think it necessary to give evidence to meet suspicions which had no reasonable foundation, and on which no court would act. But as there might be some in the community in which he lives who would be so unreasonable as to harbour the same suspicions that Mr. McQuarrie entertained, he made the declaration in question which was read in his parish church by the parish priest —a good active Conservative. Instead of sending the inclosed to Mr. Duchemin, in whose spirit of justice or fair-play I have no confidence, because of what I have seen of his methods. I send you the document.

Yours truly,
WILLIAM CHISHOLM.

I may mention to my hon. friend from Cumberland that the parish priest referred to there is the Rev. D. L. McDonald, P.P., to whom he referred in this House a few days ago, when he read a letter from that reverend gentleman white-washing his friend the commissioner. This case may be in itself an unimportant one, but I believe I am justified in referring to these facts for the purpose of showing that these investigations that were held by Commissioner Duchemin, not only were conducted in violation of the law, which permits and provides for counsel to be present, but that the findings of fact which he made, if indeed he made any, are such as no regularly constituted court would dream of finding.

Mr. CARROLL: Was Mr. McDonald dismissed?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): Oh, certainly.

Mr. RHODES: May I ask the hon. member, or any other hon. member on that side of the House, if he knows of a case in which counsel was allowed to appear before any commissioner holding similar investigations after the elections of 1896?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): The amendment to the Inquiries Act which provided that counsel should be heard was

not passed until last year, as my hon. friend, who is a lawyer, ought to know.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I shall be glad to have the papers brought down. Unless my hon. friend has read all the evidence, it is apparent that we have been hearing merely an ex parte statement, apparently based on fragments of that evidence. I find it difficult to reconcile the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to these dismissals. One hon. gentleman will contend that in every case investigations should be had, while another will contend that when an investigation is held by a reputable commissioner, against whom no charge of impartiality or unfairness is brought, then it is merely a farce and done for the purpose of shielding the minister. It is difficult to reconcile the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite in these matters.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What has the minister to say to the statement that the commissioner refused point blank to allow counsel to be heard, in face of the fact that the Inquiries Act gives the person the right to be represented by counsel?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): That is an assertion which is made, and I have not before me the documents to enable me to give an opinion.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The statement is made by Mr. Chisholm, of Antigonish, that he himself asked to be heard.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): It will be well to have all the papers down before the matter is discussed. My hon. friend has presented only one side of the case. It would be well to have all the documents before us, and then I shall be prepared to discuss this matter in view of the evidence, which will be on record, and the finding of the commissioner, which will be before us. The finding of the commissioner is of extreme importance, and I think my hon. friend, before reading portions of the evidence, should have possessed himself of the finding of the commissioner and dealt with that, instead of discussing the matter before the House, as he has done.

Mr. SINCLAIR: That is not an answer to my question at all. The fact is not disputed that the commissioner refused counsel in the case of Alexander McDonald, the case which we are now considering. That statement is made by Mr. Chisholm, the member for that county, who went to the investigation and asked to be allowed to represent the accused. I should like to get an expression of opinion from the hon. minister in regard to the conduct of his commissioner who has violated the rule in all the cases in which he has refused counsel. This is only one case. Dozens of cases have been brought to the attention of the Government.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I am now in a position to read a report of the commissioner in regard to this matter. I have before me now what I said that my hon. friend should have had when he took the matter up before the House (reading):

On the 30th ult., I conducted an inquiry into the charges of partisanship filed against Alexander McDonald, preventive officer of customs, Arisaig, N.S.

The inquiry took place in the school house at Arisaig, and the following named witnesses gave evidence under oath: A. D. McInnis of Doctor's Brook, farmer; A. H. McQuarrie, farmer; and Alex. J. McDonald of Arisaig, merchant.

Mr. McDonald, the accused, was present throughout the hearing and was attended at the inquiry by William Chisholm, M.P., Mr. Chisholm did not, however, appear as counsel.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I was not allowed to take any part. I make the statement, and I make the statement on my responsibility as a member of this House that I asked the privilege of appearing as counsel, and I was denied that privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Mr. Duchemin said: 'If you choose, you can sit alongside of the man, and you can whisper to him, but as there is no counsel on the other side you cannot interfere.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): With the permission of the House, I will read the report of the commissioner, which I think is entitled prima facie to carry weight with the House.

Mr. CHISHOLM: That is a trick of his.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): At the same time I do not desire to say that my hon. friend is making any statement that is not correct.

A. D. McInnis testified that during the last Dominion election, he saw Mr. McDonald frequent the meeting place of the Liberal committee from time to time throughout the election campaign. The Liberal committee workers were in the habit of meeting at the house of Angus R. McIsaac and witness testified that it was the custom of Mr. McDonald to meet with these committee workers. Witness gave the names of five men whom he regarded as the leading Liberal workers in the district, and amongst these he included Mr. Alexander McDonald, preventive officer of customs.

Mr. McInnis testified that it had been Mr. McDonald's habit to attend the committee meetings of the Liberal workers in McIsaac's house, not only in the last Dominion election but in previous elections as well.

A. H. McQuarrie testified that Mr. McDonald was a political worker. Witness said, 'One of my reasons for so saying is that he was reviser of voters' lists in 1910, and he had my name struck off the list. I was a duly qualified voter and there was no reason except political for my name being struck off.'

Alex. J. McDonald, of Arisaig, testified that Mr. Alexander McDonald applied to have the name of his brother George D. McDonald struck off the list of voters for district No. 1. Witness saw the notice requiring this name to be struck off. It was signed by Alexander McDonald. Witness stated that he was familiar with Mr. McDonald's writing, having seen it on several notices. George D. McDonald's name had been placed on the preliminary list, but on Alexander McDonald's application, was struck off. George D. McDonald is a Conservative.

Mr. Alexander McDonald was present throughout the giving of the testimony referred to above, and on the conclusion of the last witness' evidence was asked if he wished to make a statement under oath to rebut any of the testimony given against him; but he declined to go on the stand and make any statement.

Now, the commissioner said he gave this man the opportunity of being heard in his own behalf.

Mr. CHISHOLM: On what?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): On the charge that he was a partisan, and he declined to go on the stand and give evidence. What else could the commissioner have done?

Mr. CHISHOLM: Does my hon. friend contend that it is the duty of the accused to go on the stand to give evidence before a case is made out against him, and is there any inference to be drawn from the fact that he has not gone on the stand when there is no evidence against him?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I did not say it was a question of his duty; it is a privilege for him to give evidence on his own behalf or not. I have heard many members on the other side of the House ask why is the accused not given the opportunity of being heard in his own defence. The commissioner here is giving the opportunity to the accused to be heard in his own defence against a charge of offensive political partisanship, and he declines to take the stand. I submit it is not the fault of this commissioner or the Government that the accused did not take the stand in his own behalf, because he was given the opportunity. The commissioner could not compel him to take the stand. Now I submit that in all these cases, unless there is evidence to show some corrupt intention on the part of the investigator, his finding should be entitled to prima facie weight. I think that might be stated in regard to any judicial investigation. As there is no evidence of this kind against the commissioner, it is to be deemed that he held the investigation fairly and impartially. I have heard hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House say with regard to this particular commissioner, that they had no fault to find with the manner in which he conducted these investigations, but that they did not agree with his conclusions. That is often the case especially if those conclusions should happen to be against their views. Here is the finding:

Mr. Alexander McDonald habitually attended the meetings of the Liberal committee workers in his district during the last Dominion election campaign.

This man is paid by the Government, by citizens on both sides of politics, and apparently in violation of the regulations that he is not to take part in a political campaign, the commissioner finds that Mr. Alexander MacDonald habitually attended the meetings:

2. He has been in the habit of attending meetings of these committees for a number of years.

3. He has done work in the preparing of the voters' lists in the interest of the Liberal party during the past two or three years.

4. He has procured the striking off from the voters' list the name of George B. McDonald, a Conservative applicant to have his name placed thereon.

5. Mr. McDonald is one of the leading Liberal workers in his district.

6. He has thus repeatedly violated the rule of the department prohibiting employees from doing election work.

I have the honour to be, Sir.

Unless it can be shown that this investigator approached his duties with an almost corrupt intention of making an improper finding, that finding is prima facie entitled to weight, and I think that this House would not be justified in discrediting that finding or in refusing to believe that it was a just finding, unless my hon. friend is prepared to go into all the evidence submitted by the commissioner and can prove some corrupt intention on his part. Some weight must prima facie be given to this finding unless and until it is shown and shown conclusively that he had some improper object in making this finding. Either there is no use whatever of appointing investigators, or their findings must be entitled to weight. In connection with this it has been further suggested that every official, against whom a charge is made, should be given the opportunity of being heard in his own defence, and that his conduct should be investigated by a commissioner. That is precisely what has been done in this case. What other could the Commissioner of Customs have done than he has done. He has appointed a commissioner. The commissioner finds that this

man is actively engaged as a partisan and says that his conduct has been in violation of the rule of the department prohibiting employees from doing election work. The point I make is this. If, on that finding, this man ought not to be dismissed, we might as well lay down the rule that, no matter what part officials take in elections, no matter how they violate the regulations of the department, they are not to be interfered with. I think it is conclusively shown from this report—unless in some way the integrity, or fairness or impartiality of the commissioner is impugned—that his finding is entitled to weight and to the favourable consideration of this House.

Mr. EMMERSON: Is the finding accompanied with the evidence that was submitted?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): I find that a summary of the evidence is attached, but, if there were stenographic notes, they do not seem to have been extended.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But my hon. friend has evaded my question, and I would like very much to get an answer. This is not the only case in which Mr. Duchemin has refused counsel to represent officials charged with partisanship. There are a number of other cases besides this—dozens in my own constituency—in which not only was counsel refused, but friends of the accused were refused opportunity to help the person whose conduct was being investigated by cross-examining witnesses to draw out the truth. My hon. friend knows very well that it is imposible to reach the truth in an examination of this kind unless cross-examination is allowed. And the only way to get this done is to permit counsel to represent the person accused. That is recognized by the Inquiries Act. This commissioner, apart from the other things for which he is blamed, has constantly refused to allow a person accused to be represented by counsel. We have the proof here in this case, and it is a good time to get a decision. What I want to know is this: Assuming it to be true—and everybody admits it to be true—that the hon. member for Antigonish Mr. (Chisholmî was present on that occasion and asked the right which is given under the statute to represent this man as counsel, and Commissioner Duchemin refused the right, does the Minister of Finance approve the conduct of his commissioner?

Mr. RHODES: I do not wish to interfere with the question of the hon. member for Guysborough, but he has not put the case quite fairly.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would like to get an answer. Surely, the hon. Minister of Finance can take care of himself.

Mr. RHODES: Certainly, he can take care of himself. But he has not a wide knowledge of local conditions in Nova Scotia, and I wish to place before the House another view of the case. The hon. member (Mr. Sinclair) has made the bold statement that counsel was refused. That is not in conformity with the statement I have in a letter written to me by Mr. Duchemin, the commissioner in the case. The letter, which I received recently, bears the signature of Mr. Duchemin, and deals with a number of matters. One paragraph relates to the case under discussion. It is as follows:

> On the 30th of July I conducted three investigations at Arisaig, in the county of Antigonish. The parties under inquiry were A. R. McAdam, fishery inspector, H. R. McAdam, lighthouse keeper, and Alexander McDonald, customs officer, Mr. Girroir, M.L.A now senator, Mr. William Chisholm, M.P., and the Rev. D. L. McDonald, parish priest of Arisaig, were present throughout the inquiries. Mr. Chisholm asked if Mr. McDonald, customs officer 'might appear by counsel.' I had previously conversed with Mr. Chisholm in Antigonish, and had advised him that I was discouraging the appearance of counsel at these inquiries, and gave him my reasons. He expressed approval of my course in excluding counsel, and approved of my reasons, which were chiefly, that if counsel were admitted the investigations would be unduly prolonged and that feeling and bitterness would be engendered that would do more harm than good to the accused. I accordingly advised Mr. Chisholm that I would not have counsel in this case, but that he might remain by the accused and advise him at any stage of the inquiry, that if he wished when the accused was cross-examining witnesses he might suggest questions to him, etc. Mr. Chisholm availed himself of this right. He sat by the accused and advised him throughout.

Mr. McKENZIE (Cape Breton): The Minister of Finance, in replying to one of the criticisms on this side of the House, made reference to a member on this side as having stated that he was satisfied with the manner in which Mr. Duchemin had conducted investigations. I think that reference must have been to myself. I stated in my place a few evenings ago, that, while I did not approve of Mr. Duchemin's understanding of the regulations and statutes under which he was acting, yet, so far as rudeness or any conduct of that kind was concerned, I had no complaint to make. I have pleasure in repeating that statement; no discourtesy or rudeness was shown to me. But I must state that Mr. Duchemin refused to hear me as counsel, and refused to give me opportunity to represent the cases of those who had asked me to be present on their behalf. I must refer to the observation of my hon. friend

from Cumberland and the quotation from the letter which he says he received from Mr. Duchemin. The hon. member was pleased to intervene between the question put by the hon. member for Guysborough and the answer which we would like to have heard made—and, which, no doubt will be made—by the Minister of Finance. The hon. member for Guysborough did not ask the Minister of Finance to take it for granted that the hon. member for Antigonish had been refused the right to appear as counsel for Mr. McDonald, the custom house officer, whose case was under investigation. What the hon. member for Guysborough said was: Assuming it to be true that the hon. member was not permitted to appear as counsel, what would be the opinion of the Minister of Finance of the conduct of his commissioner. That question still remains unanswered. But the hon. member for Cumberland intervened with an explanation in the form of a letter from Mr. Duchemin, in which Mr. Duchemin says that—for the sake of economy, forsooth!—he had assumed power to suspend the law of the land. I want to know upon what authority this commissioner or any other authority in this country, can suspend the statute law. The statute law is made by the high court of Parliament representing the whole country, and that law can only be changed, repealed or suspended by the same authority that made it. That is nothing new to the Minister of Finance or to any other lawyer of this country. And I am sure, Mr. Speaker, from my knowledge of your conception of fair-play and constitutional right, you would be shocked at hearing that any person in this country had arrogated to himself the right to suspend the law and to deal with the trial of cases in such a way as might seem proper to him, and that, for the sake of saving a few dollars or a few minutes of time, he would conduct an investigation otherwise than as the law directs. I said a few days ago that the present Government will be claiming credit for the passing of this Act. I give them credit for the passing of the Act. I think it is a splendid provision which the Minister of Justice inserted in this Act of Inquiries and I submit that it is intended to further preserve the liberties of the individual. I am sure it was not the intention of the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice that this law should be put upon the statute book as a dead letter. Let me again remind the Minister of Justice of the provisions of this law.

No report shall be made against any person until reasonable notice shall have been given to him of the charges of misconduct alleged against him, and he shall have been allowed full opportunity to be heard in person or by counsel.

Mr. McKENZIE.

The people of Canada expect and properly expect that that law shall be complied with. The meaning of the law is that the charge will be placed in the hands of the person accused. What has been done and what is being done is that a man is told that he is charged with offensive partisanship, the charge extending back for 10, 12, 40 or 50 years. Does anybody who knows anything about procedure in Canada think that that is the meaning of the law? If the matter is to be dealt with under a quasi-criminal procedure, only one charge would be put in the paper, but it would have to be placed in the hands of the person accused. In a case of civil procedure then, as the Minister of Finance well knows, the charge must be stated in the most explicit terms, there must be no equivocation about it and every opportunity must be given to answer. I care not then whether the charge is under the criminal procedure or the civil procedure, and there being no procedure prescribed by the Act it must be under one or the other, the fullest opportunity must be given to defend after the charge has been properly laid and placed before the individual whose conduct is to be inquired into. I submit therefore that the question that is put so properly to the Minister of Finance remains to be answered and that it does not lie in the power or jurisdiction of any person appointed under the Inquiries Act to suspend a statute for any reason whatever. While the statute remains on the statute book it cannot be modified or suspended by any authority whatever; it must stand until this Parliament deems proper to deal with it.

Mr. AVARD L. DAVIDSON (Annapolis): I wish to state that Mr. Duchemin, the gentleman whose conduct is under discussion in this debate, is a gentleman of very high standing at the bar of Nova Scotia, known from one end of that province to the other as a very honourable and reputable lawyer. My hon. friend from Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) knows him well, and I venture to say he will not in this House assert that Mr. Duchemin has ever shown any unfairness in the conduct of these investigations. On the contrary I think he will bear testimony that whenever he is called on to act in a judicial capacity, he acts fairly, wisely and discreetly, and I am emboldened all the more to make this observation because the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) does not talk in the same way outside of this House in respect to Mr. Duchemin. During the debate a day or two ago a letter was read from a very reputable gentleman stating in explicit terms that Mr.

Chisholm had told him he was absolutely satisfied with the conduct——

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I rise to a point of order. I contradict that.

Mr. DAVIDSON: As far as I remember, the hon. gentleman said he did not remember making any statement of that kind.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I stated emphatically that I did not make any statement of that kind. I stated at first that I did not remember, then I went on to show reasons why I could not have made it, and I wound up by saying I did not—and more than that I can prove it by Mr. Murray himself.

Mr. DAVIDSON: There are some observations which I am advised he made, which perhaps he will deny also. I am advised he had a conversation with Mr. Duchemin with respect to some previous investigations and the attitude and conduct of my hon. friend from Guysboro (Mr. Sinclair) in reference to Mr. Duchemin, that Mr. Duchemin had complained to my hon. friend from Antigonish of the unfair treatment which he felt he had received at the hands of the hon. member for Guysboro.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I rise to a point of order. I do not think that this has anything to do with the case, but I may say that I give an emphatic denial to any reflection on the hon. member for Guysborough.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid that is not a point of order.

Mr. DAVIDSON: I am advised that on that occasion, after Mr. Duchemin had complained to him that he had not received fair treatment in this House from the hon. member from Guysboro, the hon. member for Antigonish laughed good naturedly and said: Oh, don't mind that. Mr. Sinclair is only talking politics. Will the hon. gentleman deny that he used these words?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I feel sure I did not use these words, but if I did they were very harmless. Mr. Duchemin may have said something, and perhaps I got into an altercation with him.

Mr. DAVIDSON: The hon. gentleman does not deny emphatically having used these words. Perhaps as the debate goes on he may grow stronger in his disclaimer, but we will let it go at that. I am bound to believe, in the light of that statement, that the hon. gentleman is trying to play the game of politics a little bit himself. A letter was read the other day from Mr. Murray in which it was stated that the hon. member for Antigonish said he was perfectly satisfied with the conduct of the investigation, but that afterwards he wrote to Mr. Murray complaining bitterly of that conduct. He said, furthermore, in reference to the conduct of my hon. friend from Guysboro' that he was playing the game of politics, and I believe, in view of these facts, that the discussion was brought up not for the purpose of getting at the facts, but simply with the view of playing the game of politics.

There are one or two observations that I wish to make with respect to the evidence brought before the House by the hon. member for Antigonish. It seems to have been established at the investigation that McDonald was a Liberal reviser of the voters' list in the province. I have had some experience of the political game in Nova Scotia, and if I were a commissioner I would not want any better evidence upon which to act than that a man was a Liberal reviser of the voters' list. I think that would be quite enough. Furthermore, my hon. friend stated that a declaration had been made by this man McDonald and that this declaration had been sent to the department explaining one of the acts which had been complained of before the commissioner. At the investigation McDonald had an opportunity to give evidence on his own behalf, and if he had taken advantage of that opportunity he would have been subject to cross-examination. The commissioner would have had an opportunity to examine him. But Mr. McDonald was afraid to give evidence on his own behalf. He remained silent. Acting on the advice of his counsel, but afterwards, behind the back of the commissioner, prepared a solemn declaration and sent it to the department. He saved himself from being subjected to cross-examination, but anxious, nevertheless, to get his story before the department he pursued the course of preparing a solemn declaration. My hon. friend from Antigonish objects that McDonald did not have a fair show because he was not allowed to be represented by counsel. It seems to me that my hon. friend from Antigonish and the hon. member for Cape Breton North, are under a misconception as to the nature of these investigations. They assume that when an official is examined before a commissioner he must be either a criminal or the defendant in a civil suit. Now, I do not think that these investigations partake of the nature of either a criminal prosecution or a civil action. Their purpose is to ascertain, for the benefit of the Government, whether or not office-holders have been guilty of offensive conduct. The Government is the employer; the office-holder is the employee, and it is merely a case of the employer wishing to satisfy himself as to the conduct of the person employed; and therefore where an accused party refuses to give evidence, it is prima facie evidence of guilt. Supposing Mr. Speaker, that you were to ask your

servant if he had stolen from you, and what he had to say to the charge of theft, and he said, 'I don't want to say anything, I will keep silent,' would you not naturally infer that he was guilty? In the same way when an official is charged with partisan conduct, and he has the opportunity to say anything on his own behalf, and he refuses to do so, is not the commissioner justified in coming to the conclusion that he is guilty, as otherwise he would disclose the facts in connection with the matter?

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson) says that an investigation of this kind is neither criminal nor civil. I would like to ask what it is. There are only two classes of cases that come before the tribunals of this country, civil and criminal. It shows the broad and legal mind of my hon. friend that he can come to this House, where there are a few lawyers, and try to impress upon them the idea that an investigation of the kind referred to should not be carried on either as a criminal or as a civil investigation. My hon. friend shows his great legal capacity when he tells us that if a man refuses to stand up and say anything, that is sufficient evidence that he is guilty of the charge brought against him. I want to point out to my hon. friend that that is contrary to the criminal and civil laws of this country, and that if a learned judge made any comment to the jury in a criminal case as to the defendant not going on the stand on his own behalf, that would be a reason for quashing any conviction that might be obtained.

Mr. LANCASTER: I suppose my hon. friend is aware that that is because of a special section of the Act dealing with the right of the prisoner to give evidence in trials of that kind.

Mr. CARROLL: It is the law of this country, and the statute which was amended last year gives to an accused person who comes before a commissioner the right to have counsel. I think Mr. Duchemin is going too far when he refuses, as there is ample evidence to show that he did refuse, hon. members of this House the right to appear before him and argue the case as counsel, when the Act, as amended last March, says that the accused official shall be permitted to be heard through counsel in those investigations. I do not think that any hon. member from Nova Scotia who knows Mr. Duchemin will say that he is not an honourable man and an honourable lawyer. I know him very well, and I know of no man that I would rather chat with than Mr. Duchemin. I know of no man in Nova Scotia, if I had money to loan, into whose hands I would rather put it than Mr. Duchemin. But in those investigations, Mr. Duchemin has proved himself to the whole of Nova Scotia as a most unfair man, and one eminently unqualified to conduct them.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Has my hon. friend forgotten that Father McDonald of Antigonish attended a great many of these investigations and pronounced them absolutely fair?

Mr. CARROLL: The Father McDonald to whom my hon. friend refers is one of the greatest Conservative partisans in the county of Antigonish. He goes from door to door at every election seeking for support on behalf of the Conservative candidate whoever he may be in that county. That is the sort of evidence that is brought to this House to show that Mr. Duchemin is unbiassed and a good man to make those investigations.

There are some cases coming up from my own constituency that I intend at some future date to talk about, and I will then give to my hon. friend from Cumberland an answer to the question which he has thrown across the floor of this House on several occasions, as to whether or not Mr. Duchemin had refused to adjourn certain cases for persons whose conduct was to be investigated before him. I do not wish to prolong this debate, but I think that the hon. Minister of Finance owes it to this House and to the country to say what he thinks of a commissioner, acting under the statute passed last March, who refuses to allow counsel on behalf of persons who come before him.

Mr. BLAIN: I ask the hon. gentleman if he will be good enough to give the House his own opinion of the commissioner?

Mr. CARROLL: I will refer my hon. friend to 'Hansard' of to-morrow, and, if he understands the English language, as an ordinary member of this House understands it, he will there get my opinion of Mr. Duchemin as a commissioner and as a man.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): It seems to me that the question of the hon. member for Guysborough, in view of the conflict of statement and possible misunderstanding—because that is the simplest explanation—is at best hypothetical. There is no question that, as has been stated by the last speaker (Mr. Carroll), Mr. Duchemin is a man whose character is of the highest. He, therefore, was properly appointed as commissioner. That is not controverted. The hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) says that Mr. Duchemin declined to hear him as counsel. On the other hand, Mr.

Duchemin, whose character is beyond question, says that the hon. gentleman did not appear as counsel.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): He does not deny it.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): My hon. friend did not appear as counsel.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I asked to be allowed to appear as counsel and he declined to allow it.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): In addition, my hon. friend from Cumberland produces a letter from Mr. Duchemin in which he says that the hon. member for Antigonish was a consenting party to the principle which he laid down that counsel should not be heard in this particular case. In view of these conflicting statements how is it possible for me to give an answer to the question of the hon. member for Guysborough? The simplest interpretation is that there is a misunderstanding all around. I decline to be put in the position of making an answer to what is an hypothetical question in view of the facts which have been stated here this afternoon.

Mr. LANCASTER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a word in reply to what has just fallen from the hon. member for South Cape Breton (Mr. Carroll) with regard to the legal aspect of this matter. I understand the hon. gentleman to say, as a matter of law, and without any hesitation about it, that the rule always is that when the facts are stated, and one of the parties to an issue has permission to contradict or controvert those facts, it is no evidence if he refrains from doing so and it is in no way an admission that the facts as stated by the other side are good as against him. I entirely disagree with that statement as a matter of law in any part of the British Empire. The hon. member must know, if he knows any law at all, that the very Criminal Code which he quoted from was passed because of the state of the law as applied to ordinary cases and under ordinary circumstances.

Mr. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr. LANCASTER: I have the floor, and I do not propose to be interrupted now.

Mr. CARROLL: I rise to a point of order. I made no such statement as that which the hon. gentleman attributes to me.

Mr. SPEAKER: Let the hon. gentleman state his point of order.

Mr. CARROLL: The hon. member who is speaking says that I made the statement which he has just made. I say that I did not make any such statement at all.

Mr. SPEAKER : I do not see any point of order in that.

Mr. CARROLL : I have contradicted what the hon. gentleman has said.

Mr. SPEAKER : It is competent for an hon. member to deny a statement which has been made and which he considers unfair to him, and it would, under such circumstances, be the duty of the hon. member making the statement to accept his denial; but I do not understand that there is any point of order raised.

Mr. LANCASTER : If the hon. gentleman was speaking to the question before the chair, if he was discussing the question of the dismissal of this man and the action of the commissioner who held the investigation—and I apprehend that I am right in supposing that he was speaking to that question—the only inference I can draw from what he said was—and he used a section of the Criminal Code to prove his point—that in any investigation, whether a criminal trial or a civil case, by a section of the Criminal Code, the judge, or counsel, is prevented from remarking to the jury that the accused did not go into the witness box and give evidence on his own behalf and that therefore the same rule must apply to this investigation before this gentleman, whose name, for the time being, I have forgotten—it matters not—who held these investigations in Nova Scotia. The common law in England, gives the parties, both sides, in every civil action an opportunity to go into the witness box and if he does not accept that opportunity it is always commented upon by the counsel and a judge as indicating that the facts must be as stated on one side or the other. How else would you ever get through with a trial or investigation ? If one side states certain facts and the law says that there is an opportunity of going into the witness box and denying those facts, why should the failure to take advantage of that opportunity not be commented upon ? It was because that is the common law, because that has always been the rule in regard to all other tribunals that, when the special section of the Criminal Code was drawn up permitting an accused person to go into the witness box, it was provided that his silence, or his failure to go into the witness box, should not be commented upon either by counsel or judge, which is an exception to the general rule. I thought it was necessary to set my hon. friend from Cape Breton right in this matter.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): With respect to the statement of the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Davidson), I have only to say that, according to his idea of the law, and according to the law that he

laid down for us this afternoon with respect to the conduct of such investigations as these, he would make an ideal commissioner for those who desired to dispense with the services of any Grit whether guilty of partisanship or not. He seems to think that Mr. Duchemin is justified, if the accused does not go upon the witness stand and give evidence himself, in coming to the conclusion that he is guilty. I stated before that these investigations are conducted under the Inquiries Act and that the Inquiries Act contemplates a procedure similar to that which is found in the county and supreme courts. Therefore, it is incumbent on the party preferring the charge to establish a prima facie case before the other side should be called upon to make a defence. You have no right to draw any inference from the fact that the other side does not choose to go into the witness box and knock down a man of straw.

Mr. LANCASTER : Will the hon. gentleman permit me a question ?

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish): I do not know that we will get very much nearer to the facts of the case by discussing these questions of law. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Annapolis lay down the proposition that if a person is accused and if he does not go on the stand and defend himself he must be held to be guilty. I have always understood that is was necessary for the party preferring the charge to prove beyond reasonable doubt that the party is guilty of the offence charged and that there is a presumption of innocence until guilt is established. As far as the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Finance are concerned, I agree with him that, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, he has the right to assume that the findings of the commissioner are justified and that the commissioner is honest and has discharged his duties properly and faithfully. I am not going to say that Commissioner Duchemin acted corruptly, but I will say that he is such an extreme partisan, like my hon. friend from Annapolis, that he would rather find a Liberal guilty than believe he was innocent. If he can at all, he will, torture the evidence, not intentionally, but his partisanship is of such an extreme character that he will unconsciously torture the evidence, as I have seen him do, and he will unconsciously read into the evidence and the surrounding circumstances that which will condemn the accused rather than that which is consistent with his innocence. That is quite clear from the findings of Mr. Duchemin in the case under consideration. He says that Alexander McDonald was guilty of partisanship because he had done work in the preparation of voters' lists, whereas the fact is that Mr. McDonald was discharging work of a judicial character in revising the lists, having been appointed by the municipal council to sit as a judge to make the lists in accordance with the law, and he was sworn to do his duty faithfully and impartially. He admits he made an honest mistake with reference to the name of Angus McQuarrie, and he did all in his power to remedy it as soon as he discovered his error. On these facts, Commissioner Duchemin, without the slightest tittle of evidence finds that Alexander McDonald was actively engaged as a partisan in the preparation of voters' lists. That is the way in which Mr. Duchemin has acted unfairly all through. The form in which the report is made is calculated to deceive the minister, who would naturally suppose from reading it that McDonald was engaged in revising the lists in a partisan capacity and not in a judicial capacity as really was the fact. To show the apparent dishonesty of Commissioner Duchemin's report, I might point out that he says that William Chisholm was present, and the minister on reading that statement would naturally infer that I was permitted to act as counsel, which is not the fact. I did have the privilege of sitting as adviser and friend to the accused, Alexander McDonald, and of suggesting to him certain questions, but any lawyer will know how difficult it is to conduct a cross-examination and to suggest proper questions through the medium of the accused, and there is the further fact that Mr. McDonald was a little hard of hearing. My experience of Mr. Duchemin before was that if I attempted to speak any way loudly enough for my friend to hear and understand the suggested questions on cross-examination, he would call me to order for interfering with what he considered to be the decorum that should prevail in his court. My submission is that when the Minister of Customs received that declaration from Alexander McDonald, he should have looked at the evidence, and I believe that if the Minister of Finance now reads the evidence given at the investigation and reads the affidavit, he will have no hesitation in arriving at the conclusion that the findings of Mr. Duchemin could not be sustained as a matter of law in any court. On account of the flippant remarks of my hon. friend from Annapolis, and his insinuation that I made reckless statements, and his animadversion with respect to certain remarks that took place between Mr. Murray, chairman of the Maintenance of Ways Executive Committee, and myself, at Pomquet, I shall read a letter which I sent to Mr. Murray. I did contradict the statement of Mr. Murray, as a fact. I

wrote to Mr. Murray before the discussion that took place some days ago with respect to this very same statement that I observed on file in one of the departments. I wrote to him on December 2, and as I have not yet received a reply, it looks as if no reply were coming. In order that the member for Annapolis may have no misgivings as to how I regard the conduct of Mr. Duchemin, I read the following letter which I wrote Mr. Murray:

December 2, 1912.

G. W. Murray, Esq.,
Chairman Maintenance of Ways Executive Committee,
Truro, N.S.

Dear Mr. Murray,—

I observe from the correspondence on file here that Mr. Girroir, now Senator Girroir, states that I admitted to you that Duchemin conducted his investigations at Pomquet with the utmost fairness.

I cannot understand how Girroir could make such a statement, for I do not believe that you ever so informed him. You will recollect that in the course of that investigation Mr. Duchemin undertook to read a lecture—I do not know whether it was intended for your benefit or mine or some of the witnesses—to the effect that it was an act of kindness and condescension on his part to allow those not directly interested in the inquiry to be present. He spoke of the courtesy that he extended to some person or persons, which he had in mind, but did not name. I commented on this to you in words that did not convey much appreciation of Duchemin's sense of judicial dignity, justice and impartiality. If you refer to my letter to you not long afterwards, you will see there an expression of opinion of Duchemin hardly consistent with the certificate of character contained in Girroir's correspondence. If you refer to my letter to Mr. Lowe, which was sent to you by the latter, and which I observe by the correspondence on file, you must in the goodness of your heart have shown to Mr. Girroir, I do not think you will find there any evidence of a high regard for Duchemin's fair play.

I do not want to do you any injustice and I therefore desire to know whether you did inform or misinform, I should say, Mr. Girroir in the manner which he ascribes to you.

Asking for the favour of an early reply, and thanking you in anticipation of same,

I remain,
Yours truly,
WM. CHISHOLM.

When the papers are brought down I may have something more to say upon the matter.

Motion agreed to.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

For a return showing for each department of the Civil Service, the names, ages, offices and salaries of such persons employed either in the inside or outside divisions thereof, and of such persons not in the Civil Service employed by the Government in any department since the 10th October, 1911; and in cases where no commission of investigation was appointed, as have been removed from office by dismissal, superannuation or otherwise, specifying in each case the manner of, and and grounds for such removal, and the length of notice given to the person removed, and the amount of superannuation or gratuity granted, if any; also showing the name, age, office and salary or remuneration of any and every person appointed to the Civil Service in the place of, or as a consequence of any such removal.—Mr. Murphy.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Charles J. Lafford, postmaster at Grand Grève, Richmond county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against John R. Morrison, postmaster at Oban, Richmond county, N.S., and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating in any way to his dismissal, and the appointment of a successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all papers, documents and correspondence relating to the dismissal of A. T. Doucet, postmaster and collector of customs at Salmon river, Digby county, N.S. —Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the establishment of a car ferry between Prince Edward Island and the mainland, of the report or reports of any engineers or experts in regard to the said proposal, and of their estimates of the cost thereof, the advertisement calling for tenders therefor, and a copy of any plans, conditions or proposed specifications therefor, or in regard thereto, and of the tenders received in response to said advertisement, of the reports, if any, of any officials in regard thereto, and of all data in possession of the department in respect of said project.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of W. H. Henlow, keeper of storm drums, Liscomb, Guysborough county, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Henry Hanlon, chief engineer at lobster hatchery at Canso, Guysborough county, N.S.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Stanley Henlow, lightkeeper at Liscomb, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expense of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of L. W. Pye, customs officer at Liscomb, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relat-

ing to the dismissal of Parker Sangster, postmaster at Upper New Harbour, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expense of such investigation. —Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telgrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Archibald Barss, postmaster at New Harbour, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against Simon Hodgson, engineer lobster hatchery at Isaacs Harbour, Nova Scotia, and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating in any way to his dismissal and the appointment of a successor.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Fred E. Cox, engineer lobster hatchery at Isaacs Harbour, Guysboro county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all complaints and charges made against W. B. Langley, assistant at lobster hatchery, Nova Scotia, and of all letters, telegrams and correspondence relating in any way to his dismissal and the appointment of a successor.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of John Cummings, assistant at the lobster Hatchery of Isaacs Harbour, Nova Scotia, and of evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all representations, statements and complaints as to political activity made against John A. Macdonald, postmaster at McArras Brook, Antigonish county, and of all correspondence relating to the charges made against him, and of the report of commissioner Duchemin on said charge.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all papers, documents, payrolls, accounts, receipts, and correspondence in connection with all expenditures of money made in 1912 upon the Petite Rivière breakwater, Lunenburg county, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax.)

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of H. C. V. LeVatte, harbour master at Louisburg, Cape Breton South, Nova Scotia, and of evidence taken and report of investigations held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same.—Mr. Carroll.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of John McLean, fishery officer at Gabarus, Cape Breton South, Nova Scotia, and of evidence taken and reports of investigations held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same.—Mr. Carroll.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of H. C. V. LeVatte, fishery officer at Louisburg, Cape Breton South, Nova Scotia, and of the evidence taken and reports of investigations held by H. P. Duchemin, in regard to the same.—Mr. Carroll.

For a copy of all Orders in Council in connection with the construction of a line of railway from St. John to Grand Falls in the province of New Brunswick, or any portion thereof, and also of all plans and profiles filed with the Department of Railways and Canals by the St. John and Quebec Railway Company, and of all correspondence between the Department of Railways and Canals or any official thereof and with the said company or the government of the province of New Brunswick, or any official thereof, with reference to the curves, grades or general specifications of the said railway or any portion thereof.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of John Taylor, late postmaster at Carnduff, Sask., and of all reports of investigations held, &c.—Mr. Turriff.

For a copy of all papers, documents and correspondence relating to the dismisssal of Captain C. E. Miller from the 75th Regiment. —Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Pascal Poirier, collector of customs at Descouse, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation; and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Bertie Boudrot, light keeper at Poulamon, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation; and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Abram LeBlanc, postmaster at West Arichat, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expense of such investigation; and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Frederick A. Martell, postmaster at L'Ardoise, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and of the report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation; and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of J. Scott Nelson, postmaster at Louisdale, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement

of the expenses of such investigation; and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Leon N. Poirier, postmaster at Descouse, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and of the report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation; and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Ellis M. Boudrot, keeper of storm signal at Petit de Gras, Richmond county, N.S., and of all the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation; and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Peter Fougère, preventive and customs officer at Petit de Grat, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Norman McAskill, postmaster at Framboise, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and of the report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation, and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Martin Bourque, lightkeeper at River Bourgeois, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and of the report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation, and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Dan. A. Coffey, lockman at St. Peter's canal, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and of the report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of W. A. McNeil, lockman at St. Peter's canal, Richmond county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and of the report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation, and a copy of all papers relating to the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all accounts, correspondence, telegrams, complaints and other documents in possession of the Department of Public Works in relation to the expenditure of moneys on harbour improvements at Grand Etang during the year 1911-12.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all accounts, correspondence, telegrams, complaints and other documents in possession of the Department of Public Works relating to the construction of telegraph lines during the year 1911-12 from South West Margaree to Scotsville, from Scotsville to North Ainslee, from Scotsville to South Lake Ainslee and Whycocomagh, from Little Narrows to Whycocomagh, from Rossville to Big Interval, and from Rossville to the Victoria county boundary line all in the county of Inverness.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of John K. McDonald, postmaster at Whycocomagh, Inverness county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of D. McLochlin, postmaster at Marble Mountain, Inverness county, N.S., and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of M. Muce, lightkeeper at Cheticamp island, Inverness county, Nova Scotia, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of John A. McRea, lightkeeper at Margaree Island, Inverness county, Nova Scotia, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of W. S. Lawrence, postmaster at Margaree Harbour, Inverness county, Nova Scotia, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of A. G. McDonald, postmaster of North East Margaree, Inverness county, Nova Scotia, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness.)

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of Ronald D. McDonald, fishery overseer, at Broad Cove, Inverness county, Nova Scotia, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held

by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness.)

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of A. D. Archibald, postmaster at Glenelg, Guysborough county, N.S., and of all evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same; also a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. Sinclair.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, December 12, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS.

Eighth Annual Report of the Commissioner of the National Transcontinental Railway for the year ended March 31, 1912. —Mr. Cochrane.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce, No. 2, for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Foster.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—FREE TRANSPORTATION OF HAY.

*Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish):

1. Is it the intention of the Railway Department to allow free transportation of hay over the Intercolonial railway from the province of Quebec to the eastern counties of Nova Scotia, or any of them?

2. What relief, if any, in the matter of freight rates on hay to be carried over the Intercolonial railway for the farmers of the eastern counties of Nova Scotia is proposed?

Mr. BORDEN: This matter is under consideration at present.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MR. ALEXANDER ALEXANDER.

*Mr. BELAND:

1. Was Mr. Alexander Alexander, late of Troy, New York, appointed an inspector on the National Transcontinental railway in or about the month of October, 1912? If so, what are his duties and salary?

2. Prior to his appointment in Canada, what engineering experience had he and on what railroads had he been employed?

3. By whom was he recommended for appointment on the Transcontinental railway and by whom was he appointed?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. (a) No. (b) Duties as assigned by the chief engineer. Salary $90 per month.

2. Location of electric railways in New York state.—

3. Applied for work, and was employed as a draughtsman on October 4, 1912.

PAYMENTS TO MR. H. P. DUCHEMIN.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How much has been paid by the Government, or any department thereof, up to the 21st day of November, 1912, to Mr. H. P. Duchemin for services and expenses in connection with investigations into complaints or charges against officials?

2. If any accounts of Mr. Duchemin for remuneration or expenses have been rendered and not paid, what is the amount of the same?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Department of Agriculture, $103 for services and expenses; Department of Customs, $860.31; Department of Marine and Fisheries, $840, expenses, including witness fees, &c., $473.31; Department of Militia and Defence, $36.80; Department of Post Office, $521.93; Department of Public Works, $112.83, $75 services, $37.83 expenses; Department of Railways and Canals, $1,279.83; Department of the Interior, $26.21.

2. Department of Agriculture, nil; Department of Customs, $239.30; Department of Marine and Fisheries, nil; Department of Militia and Defence, nil; Department of Post Office, nil; Department of Public Works, $47.80, services $30, expenses $17.80; Department of Railways and Canals, nil; Department of the Interior, nil.

INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES INVESTIGATION ACT.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Is it the intention of the Minister of Labour to introduce any amendments at the present session to the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act.

2. If so, when will the legislation be brought down?

3. Is it the intention of the minister to repeal said Act?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. No decision has been reached.

2. Answered by reply to No. 1.

3. The Minister has no such present intention.

OSGOODE STATION POSTMASTER.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Was a charge of offensive partisanship preferred against the postmaster at Osgoode station, Ontario? If so, by whom?

2. Was such charge investigated? If so, by whom and what report was made by the commissioner?

Mr PELLETIER:

1. (a) Yes. (b) By Messrs. A. P. Wilson, Henry Lewis, Vance Allen and J. A. Moss.

2. (a) Yes. (b) Mr. C. A. Seguin was appointed Commissioner to investigate this case. His report was to the effect that the evidence submitted was not of such a character as to substantiate the charges of partisanship preferred against the postmaster.

CUMBERLAND POSTMASTER.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has there been a change of postmasters at Cumberland, county of Russell, since November 1, 1911?
2. If so, on whose recommendation was the change made, and what was the reason therefor?
3. What is the name of the present postmaster at Cumberland?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. The post office inspector reported that the postmistress had not resided in Cumberland for over two years, and had never performed any of the duties of the office. The Postmaster General directed, therefore, that an appointment should be made to this office, as the office was practically without a postmaster.
3. Mr. H. D. Cameron.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—CARDSTON, ALBERTA.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Was the attention of the Department of Customs drawn to a report that the collector of customs at Cardston, Alberta, was using his position to his personal advantage in making imports of lumber from the United States?
2. Was an investigation held? If so, by whom?
3. What was the finding of the person who held the investigation?
4. If the report was shown to be correct what action has the department taken, or does it intend to take?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. Complaint has been received at the Department of Customs to the effect that the customs officer at Cardston, Alberta, was importing lumber from the United States for sale.
2. The matter was investigated by Inspector H. C. Graham.
3. The inspector reported that the customs officer had not imported lumber from the United States, but had been selling shipments of lumber from British Columbia.
4. The attention of the officer was directed to the provisions of the Audit Act concerning revenue officers, and he has undertaken to discontinue his connection with outside business.

YORKTON HOMESTEAD INSPECTORS.

Mr. CASH:

What are the names of the homestead inspectors appointed to the Yorkton agency between September 21, 1911, and July 11, 1912, and the salary of each?

Mr. ROCHE: Geo. McGowan, $1,200; R. J. M Parker, $1,200; J. C. deBalinhard, $1,200.

EDMONTON CUSTOMS COLLECTOR.

Mr. OLIVER:

1. Has Frank A. Osborne, collector of customs at Edmonton, been dismissed? If so, why was he dismissed?
2. What was his salary at the time of his dismissal?
3. Who was appointed in his place, and at what salary?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. No.

GRAND MERE PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. Has a site been purchased for a public building at Grand Mère, county of Champlain?
2. If not, are any negotiations now taking place for such a purpose?
3. If a site has been purchased, what is the number and location of the lot or lots, from whom purchased and what was the price paid?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2. A site was purchased on 16th August, 1912.
3. (a) Lot 31 of subdivision 93 of Ste. Flore, situated at the corner of the public road and Jarvis street; (b) from Mr. Paul Doucet for the sum of $15,000.

KOOTENAY RIFLES.

Mr. BUCHANAN:

1. Have the Kootenay Rifles, Fernie, B.C., Military district No. 11, been dissolved? If so, for what reason?
2. Was any attempt made to reorganize this company?
3. Has the intention of the late Government to build an armoury at Fernie been abandoned? If so, for what reason and on whose advice?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. (a) Yes, they were disbanded by General Order 102 of the 1st June, 1912. (b) they were not kept up since the fire of 1908, and did not drill after that period.
2. Yes.
3. The intention of the late Government is unknown. Tenders are being called for a proper drill hall.

CANADA-JAMAICA TRADE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What was the total trade between Canada and Jamaica for the year ending March 31, 1912?
2. What was the total trade between Canada and Porto Rico for the year ending March 31, 1912?
3. What was the total trade of Canada with the West Indian colonies, mentioned in the recent proposed trade agreement, for the same period?

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto):

1. Not available.
2. $690,408.
3. Not available.

ST. ELOI MAILS.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Have tenders been asked for the carriage of the mails from the post office of St. Eloi, Quebec, to the Intercolonial railway station?
2. If so, how many tenderers were there and what are their names?
3. What is the amount of each tender?
4. Who obtained the contract and was he the lowest tenderer?
5. Why was there so much delay in granting this contract?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. J. B. Parent, $216; Ernest Godbout, $264, reduced to $200; Isidore Dumas, $287.

4. Ernest Godbout at $200.

5. The department was endeavouring to obtain a reasonable offer for the service.

FRASERVILLE HARBOUR WORKS.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the Hon. Minister of Public Works been interviewed lately, with delegates from Fraserville, on the subject of the harbour works, at Rivière du Loup?
2. If so, did the promise to place in the Estimates of this year or next year a reasonable amount for the said works?
3. If not, does he propose to ask for a certain amount for the said works, and what will be the nature of the said works?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Matter now under consideration.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Foster:

That the report of the Committee of the Whole on the resolution to authorize measures for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, adopted in Committee of the Whole on the 10th instant, be now received and read a first time.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria).

Motion agreed to, and resolution read the first time.

Mr. BORDEN: I beg to move that the resolution be now read a second time and concurred in. Before doing so, I would like to read, for the information of hon. members, and especially for the information of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), certain correspondence which I have obtained leave to place upon the table with regard to the matter which was brought to my attention yesterday. I was unable at the moment to give further information on the subject without communicating through His Royal Highness with the Secretary of State for the Colonies. The correspondence which I desire to read is as follows:

Ottawa, Ont., October 3, 1912.

My dear Mr. Churchill,—

As I txplained to you in England.... it is sufficiently manifest to me that the construction of battleships of the largest and most powerful class cannot be undertaken in this country within a reasonable period, having regard to the grave conditions which we are called upon to confront. At our interviews in London I suggested to you a possible solution which you will doubtless recall. If the Canadian Parliament should vote a large sum of money sufficient for the construction of two or three battleships of the latest type, and should authorize the expenditure of that money in the United Kingdom, it would seem not only practicable but reasonable that the great ship-building firms to which the contracts might be let should undertake the beginning of a ship-building industry in one or two parts of this country.

Moreover, you will perhaps agree in the importance from an Imperial standpoint of the early establishment not only of dockyards but of naval bases provided with the necessary equipment both for building and for repairing war vessels of the smaller type at least.

I cannot too strongly emphasize the importance of the considerations which have been very briefly set forth in this letter. Possibly the particulars, the early arrival of which your recent cable announces, may cover this point.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) R. L. BORDEN.

The Right Honourable
Winston S. Churchill, M.P.,
First Lord of the Admiralty,
London, England.

Ottawa, October 5, 1912.

My dear Mr. Churchill,—

In writing to you on the 3rd instant with respect to the importance at this juncture of stimulating or encouraging the beginnings of a ship-building industry in Canada, I omitted to allude to the proposal or suggestion more than once discussed between us, that war vessels, such as destroyers or small cruisers, might be built within a very early period in Canada, and that possibly an arrangement

might be made to divide the extra cost between the two Governments.

Believe me, yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) R. L. BORDEN.

The Right Honourable
Winston S. Churchill, M.P.,
First Lord of the Admiralty
London, England.

Admiralty, Whitehall,
4th November, 1912.

My dear Mr. Borden,—

I have given careful consideration to your two letters about the encouragement of the ship-building industry in Canada. I recognize the importance of such a policy on general grounds not less than from the immediate Canadian standpoint; and any practical scheme for Admiralty co-operation would command my support. The main difficulty to be surmounted is to obtain that high degree of expert knowledge and experience which modern war-ships require for their efficient construction.

We might, however, in the first instance agree upon certain classes of vessels with which it may be considered that competent Canadian shipyards would be able to deal. The most suitable classes of vessels with which to inaugurate the system would be light cruisers, oil tank vessels and small craft for auxiliary services. We should, if it would meet your views, be prepared to invite tenders from approved Canadian firms for the construction of some vessels of such classes in the near future.

It would be understood that progress with this policy would have to depend on the prices quoted being reasonable, having regard to all the circumstances (including the fact that Canada will be prepared to share any extra cost) and also on the time required for construction not being excessive as compared with the dates fixed for completion of similar ships in England. No fixed scale or proportion of orders could be guaranteed to Canadian firms. We would begin by giving some orders at once, and further progress would depend upon the development of the industry and the extent of our programme.

The Admiralty would, of course, remain wholly responsible for the design of all vessels, and for the supervision of the construction of those building in Canada. Arrangements for this could be worked out in detail and should not present any difficulty.

WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

I also inquired as to the statement of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, which was alluded to by my right hon. friend yesterday, and I have the following telegram as to what actually took place:

Text of Lee's question December 9th is as follows: 'Mr. Arthur Lee asked the Prime Minister what conditions, if any, have been attached to the offer of the Canadian Government to provide three first class armoured ships for the strengthening of the British fleet and is it to be understood that these ships will be in addition to the programme for several years ahead adopted by His Majesty's Government and announced on July 22, 1912.

Prime Minister's reply was: 'Certain arrangements of a general character have been agreed to between the Admiralty and the Dominion Government regarding the transfer of the Canadian battleships to the Royal Canadian navy on notice sufficient to allow for their replacement if necessary being given and regarding the placing by the Admiralty of orders for some light cruisers in Canada, the training of Canadian naval cadets and other minor and incidental matters. Papers on these subjects will be laid (before the House) when the Bill now before the Dominion Parliament has received the Royal assent. As to the second part of the question it was stated by my Right Honourable friend the First Lord of the Admiralty in introducing the Supplementary Estimates in July last that any ships given by Canada at this juncture would be additional to the forecast of annual construction already announced and that this was the wish of the Dominion ministers.'

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to present to the House the views of His Majesty's loyal Opposition upon the measure which has been presented to it by my right hon. friend, perhaps it will not be out of place if I refer to the fact that some few months ago a document came to me as well as to my right hon. friend, signed by some of the most important citizens of Canada belonging to both parties, strongly urging that the subject of Imperial defence should be removed from the domain of contentious politics. The motive which animated these important and respected citizens is certainly worthy of all ecomium, and, so far as I am concerned, meets altogether with my approbation; but I may be permitted to observe that if the question of Imperial defence has been introduced into the domain of contentious politics, the blame is not to be imputed to any one sitting on this side of the House.

When four years ago my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) introduced this subject in a concrete form, we were in control of the House, and the House will agree with me that we did not receive his motion in any carping spirit. The motion moved by my hon. friend was to this effect :

That, in the opinion of this House, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and of that spirit of self-help and self-respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

We received the proposition of my hon. friend quite sympathetically, and we suggested to him that it would be advisable to enlarge it and to bring it to the broader basis of Imperial defence, in view espe-

cially of the new conditions which were then and had been for some time arising in Europe. I am bound to say that our suggestion was well received by our friends on the other side, and they in turn offered us some amendments which we were only too glad to receive. The original motion of my hon. friend thus amended, was passed by the unanimous voice of Parliament. It was in these terms:

This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada, as they increase in numbers and wealth, to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the mother country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire and the peace of the world.

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the Imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the Empire.

The ink was scarcely dry upon that resolution before it was assailed from the ranks of the Conservative party assailed from motives divergent and contradictory. One section affirmed that the duty of Canada towards the Empire would not be properly discharged by the creation of a Canadian navy, but that the only manner in which this duty could be discharged was by contributions from the Canadian treasury to the Imperial treasury. The other section on the contrary, protested against the very idea either of a contribution or of the creation of a Canadian navy. This was introducing with a vengeance into the domain of contentious politics the question of Imperial defence and it also let loose passions which he had hoped were buried, but which we found were easily brought to life again. Can it be denied that the result was affected by these feelings in the last contest?

Under such circumstances, there might perhaps be some temptation to retaliate, and to create political capital out of the difficulties of the gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches,—difficulties which have resulted and culminated in the resignation of one of the most important of their number. But, Sir, the subject is too great, too sacred. By such methods we will not be impelled to act, by such methods we do not desire to win. I have stated before, and I now repeat—and I think that always I have been true to my pledge—that never would I utter a word which would be calculated to fan the flames which unfortunately this subject has rekindled. I have stated before, and again I repeat, that in the consideration of the measure which was to be brought forth, and which has been brought forth by the Administration, we would be guided by its merits, and by its merits alone. My right hon. friend, the other day, in presenting his resolution—and he presented it in terms to which I do not take exception, as I said at the time—stated that he was animated—this may not have been his exact words, but it is the effect of what he said—by no other purpose than to promote the welfare of Canada and of the Empire to which we belong. Let me say to my right hon. friend that I am glad to meet him upon this ground. If we differ from him on the policy which he has presented to the House, it is because we are firmly convinced, in our consciences and our souls, that the policy which we advocate is more conducive to the end which he says he has in mind than the policy which he has presented.

Sir, the country expected and waited with great impatience for the announcement to be made, and which has now been made by the right hon. the Prime Minister after consultation with the Admiralty. Mr. Asquith, Mr. Churchill, Sir Edward Grey, had again and again, asserted that England had no enemy, that she was prepared and ready for all comers. Still, there was an apprehension far and wide spread that somehow, somewhere, some mysterious danger was threatening England. And, indeed, some went so far as to say that England was on her knees, begging for support — an assertion which surely was more calculated to wound the pride of those to whom it was addressed than to create respect for those who uttered it. All these apprehensions, however, have been removed by the document which was placed on the table of the House by my right hon. friend. England is always England; she bows the knee to no one; she asks no favour from anybody; she does not come here as a suppliant, still less as a mendicant; but, to the inquiry of our ministers, she answered: Here are the facts

set forth in this paper; judge for yourselves and act as you please. This is the language, and it is no other than what we might expect from English statesmen and the English people.

Sir, in other respects there is cause for rejoicing. This document shows that there is no emergency, that England is in no danger, whether imminent or prospective. But the document discloses a condition of things, of which indeed we knew, but upon which has now been placed the sanction of official correspondence. It shows that there has been going on in Europe for some years past a certain movement to which we cannot be indifferent. The armament of the great powers has compelled England to alter the strategic lines which hitherto have been essential for her security. The document discloses the fact that, on account of this increased naval armament, England, in order to maintain her security in her own waters, has been obliged to withdraw some of her naval forces from the distant seas. This, I believe, is a fair statement of what is disclosed by the document laid upon the table by my right hon. friend. In the face of this position, I now ask the question: What is the duty of the House of Commons, what is the duty of the people of Canada? That is the question.

But, before I proceed to give my answer, I think it would be advisable that I should come nearer home, and review the situation as it has been made by the division of the two parties during the last contest. During the last contest in the province of Quebec, the Conservative party, as a whole with some exceptions, which I could count upon the fingers of one hand, or at most upon the fingers of two hands—contended upon hundreds of platforms that Canada owed nothing to England——

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am glad there are some hon. members who say, 'No, no,' to that statement. I cannot accept their denial; the facts are too patent. But at least the denial shows that these hon. gentlemen resent the conduct of some men with whom they are now forced to associate. The position taken, I repeat, by the Conservative party in the province of Quebec—at that time they were not the followers of my right hon. friend; they were an independent party—was that Canada owed nothing to England and discharged its whole duty in the matter of defence simply by providing for the defence of her own shores. I am glad to say there is another spirit prevailing now. Conditions seen from another angle have changed the view. But when harmful doctrines of that kind have been preached for months and years, that preaching leaves behind it an impression which it is much more easy to create than it is afterwards to destroy.

We have recently heard throughout the province of Quebec that we owe nothing to England, because in the long chapter of our diplomatic history she has sacrificed our interests in the adjustment of the boundaries between ourselves and our neighbours to the South. For my part I have often stated that in such questions British diplomacy has not shown itself to advantage. And what conclusion are we to draw from this? Are we to draw the conclusion that England was indifferent to our interests? Nothing of the kind. Are we to draw the conclusion that England wantonly sacrificed our interests? Still less may this be presumed. The only conclusion we can draw is that in these matters British diplomatists were not as well informed as those of the United States in regard to every inch of ground which was in issue. This shows conclusively that local matters are always better dealt with by those responsible for local administration. The fact is undeniable that, practically ever since we have had in our hands the conduct of our diplomatic relations, Canada has suffered no sacrifice. In the last dispute we had with our neighbours, on the question of the Atlantic fisheries, not only did we not suffer any sacrifice, but we obtained recognition of rights which had been long denied.

As a result of this deleterious preaching to which I referred a moment ago, we have lately heard in the province of Quebec that England, forsooth, had sacrificed our interests because she had not interfered on behalf of the South in the American civil war! The young gentleman who made that assertion I know quite well. It was not his better nature that thus spoke, and I am sure he will some day appreciate the fact—if he has not already done so—that if there is one thing which tends to the glory of England it is that when the North and the South were engaged in that titanic struggle resulting in the abolition of African slavery, she would not interfere as against what might have been her own interests; and, as a result of her non-interference, that blot upon Christian civilization has forever been wiped out. England is too great to fear or to begrudge the greatness of the United States, and no British subject, wherever he may be, has any cause to resent or fear the rise of any other power.

Sir, there does not exist the necessity for our saying what we owe to England. We are British subjects; we do not want to be

anything else; and that settles the whole question. If there are men in the province of Quebec who will not recognize this truth, let me appeal to them from another point of view—from the baser motive of selfishness. We have been immune from invasion by the sea ever since we became subjects of England by the Treaty of Paris in 1763. But can we say to-day that we are now immune from invasion by the sea? At the end of the seventeenth century, there were only three maritime powers in Europe—England, France and Spain. In 1805, at the memorable battle of Trafalgar, the naval forces of France and Spain were crushed. Spain never recovered from the blow; but France, owing to her marvellous recuperative strength soon built a navy second only to that of England. The navy of France ranks to-day second or third among those of the different countries of Europe; but, happily, we have nothing to fear from France. The entente cordiale has brought France and England together in such close friendship that war between these countries would, I am sure, be regarded by either nation as equivalent to civil war in any one of them. I have heard that the late Queen said on one occasion she would rather die than see another war between England and France. The good Queen did not live to see accomplished that dream of her life, the 'entente cordiale,' but it was left to her son to accomplish it, and we to-day receive the benefit of it. There are other maritime powers to which we are exposed, although I do not apprehend any attack from them, nor do I consider that there is even any comtemplated; but I am sure we must all agree that when increased armaments are going on we cannot afford to be idle and rest upon a sense that our security in the past would be a guarantee of security in the future.

It has also been said in the province of Quebec during the last contest that we could rely on the Monroe Doctrine. To anyone who would rely upon the Monroe Doctrine, I would say, let him examine the record of Cuba after the Spanish-American war. When the Cubans were desirous of removing the yoke of Spain, they appealed to the United States for help, and they got it, but when, with the assistance of the United States, they had freed themselves from the control of Spain, they found that they had a rather high price to pay for the help they had received. That price was the abridgement of a portion of their independence. After the war was over, the people of Cuba naturally wanted to establis a regular government of their own. They called a convention and adopted a constitution, but that constitution had to go to Washington for revision, and there after three months discussion, certain conditions were imposed upon Cuba which to the people of that country were extremely distasteful, which convention they adopted by a narrow majority of five. The following conditions were made part of the constitution of Cuba:

> Cuba shall not make any foreign treaty which may tend toward placing the independence of the island or any portion thereof in jeopardy; no loans can be issued unless a surplus of revenue is available for the service of such obligations; the United States can intervene to preserve the independence of Cuba or to insure protection for life and property; the Acts of the United States military administration in Cuba since 1898 are recognized as valid; proper hygienic precautions must be taken to protect public health on the island; the ownership of the Isle of Pines is left for future consideration; coaling stations shall be sold or leased to the United States in localities to be hereafter decided.

This shows how much Cuba had to discard of her sovereign power for the sake of the Monroe Doctrine. We have to take our share in the defence, not only of our native shores, but of the Empire as a whole. We can defend ourselves only by the assistance of the mother country.

Now, I come back to the question which I put a moment ago upon the condition disclosed by the memorandum of the Admiralty. Let me state it again. As a result of the armaments which are now going on in Europe, England has been obliged to increase the margin of security which she relies on for her own defence, by reducing her naval forces in the outlying seas. Such is the condition; and, I ask once more, what is the remedy? In our humble judgment, the remedy is this, that wherever, in the distant seas, or in the distant countries—in Australia, Canada or elsewhere—a British ship has been removed to allow of concentration in European waters, that ship should be replaced by a ship built, maintained, equipped and manned by the young nation immediately concerned. If the young nations of the Empire take hold of the equipment and manning of ships to look after the distant seas, concentration can easily take place in the waters of Europe, and the British Admiralty knows what zones it has to defend. This is the Australian policy; this ought to be the Canadian policy. I insist once more upon what is stated in the memorandum: There is no emergency, there is no immediate danger, there is no prospective danger. If there were an emergency, if England were in danger—no, I will not use that expression; I will not say if England were in danger, but simply if England were on trial with one or two or more of the

great powers of Europe, my right hon. friend might come and ask, not $35,000,000, but twice, three times, four times $35,000,000. We would put at the disposal of England all the resources of Canada; there would not be a single dissentient voice.

But this is not the condition with which we have to deal. The condition that we have to deal with to-day is simply what I described a moment ago. This is not new. The memorandum which my right hon. friend submitted the other day disclosed nothing which we did not know before. Every word that is there we knew; every figure we knew. I may say more; every word, every figure in that memorandum we discussed four years ago. We discussed it in the month of March, 1909; and then we came to the conclusion, the unanimous conclusion, that the best method of helping England, of discharging our duty, was not by contribution, but by the creation of a Canadian navy. Sir, I remember very well the question on that occasion, and those who were present in the House at that time cannot have forgotten it. This question gave rise to one of the most important debates which, in the some thirty years of my own experience, the Parliament of Canada ever saw. I remember the speech of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), an excellent speech, one of the very best he ever made, and that is paying a great compliment well deserved. I remember the speech of my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) the present Prime Minister, and if ever a man gave reasons against the policy which he has now introduced, my right hon. friend gave those reasons on that occasion. This is his language:

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to-day outlined the lines of naval defence of this country, I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that. The other experiment has been tried as between Australia and the mother country and it has not worked satisfactorily in any respect. In Great Britain the contribution has perhaps been regarded as rather unsatisfactory. In Australia it failed, in the end, to meet with the approval of the people for the reason that Great Britain felt constrained to ask Australia that the field of operations of the squadron should be extended to the China and Indian seas; and when the operation of that squadron was so extended, the Australians felt that the contribution which they had been making for some years past was not really being used to give that protection to Australia which her interests demanded. So that the policy of Australia at the present time is to build up a flotilla of submarines and torpedo boats which, in case of war, would co-operate with the armed cruisers and battleships of the British navy.

Mark these words, Sir:

So that, the policy of Australia at the present time is to build up a flotilla of submarines and torpedo boats,——

I have heard that described as a tin-pot navy——

—which, in case of war, would co-operate with the armed cruisers and battleships of the British navy. It was pointed out in discussing this question that Australia in providing a force of that kind would provide a force which it would be very difficult if not impossible for Great Britain to send across the seas, and that in thus protecting themselves they were providing the best possible force for the protection of the Empire. So, I am at one with the Prime Minister as far as this is concerned.

No less forcible was the language of my hon. friend from North Toronto. He said:

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neighbour something per month for looking after the welfare and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself. That seems to me, when you work it out, to be a basic objection to this form of aid. It goes still further than that. Suppose you contribute this year your sum, and next year your equal sum, and thereafter year after year. After ten or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years, you will have paid out an immense amount of money. You will have been protected in the meantime; but in Canada itself there will be no roots struck, there will be no residue left.

There will be no preparation of the soil, or beginning of the growth of the product of defence. Yet some time or other, no one can doubt that with resources and with a population constantly increasing, we must and will have in this country a naval force of our own for our coast and home defence.

Four years ago my right hon friend said we must and will. To-day he no longer says we must and will; but we on this side of the House continue to say we must and will. Now, Sir, I ask, why is it that my right hon. friend and his first lieutenant, the leaders of the Opposition then, who to-day have the responsibility of office, will not go on with the policy so forcibly put forward by them, instead of a policy under which, in the language of my right hon. friend, there will be no preparation of the soil or beginning or growth of the product of defence? The reason, Sir, is not far to seek. The reason is well known: there is one, and only one, and it is because this subject of Imperial defence has been made the subject of contentious politics. It is the result of the alliance, the unholy alliance, which has been formed by hon. gentlemen opposite.

What is this contribution that we have

to-day before us, and upon which we are asked to vote? It is big in money; it is big in figures. Is it as big otherwise as it ought to be? I ask every hon. member of this House; I ask every hon. gentleman sitting there: You give England two or three dreadnoughts, to be paid for by Canada, but to be equipped, maintained and manned by England. Did I say, manned by England? I must qualify that statement. In justice to my right hon. friend, I must qualify that statement; because he told us that he had secured from the Imperial authorities the privilege of having Canadian officers serve on those ships. Oh, ye Tory jingoes, is that the amount of the sacrifice you are prepared to make? You are ready to furnish admirals, rear admirals, commodores, captains, officers of all grades, plumes, feathers, and gold lace; but you leave it to England to supply the bone and sinews on board those ships. You say that these ships shall bear Canadian names. That will be the only thing Canadian about them. You hire somebody to do your work; in other words, you are ready to do anything except the fighting. Is that, Sir, the true policy?

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Is that the true policy? It is a hybrid policy, it is a cross between jingoism and nationalism. Unless I mistake the spirit of the Canadian people, if they are true to their ideals, if they are true to their own blood, no matter to what province they belong, they will not be satisfied with this hybrid policy, but they will insist that their contribution shall be a contribution of money and of men as well, as was provided in our resolution of 1909.

Mr. Speaker, it is not money that England wants at this moment. England never was wealthier than she is at the present time; her coffers are overflowing. What she wants are the hearts, the brains, and the brawn of her subjects all over the world. It has been stated—I hope it will prove true—that this generous contribution of $35,000,000 to the Imperial treasury will create a deep impression in Europe amongst the great powers. I hope it is true, but would not the impression be much greater yet if, instead of this money contribution, the nations of Europe were to see the young daughters of the Empire, the young nations scattered over the whole world, building fleets of their own, to use the language of the resolution of 1909—

—in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy, along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Great Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire, and the peace of the world.

Would not that create a greater impression? Many there are, and I am one of them, who deprecate the important fact that upon the distant seas they do not count as many pennants as they counted some few years ago, but let this policy be adopted, and then the full quota, which we saw at one time, of our ships on the distant seas, would be re-established, and the white ensign, which has been for so many centuries the symbol of England's naval pride, would again unfurl its folds on the seven seas. Then, Sir, we would see, besides the white ensign, the colours of the young nations themselves, attesting the solidarity between mother and daughter. That is the policy which we adopted, that is the policy which we intend to follow.

But I may be told that that is not the policy recommended by the Admiralty to the Prime Minister. Sir, I deny that altogether. My right hon. friend did not go to England to consult the Admiralty about a policy. It is evident that when my right hon. friend went to England, he had abandoned the policy of a Canadian navy. He went to England—it is very clear from the last paragraph of the memorandum—to ask what they would accept for immediate aid. In other words, he went to England to ask what England would accept in the case of an emergency, although there was no emergency.

Therefore, we come back to the question: what is the true policy? Is it a policy of emergency, which as stated by my hon. friend from North Toronto, which produces nothing and leaves nothing behind, or is it a policy of naval organization in Canada? That is the problem we have to deal with at the present time. Australia has adopted the same policy, and she has adopted it for the reason stated by my hon. friend in the debate of 1909: that having tried contribution, she found that contribution would not work. Australia, therefore, came to the conclusion which we came to: she came to the conclusion that gentlemen now sitting on the Government benches came to, but which they have abandoned, and abandoned for what reason? For no other than the well known reason of their alliance with the Nationalist party of Quebec.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we went on with the execution of our policy. We asked for tenders, with the intention of having ultimately a double unit, one on the Pacific ocean and one on the Atlantic ocean; we asked for tenders for four cruisers and six destroyers, which would cost $11,280,000. We did not choose to award the contract, in view of the impending change of Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS : Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER : Yes; we thought as the general elections were coming, that it would not be fair, in a matter of this kind, which was at issue between the two parties, to award the contract in case there might be, as there was, a change of government. I say now that the Government in power would have been better advised if they had awarded the contracts, and, had they done so, we would at the present time have under construction on the stocks in Montreal four cruisers and six destroyers.

There is another reason which causes us to stick to our policy of a Canadian navy. I have to thank my right hon. friend the Prime Minister for bringing down to-day some papers—not those for which I inquired yesterday—but some papers which show us the policy of Canadian construction of our navy is so strong that he and his Government are trying to trifle with that question by endeavouring to get some ships built in Canada, which he tells us may happen some time in the spring. There is a better way of doing it. Let us have a Canadian navy, and as soon as practicable, and then all the ships will be built in Canada. I have reason to believe that the Minister of the Naval Service has actually an offer from one of the great British firms, to build the largest possible plant in Montreal if he chooses to have it.

I now come to another subject, which I would not have mentioned at all were it not for some observations made during the Debate on the Address by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). During the last electoral contest, I heard it many a time, and I read it many a time, that our Canadian navy was a separatist navy, and that it was, on account of something which was to be found in the Act, liable to be neutral in time of war. I have been too long in the fight to care very much for what may be said of me during an electoral contest; but when a thing is repeated upon the floor of Parliament within my hearing, I owe it to myself to take notice of it. And, just here, apropos of this, let me recall a classical and historical incident. On the eve of the battle of Salamis, Themistocles offered advice to the commander of the fleet of the Greeks, and, although that advice ultimately prevailed and carried the Greeks to victory, the Greek commander at first refused to accept it; and, on Themistocles persisting the commander raised his staff to strike him. Themistocles said: 'Strike, but hear me.' Sir, I have been struck, but I still say: 'Hear me.' In refutation of the charge that the Navy Act was intentionally, on my part, separatist, I think it is sufficient for me to set up the record of my seventy years of life. I do not entertain, at the age of seventy, many of the ideas I had at twenty, or at thirty, or even at forty; but I trust I have not lived in vain, and that in the course of my long career I have learned something from observation and experience. Let the matter be settled once and for all, not only for myself, but for my friends here and outside, by my declaration: that any thought of separation from Great Britain if any such thought exists anywhere, and I do not believe it does—would be a folly and a crime. As to the contention of my hon. friend from Kingston that in case of war our navy would be neutral, I have only this to observe. I said a moment ago that I hope I have not lived in vain, and I hope I am to be given credit for some common sense and some knowledge, and my answer to that contention is: when England is at war, we are at war, and the thought of being neutral would be like the command of King Canute to the sea to recede from his feet. No action of ours could bring that about. When England is at war, we are at war; but it does not follow that because we are at war, we are actually in the conflict.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: We can be in the conflict only through two things, namely, actual invasion of our soil, or, the action of the Parliament of Canada. That seems to arouse the hilarity of gentlemen on the other side of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: They have not read much history.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Perhaps, if I answer these hon. gentlemen opposite by citing history, that will be the best answer of all. How many wars have we had since Canada became a British possession? Speaking from memory, we had first, in 1776 the war with the American colonies; we had next the war with France, which commenced in 1793 and lasted until the Battle of Waterloo in 1815; we had the war with the American republic in 1812 and 1813; we had next the war with Turkey for the independence of Greece in 1827; we had next the Crimean war with Russia in 1854; we had next the war with China in 1860; we had next the expedition to Abyssinia in 1868; we had the expedition to Egypt in 1882; and, last of all, we had the Boer war in 1899.

Mr. BENNETT (East Simcoe): We were in it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I did not expect such a compliment to the Liberal Government would come from my friend from

East Simcoe. We were in it on account of the action taken by the Canadian Government and the Canadian Parliament at that time.

We were in it in the war with the American colonies in 1870; we were in it in the war with the American republic in 1812-13; but we were not in it in the war with France; we were not in it in the war with Turkey; we were not in it in the Crimean war; we were not in it in the expedition to Abyssinia or the Soudan war of 1885. We might have been in that, but Sir John A. Macdonald, then leader of the Government, refused. Why should we attempt to trifle with such questions as these? Is it not a fact that our forces can go to war only by the action of this Parliament? You may give your sanction, now or at any time if you choose; but no one in this country will claim that we can go to war, except by the will of Parliament or by the force of circumstances.

Some objections have been made to our Naval Act, because it was said that the British Admiralty could not count at all times upon the support of the Canadian navy. I simply say that the Admiralty can count at all times upon the Canadian navy, because last year we passed an agreement with the Admiralty, whereby naval stations were created for the Canadian navy. The Canadian Atlantic station would include north of 30 north latitude and west of the meridian of 40 west longitude. The Canadian Pacific station would include north of 30 north latitude and east of the meridian of 180 west longitude. So the Admiralty knew that at all times in those bodies of water there were Canadian ships to guard the waters; and the moment the ships of an enemy of England appeared in those waters it was the duty of our navy to pounce upon them, to grapple with them and to sink them, in the same manner as if they had been in the harbour of Halifax. That is the interpretation placed upon that Act. My hon. friends, however, have to-day the administration of the Act; they can interpret it themselves; but surely they will not interpret it in the way it is said they could. They can amend it as they please; but, whatever they do, if they are sincere, as I hope they are, they cannot put any other construction than the construction I put upon this Act.

The present policy which my right hon. friend proposes settles nothing. The problem that you have to deal with is one which demands a permanent policy—a policy for to-day, for to-morrow, and for every day, so long as the armaments grow in Europe; and the duty which you owe to yourselves, to Canada, and to the Empire, is the enactment of a permanent policy. As regards the creation of a Canadian navy, you have apparently decided against that. In respect to contribution, does any one imagine that you will have only one contribution? Contributions must be recurring and again recurring, and, in the words of my hon. friend from North Toronto, they leave no trace behind them. As I understand from the speech of my hon. friend, he does not want to have a permanent policy on this subject, because, he says, 'Before we have a permanent policy, we must have a voice in all questions of peace or war.' This is a very large contract. If we are to have a discussion of that question, this is not the time for it. It is not germane to the question which we have before us to-day. We have the question of defence to deal with. When we have to deal with the danger of an enemy rushing upon us, whom we must be called to face at any moment, are we to fold our arms and do nothing until we have settled the question as to whether or not we shall have a voice in all matters of war or peace? My hon. friend is like the Emperor of Constantinople, who went to Italy to discuss questions of theology, when his city was on the eve of being assaulted by the Turks, who finally captured it. If we go on discussing the question of having a voice in matters of peace and war, the enemy may be upon us before we have settled that question, and we may never have any occasion to deal with it at all. It is a very important question, and I do not minimize it in any way; but it must be discussed separately and not in conjunction with the present question, or we shall be at a standstill.

Whether we shall or shall not have a voice in all questions affecting peace and war is a very large proposition, and I would not at the present time pronounce finally upon it; but there are certain objections that present themselves at once to my mind. The diplomatic service of England is carried on by the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and it is to-day in as good hands as it ever was. These transactions are very minute, very serious, and sometimes must be carried on with great secrecy. I understand that my right hon. friend proposes to the English Admiralty that there should be a representative of the Canadian Government all the time in England to confer with the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on all questions on which war may probably arise. If this is done for Canada, it must be done for Australia, for New Zealand, for South Africa and for Newfoundland, and I doubt very much if the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs would receive much assistance from such a multitude of advisers. Supposing they do not agree, or supposing

they do agree, how can we pretend to dictate in these matters, or even to take a part? The Foreign Office, only last year, had to deal with the question of the division of Persia. Are we to understand that Canada and all the other Dominions would be invited to discuss such a question with the Foreign Office? A few years ago the Afghan boundary question was a burning question with the Foreign Office. Of late years it has been put in the background by the fact that Russia has not been in a position to be aggressive. But that question may be revived. Within the last year, when the German Emperor sent warships to Agadir, the Foreign Office had to take immediate action upon the question whether Germany should be allowed a footing in North Africa. Would the Dominion of Canada also be interested in and be consulted upon this question? If so, it seems to me that this is opening a door to consequences which must be carefully considered before any action is taken. I do not wish to condemn the view taken by the right hon. gentleman; I do not now approve or condemn it; the subject is too new. But the point upon which I appeal to him, and to which I ask the attention of the House, is this, that we cannot postpone our preparation for defence until this question is settled. It may take a long time to settle it. Therefore, let it be settled by itself; but, in the meantime, let our preparations go on.

My right hon. friend concluded the argumentative part of his speech with the statement that, in claiming for the overseas dominions the power to have a voice in all questions of peace and war, he was inviting the attention of the statesmen of Great Britain 'to the real problem of Imperial existence.' Mark the words: 'the real problem of Imperial existence.' I think it would be difficult for my right hon. friend, or anybody else, to convince us that the existence of the British Empire rests upon so slender a thread. We have been accustomed to believe, and we will continue to believe, that it rests upon a firmer basis. Sir, I am not indifferent—far from it—to anything that concerns the unity of the British Empire. This agglomeration of continents under the British Crown has something in it which strikes the imagination, something which has always had, at all events for me, a great attraction. But I have always believed, and will continue to believe, that the firm basis of the British Empire is next to the British Crown the local autonomy of the different dependencies; that is to say, their working out of their own destinies to the central end of the Empire. The Crown is the great bond, the cement, which binds together the scattered continents over the whole world. The Crown is a purely sentimental bond; but that bond, though purely sentimental, has proven itself stronger than armies and navies; has shown itself to be equal to all occasions. I do not believe the Empire is in danger; I do not believe it can be cemented by the means suggested by my right hon. friend. I believe the relations of the different parts of the Empire to the Mother Country are not perfect, but that essentially they are perfectible. You can discuss problems of improvement; there is no occasion to discuss problems of existence.

It is with these views that we approach this subject. And I repeat now, in conclusion, what I said at the beginning, that I have endeavoured to approach this subject on the same plane as my right hon. friend. I do not question his motives when he says that what he has in mind is the grandeur of our common empire. I hope he will not discuss my motive when I say that I approach the question in the same spirit. If we differ with him, it is because we believe that under existing circumstances our policy is more conducive to what he has in mind than is the policy which he has announced. Therefore, I beg to move the following as an amendment to the resolution:

That all the words after the word 'That' be struck out, and the following be substituted therefor:—

'This House declines to concur in the said resolution and orders that the same be referred back to the committee with instructions to amend the same in the following particulars, namely, to strike out all the words after clause (a) and substitute therefor the following:

'The memorandum prepared by the Board of Admiralty on the general naval situation of the Empire and communicated to this House by the right hon. the Prime Minister on December 5th shows that several of the most important of the foreign powers have adopted a definite policy of rapidly increasing their naval strength.

'That this condition has compelled the United Kingdom to concentrate its naval forces in home waters involving the withdrawal of ships from the outlying portions of the Empire.

'That such withdrawal renders it necessary that Canada without further delay should enter actively upon a permanent policy of naval defence.

'That any measure of Canadian aid to Imperial naval defence which does not employ a permanent policy of participation by ships owned, manned and maintained by Canada and contemplating construction as soon as possible in Canada, is not an adequate or satisfactory expression of the aspirations of the Canadian people in regard to naval defence, and is not an assumption by Canada of her fair share in the maintenance of the naval strength of the Empire.

'This House regrets to learn the intention of the Government to indefinitely postpone

the carrying out by Canada of a permanent naval policy.

'It is the opinion of this House that measures should be taken at the present session to give effect actively and speedily to the permanent naval policy embodied in the Naval Service Act of 1910 passed pursuant to the resolution unanimously approved by this House in March 1909.

'This House is further of the opinion that to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy by the addition by Canada under the above Act of two fleet units, to be stationed on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Canada, respectively, rather than by a contribution of money or ships, is the policy best calculated to afford relief to the United Kingdom in respect to the burden of Imperial naval defence, and in the words of the Admiralty memorandum, to restore greater freedom to the movements of the British squadrons in every sea and directly promote the security of the dominions; and that the Government of Canada should take such steps as shall lead to the accomplishment of this purpose as speedily as possible.'

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I have this afternoon, as I always do, listened with very great interest, not unmixed with pleasure, to the speech which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has made in opposition to the resolution which has been placed before this House by the right hon. the Prime Minister of the country, and in opposition to the Naval Bill introduced to this House by the Prime Minister early last week. I have followed as closely as it was possible for me to do, the remarks of my right hon. friend. In the course of the hour and a quarter that he occupied in addressing the House, he discussed very many subjects. The hon. gentleman has delved into history, ancient and modern, and has dealt with questions which I think have no bearing whatever on the resolution before the House. Having followed the hon. gentleman as closely as I could, I think I may without offence make the observation that I believe the people of this country and the members of this House will recognize that my right hon. friend has advanced no argument and no reasoning that is conclusive as to why this Parliament should reject the resolution and the Bill which has been based upon it.

The commencement of my right hon. friend's speech was couched in lofty sentiment and lofty language. From his opening remarks, a stranger coming into this House would have been led to conclude that not for anything in the world would the leader of the Opposition have attempted to deal with this question so as to obtain advantage for the party which he leads. But, Sir, scarcely had my right hon. friend passed the introductory remarks in his speech, before he began to discuss this question absolutely from the standpoint of party politics; and, as his speech proceeded, it became clearer with every sentence that the interests which the right hon. gentleman was so anxious to protect were not the interests of the British Empire—but were the interests of the party which he leads. From first to last, the speech of my right hon. friend was simply an appeal to the party spirit, and the party feeling of his supporters throughout the country, as well as of those who are in the House.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, endeavouring to fix the offence of inconsistency upon the right hon. the Prime Minister and upon my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), harked back to the debate which occurred in this House in the year 1909, when a resolution was passed with regard to the naval defence of Canada and of the Empire. I was not a member of the House of Commons in 1909, and therefore do not feel called upon to enter upon a discussion of what took place on that occasion. But, Sir, had I been a member of this House in 1909, I do not think I would have felt called upon to defend my action on this occasion. What the people of this country want is not a discussion of ancient history, not a discussion of what may have taken place in 1909 and 1910; but what they want to know is whether or not the proposition submitted to the House by the Government of this country on Thursday last is a proposition in the interests of Canada and of the Empire, and a proposition that should commend itself to the constituencies of this country. I fail entirely, Mr. Speaker, to appreciate any argument which my right hon. friend made charging the right hon. leader of the Government and the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce with inconsistency in regard to that matter. The right hon. the Prime Minister has pursued a course that is the very epitome of sincerity, the very epitome of consistency with regard to naval defence. What was it that the right hon. the Prime Minister promised to do, if he, as the result of an appeal to the country was entrusted with the seals of office? I would refer my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to 'Hansard' of November 24, 1910, and there he will find the declaration of the Prime Minister as to what course he would take in this matter if he became Prime Minister of Canada. On that occasion, he said:

It may be fairly asked what we would do if we were in power to-day with regard to a great question of this kind. It seems to me that our plain course and duty would be this. The Government of this country are able to ascertain and to know, if they take the proper action for that purpose, whether the con-

ditions which face the Empire at this time in respect of naval defence are grave. If we were in power we would endeavour to find that out, to get a plain, unvarnished answer to that question, and if the answer to that question, based upon the assurance of the Government of the mother country and the report of the naval experts of the Admiralty were such—and I think it would be such—as to demand instant and effective action by this country, then I would appeal to Parliament for immediate and effective aid, and if Parliament did not give immediate and effective aid I would appeal from Parliament to the people of the country.

That was the policy of the party led by the right hon. gentleman then, and that is the policy of the party which the right hon. gentleman leads in this House and in this country to-day. But the right hon. gentleman then went further, distinguishing between the two questions of an emergency contribution and a permanent policy. He said:

Then, Sir, as to the permanent policy, I think the people have a right to be consulted. I do not know whether I have made my position clear but I have done so according to my humble capacity. I think the question of Canada's co-operation upon a permanent basis in Imperial defence involves very large and wide considerations. If Canada and the other dominions of the Empire are to take their part as nations of this Empire in the defence of the Empire as a whole, shall it be that we, contributing to that defence of the whole Empire, shall have absolutely as citizens of this country, no voice whatever in the councils of the Empire. I do not think that such would be a tolerable condition. I do not believe the people of Canada would for one moment submit to such a condition. Shall members of this House, representative men, representing 221 constituencies of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, shall no one of them have the same voice with regard to those vast Imperial issues that the humblest taxpayer in the British Isles has at this moment? It does not seem to me that such a condition would make for the integrity of the Empire, for the closer co-operation of the Empire. Regard must be had to these far-reaching considerations, a permanent policy would have to be worked out, and when that permanent policy has been worked out and explained to the people of Canada, to every citizen in this country, then it would be the duty of any government to go to the people of Canada to receive their mandate and accept and act upon their approval or disapproval of that policy.

That was the well defined pledge which the Prime Minister made to this House and to the people of this country at the time that he led the Conservative party in opposition in 1910. Has the right hon. gentleman not carried out in good faith the pledge that he made? Has he not, in the language of the report, taken proper action for the purpose of ascertaining whether the conditions that face the Empire at this time with respect to naval defence are grave? Has not the right hon. gentleman done as he promised to do—to consult with the Admiralty, with the Government of Great Britain, and to take instant and effective action in this country if it were found that such action was necessary?

My right hon. friend brings before the House to-day this policy in pursuance of the promise which he made in 1910. The fact that at the very first opportunity he consulted with the Admiralty, and, as a result of that consultation, he lays before the House a state paper, which is now on the table, and comes before Parliament asking that, under the circumstances as they now exist, this Parliament shall make provision for aiding and increasing the effective naval power of the British Empire, shows conclusively that my right hon. friend is determined to carry out the pledge which he gave to the Canadian people. But my right hon. friend has on all occasions been careful to distinguish between what may be regarded as an emergency contribution and a permanent policy with regard to Imperial defence. The policy which the right hon. gentleman is placing before the House to-day, having regard to the present condition of affairs, is not intended to take the place of a permanent policy for the naval defence of the Empire; it is proposed because of the circumstances which exist at the present time.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, time and again, in addressing this House, has made the statement that there is no emergency, that there are no circumstances which justify this contribution; but I will take the opportunity a little later on to point out to the House what the unanswerable reasons are why I think that, if Canada is true to herself and true to the Empire, she should not hesitate in carrying out the proposal which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister has laid before the House.

My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, in discussing the naval policy which his Government had brought down, sought to excuse the action of that Government in not entering into contracts for the four cruisers and six destroyers for which they had asked tenders from ship-builders in Great Britain. Any one who was not aware of the facts, listening to my right hon. friend, would have gone away from this House and from the dulcet sounds of his voice, thinking that only a few days, or at least a few weeks, had elapsed between the receipt of the tenders for these cruisers and destroyers, and the date of the defeat of my hon. friend's Government at the polls. What are the facts in regard to the case? The facts are that on May 1, 1911, tenders were received from a number of leading ship-building firms in the British Empire for the construction of these de-

stroyers and cruisers. My right hon. friend did not go out of power, or resign office, until the 7th of October following. The elections were held on the 21st of September, nearly four months and three weeks after these tenders had been received. My right hon. friend did not retire until the 7th day of October, nearly five months after these tenders had been received; and yet my right hon. friend had no better excuse to offer, no better reason to give, for the course he took in allowing, these tenders, with the deposits attached to them, to remain in the office here, in Ottawa, for nearly five months, than that this Government thought that, as they might go out of power at the election, it was wise to leave the question to be dealt with by their successors in office. Did my right hon. friend, when these tenders were received on the 1st of May, anticipate the result of an appeal to the country within a few months? When I referred to this matter, in speaking on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne at the session of 1911, I took the opportunity of saying that I believed the Government of the day in not accepting these tenders, although they had had many months in which to do so, were actuated by the fact that an examination of the whole matter, they having had time to sit down and think about it, had led them to the conclusion that they had acted hurriedly and unwisely in calling for those tenders. Having made themselves acquainted with the information that was available to them, and having realized what they had done, they felt that to enter into a contract at that time for these cruisers and destroyers, under the conditions and with the possibilities of building ships in Canada which existed, would result in a waste of public money to the amount of at least $15,000,000, which, including armaments, would have been the price which these vessels would have cost. What reason have I for making that assertion? I quoted to the House last year a memorandum on the subject, prepared by Admiral Kingsmill, director of the Naval Service, on the 9th October, 1911, in which Admiral Kingsmill said:

> Owing to the rapidity with which designs change it is anticipated that, if it takes six years to complete the programme, the ships will be out of date before they are completed.

Then he said:

> In the short period which has elapsed since the present designs were adopted, the typical destroyers have increased in displacement and the machinery arrangement has been redesigned, which may make it desirable to negotiate with the firm who undertakes the work for an improved destroyer.

But, Mr. Speaker, I propose to give this House and the country other evidence than that which was contained in the memorandum of Admiral Kingsmill—evidence which has come to my knowledge. In the service of the Naval Department of the Canadian Government, appointed by hon. gentlemen opposite, there was a gentleman who occupied the position of chief-of-staff, Commander Roper, an officer brought here from His Majesty's navy, and, on the 20th of September, 1911, one day before the defeat of hon. gentlemen opposite, Commander Roper prepared a memorandum regarding this matter in which the following sentences occur, and I commend them to the consideration of the members of this House:

> Extract from a Memorandum of Commander Roper, Chief of Staff, dated 20th September, 1911.
>
> As is well known a naval service is composed of a large number of items which all dovetail and all of which go to make up the whole. If, therefore, all these items are not simultaneously proceeded with, the structure must become unstable and ultimately collapse.

Mark you, this was written on the 20th of September, 1911. And to-day, when hon. gentlemen opposite are speaking in such emphatic language about the beauty and the wisdom of their naval policy, we find that they were so managing their Naval Service that the structure, according to this high authority, had become unstable, and would ultimately collapse. Proceeding, Commander Roper says:

> This, at present, is what is occurring with regard to the Naval Service of Canada.
>
> A programme having been drawn up, it was adopted by the Canadian Government and embarked upon in the early part of 1910. From that time up to the present it has only been proceeded with piecemeal and items have, from one cause and another, been postponed and again postponed, until at last a point approaching stagnation is being reached, and all the most undesirable features such as uncertainty, delay and unnecessary expense are being produced.

Let me read a little more from this memorandum of Commander Roper:

> The only vessels belonging to the Naval Service of Canada up to the present, are the two cruisers Niobe and Rainbow, whilst four cruisers and six destroyers have been authorized by Parliament.
>
> So far back as August of 1910 it was announced that these vessels would be built by contract and that tenders would shortly be called for. It is now the last half of 1911 and the contract has not yet been awarded.
>
> The conditions are that the first cruiser is to be delivered in three years from the date of signing the contract, whilst the total of four are to be completed in six years from that date.
>
> On referenec to the Admiralty return it is found that the Weymouth type of cruiser which is similar to the type to be built by Canada was launched in 1910, and is now ready to be commissioned. The earliest that

the first cruiser for Canada can be expected, supposing the contract to be awarded without further delay is the latter part of 1914; in other words this type of vessel will be four years old before it is completed, whilst the last will be seven years old, and rapidly approaching the stage of obsolescence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I digress, to make reference to certain utterances of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley). From the moment we announced to the House last year that we did not intend to accept any of these tenders for the construction of cruisers or destroyers, that hon. gentleman has lost no opportunity of declaring in our constituency and elsewhere, that the Government, especially myself, by declining to accept these tenders—although he and his party when in power allowed five months to pass without accepting them—were striking a blow at the interests of Canada and especially at the interests of the city of St. John. When in June last the provincial elections took place in New Brunswick, the hon. gentleman hurried down to that province and he availed of every opportunity, condemning me, not only because of my record as a member of the Dominion Government which did not accept any of these tenders, but because of my record as Premier of that province during the time I held that office. With the finesse which the hon. gentleman thinks distinguishes him, he formed a ticket in the city of St. John, and, after putting forward his arguments up and down the constituency for weeks before the election took place, although the constituency is usually a reasonably close one, three members of his ticket lost their deposit and the fourth succeeded in saving it by a very few votes. And, in that part of the constituency which lies outside the city of St. John, and where the hon. member addressed the electors in the strain I have referred to, for the first time in the history of that constituency, by an overwhelming vote, the candidates in favour of the Conservative party and who supported my friend Mr. Fleming, Premier of New Brunswick, were returned by an overwhelming majority. I take this opportunity of saying to my hon. friend that he can continue in the course he has adopted for the past year of trying to raise the smallest kind of party feeling out of this naval matter, and I can assure him that his arguments will fall on deaf ears in that constituency. The hon. gentleman also referred to Admiral Kingsmill's memorandum, which he criticised, saying that if the reasoning of Admiral Kingsmill were true, how foolish it would have been for Japan to have undertaken the construction of a navy, and how foolish also for the United States, both of which countries to-day have navies which are almost equal to any of the navies of the world. But the hon. member forgot to tell the House that it is well known that Japan gradually developed her resources, and commenced by having her warships built in England of the latest design, and that Japan was establishing shipyards and buildings for constructing merchant ships, before undertaking the building of vessels of war. The building of war vessels in Canada has been referred to by my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on many occasions in this House, but I would ask any practical man in Canada if he can imagine for a single moment that within any reasonable time we could build in Canada a great dreadnought which costs in Britain $11,500,000. Possibly, after considerable delay, we might get in Canada shipyards in such condition that the material could be assembled and put together here, but even then the great mass of that material would have to be manufactured in Britain, the guns, the armament, the armour plate, all that portion that goes to make up largely the value of the ship. In the policy which has been announced to the House by our right hon. leader, we have, I submit, taken a sane, common-sense, business-like view of the situation, and in carrying out that policy we may hope that in the course of a reasonably short period of time we will be building in Canada for the British navy vessels of the smaller type such as cruisers, tank-ships and destroyers, and that ultimately, and before many years, we will be building in Canada vessels as large as any afloat, and on as advantageous terms as they can be built in the shipyards of the motherland.

I think the House will agree with me that the principal matter we have to consider in this Debate is as to whether the occasion exists to justify the legislation submitted by the right hon. the Prime Minister. I have only had the opportunity of hearing read in the House the amendment moved by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. Anybody who reads that amendment will agree that it is prepared simply from the standpoint of party strategy and party tactics. It is an extraordinary thing that my right hon. friend who in 1910 was absolutely opposed to the contribution of one fleet unit, is now prepared to go the length which he says this country ought to go. It is a pity we had not heard from my right hon. friend earlier in that regard. The country would have been disposed to put more faith in his words than they do to-day, when they consider that during the long years the right hon. gentleman was in control of the Government, he did nothing in the direction suggested. And now

he comes along with a proposition which is larger in its ideas and scope than anything ever before suggested in this country. Will not the country think that the time for my right hon. friend to have put forward that view and that policy was the time when he was in power? My right hon. friend has made the statement that when the Empire is at war Canada will be at war, but that Canada, while at war, may not be in the conflict. It takes a master of the English language, a master of finesse, a master of adroitness and skill in debate, to utter a sentence of that sort, which sounds well, but the moment it is analysed, the whole idea behind it falls to pieces. My right hon. friend has perhaps read what Louis Botha, who commanded the Boer forces in the South African war, and who is now Prime Minister in South Africa stated, when the words attributed to my right hon. friend were read to him, and he was asked what he thought of them. He said: 'I for my part cannot comprehend how the Empire can be at war without every portion of that empire being at war.' Having regard to the popular opinion of this country, it is evident that a change has come over the spirit of the dreams of my right hon. friend since the year 1910. I hold in my hand a copy of a speech made in this Parliament by the present Prime Minister of Canada on the 20th of April, 1910, during a discussion regarding naval affairs. The right hon. gentleman said:

I have here section 18 of the Bill. The section provides:

In the case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal navy, the Naval Service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the Naval Service, and the officers and seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the Naval Service.

What is the meaning of that proposal? From the report of the debate in Committee, I will read one passage which I think ought to be placed before the House. On page 7626 of the unrevised 'Hansard', I find:

Mr. R. L. BORDEN: Would the right hon. gentleman permit me to ask him a question? Suppose a Canadian ship meets a ship of similar armament and power belonging to an enemy, meets her on the high seas, what is she to do? I do not ask now what she will do if attacked, but will she attack, will she fight?

Sir WIRFRID LAURIER: I do not know that she would fight. I do not know that she would fight either. She should not fight until the Government by which she is commissioned have determined whether she would go into the war. That is the position we take. My hon. friend takes a different position. He says that without any question, under all circumstances, we are bound to send our ships into the war. We take a different position, and we say: let the country judge between us.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN: Would our ports and harbours be neutral like our fleet until an Order in Council had been passed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not understand what my hon. friend means by asking if they should be neutral.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN: I understand the Prime Minister to say that our ships would not fight until they were ordered to do so, and therefore they would in effect be neutral until the Governor in Council had made an order that they should participate in the war. Have I misstated my hon. friend's position?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No.

My right hon. friend has repeated that statement about Canada being at war and not being in the conflict, by referring to certain historical events which occurred during the past hundred years, but nearly every reference he made was to a war that existed long prior to the time when Canada had the means, the transportation facilities, and the opportunity for sending her troops to fight the battles of the Empire.

My right hon. friend has also referred to the South African war, and has spoken as if his Government had sent troops to South Africa. Has the right hon. gentleman forgotten that the statement was made that the government of that day permitted troops to go to South Africa, but did not send them? It was first declared that not a man would be sent to South Africa, and only after the country was aflame did the right hon. gentlemen submit to the wish of the people of this country, and permit the troops to go to South Africa. The right hon. gentleman has also said—I intend only to refer to the matter now, and will discuss it a little later on—that this proposition to place three battleships of the most modern character at the disposal of Great Britain, is not a business proposition. He said that if we do that we should also equip them, man them, and maintain them. Does the right hon. gentleman remember that in the South African war the British Government put up the larger proportion of the sums that were paid to our troops for their services? When the right hon. gentleman talks so lightly about manning our ships, surely he overlooks the fact that the naval service to-day is a highly scientific service, and that the men who are to be put on these great fighting machines, these great policemen of the ocean, have to be men who for at least five years have undergone training to qualify and fit themselves for the service. We expect that these three great dreadnoughts will within three years be in service, and form part of the fleet of Great Britain. It would be impossible in that time to man them with sailors from Canada, because, even if our men could be

got in time of peace to enlist in the navy, we would not be able to give them the necessary training to serve on board those ships to the satisfaction of the Admiralty by the time those vessels were in commission, were flying the British flag, and were playing their part in keeping the peace of the world and guarding the honour and safety of the Empire.

My right hon. friend has also referred to the question of representation. I think I recollect his utterances, as I have read them many times, and I was led to the conclusion that he regarded the question of representation as one of extreme importance, when we came to consider what the future relations of the different component parts of the Empire were to be. My right hon. friend nods his head in assent. Then, why does he find fault with my right hon. leader for putting that view of the question forward? Is not the right hon. leader of this Government right in saying that the question of the permanence of the Empire and the permanent policy under which Canada will unite with the other overseas possessions and with the British Islands for the purposes of bringing about the defence of that Empire is connected and linked up with them the question of representation, so that Canada, contributing to that protection as a permanent matter, may have some voice in regard to the foreign affairs, some voice in regard to the general affairs of the British Empire? That question of representation has made very great strides everywhere during the past twelve months. We know the view that Mr. Asquith previously entertained with regard to it. We know Mr. Asquith's sentiments as uttered this year in the House of Commons when the Canadian ministers were in England and after he had listened to the opinion of the Canadian people, voiced—and I believe correctly voiced—by the Prime Minister. Let me read Mr. Asquith's words:

> I will add—although I will not make any detailed statement upon that point at this moment—that side by side with this growing participation in the active burdens of the Empire, on the part of our Dominions, there rests with us undoubtedly the duty of making such response as we can to their obviously reasonable appeal that they should be entitled to be heard in the determination of the policy and in the direction of Imperial affairs. I do not say it would be wrong to state—of course Mr. Borden and his colleagues would be the first to disclaim any desire for any such declaration—but I do not say in what shape or by what machinery that great purpose is to be obtained. Arrangements like that cannot be made in a day. They must be the result of mature deliberation and thought; they will probably have to develop from time to time; but without committing ourselves in any degree to particular forms in the matter we share with our great dominions the feeling which has become more and more conscious and articulate as years have gone on throughout the Empire, that we have a common heritage and interests, and that in the enjoyment of that heritage, and the discharge of the duties which those interests involve, we ought more and more to be conscious partners with one another.

Throughout the speech of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition there ran the idea that this policy—or rather this contribution, for I do not speak of it as a policy—this contribution which we are asking the Parliament and the people of Canada to make towards the British navy, was to be regarded as a substitute for the policy which the right hon. gentleman himself had introduced in this House. Permit me to say that nothing is further from the thoughts of this Government. That policy might have existed, it might have been going on now, and yet we would have felt compelled to ask Parliament for the contribution which we are now asking it to make to the effective naval forces of the Empire. It is a contribution, not part of a permanent policy—a contribution intended to meet the circumstances of the case as they are now. The further question of permanent policy and the permanent defence of the Empire, that will be shared in, I trust, not only by Canada, but by Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and the other overseas dominions, will still command the attention and thought of this Government. It is a policy that cannot be worked out—and the people of this country will not expect it to be worked out—in a few weeks or a few months. But when it is worked out, and before the country is asked to commit itself to it, the Government will be prepared to appeal to the people on that policy.

Now, I come down to what I really think is the question which this House has to consider to-day—the question of what is the right thing for us to do at the present moment for the British Empire, having regard to the circumstances of the case as they exist? Is it right for the country to ask at the present juncture that this contribution of three great capital ships shall be made? As I desire to place my argument in this matter before the House in a form and in language which will be exact and which I am prepared to stand by without any question, I may have to trespass a little upon the good nature of the House, and perhaps even trespass upon the rules of the House, by making more frequent reference to the notes and manuscripts which I have prepared than I would otherwise do.

It has been truly said, Mr. Speaker, that 'the defence of the territory and commerce of the British Empire is founded upon sea power, the correct and legitimate employment of which, in war, is to obtain early and effective command of the sea, and to maintain that command against any and every attack of the enemy.' The importance of defence of that commerce to Canada may be seen from the fact that the value of Canadian trade (overseas) in 1911-12 amounting to $100,000,000, and that tonnage of Canadian vessels, on December 31, 1911, amounted to 588,741 tons, to which must be added the Canadian shipping registered in Great Britain, bringing up the total to over 700,000 tons. In the maintenance of the whole of this vast and increasing trade wherever it may be about the distant waters of the world, as well as for the maintenance of her communications and the security of her trade across the seas, Canada is dependent and has always depended upon the Imperial navy without corresponding contribution or cost. To attain this command of the sea, it is necessary that the British navy should be maintained at a standard of strength which would give complete and absolute command of the sea against any reasonably probable combination of powers. This command of the sea ensures; (a) the security of the Empire against oversea invasion; (b) the power to reinforce oversea garrisons and to transport land forces rapidly and safely to any point where the vital interests of the Empire may be threatened; (c) the power to establish an effective blockade of the enemy's ports; (d) the comparative safety of seaborne commerce; (e) the power to deny passage of the high seas to mercantile vessels under the enemy's flag. Great Britain still has the power, by making special arrangements and mobilizing a portion of her reserve, to send, without courting disaster at home, an effective fleet of battleships and cruisers to unite with the Royal Australian navy and the British squadrons in the Pacific for the defence of British Columbia, Australia and New Zealand, and these communities are also protected and their interests safeguarded by the power of Great Britain so long as her naval strength is unbroken, but this power will diminish with the growth not only of the second greatest navy in the world, but by the simultaneous building by many powers of great modern ships of war.

The aims of the British Empire are essentially of a peaceful nature. Britain does not look for conquest or for further enlargement of her dominions, but her interests in the way of trade, and especially in the way of her large carrying trade, call for the maintenance of peace; and the fact that the British dominions and colonies are spread over the four quarters of the globe makes it of paramount importance that her communications on the high seas should not be interrupted by war. The British navy is the instrument which serves to effect this purpose and to insure Great Britain, her dominions, her colonies and her trade routes against attack by any foreign power. To render the navy effective for this purpose it is necessary not only that it should be superior to that of the possible foe, but also that it should have sufficient superiority to make a successful attack almost an impossibility. Britain stands thus on the defensive, and, in the great game of war, the defensive position, as far as the navy is concerned, is a weak one. The navy cannot hold all its ships in constant readiness. A number of the vessels must be laid up periodically for repair and refit, and the officers and crews must be given proper rest and a certain amount of leave. This means that at any average moment the effective force of the fleet is very much below its total striking force, and at certain moments, by reason of accidental causes, its numbers may be seriously diminished. On the other hand, the navy preparing for attack would calculate its movements and operations so that every ship, every gun and every man would be available for the chosen moment of attack. A navy standing on the defensive must therefore provide a large margin of strength over the navy which may be the attacking force. To insure safety, it is necessary that the navy on the defensive should at its moment of least efficiency still be superior to the possible attacking navy at its moment of maximum efficiency. This is one of the reasons why it is necessary that the British navy should have such a large margin of superiority over any possible foe. It is not that the British ships or sailors are in any way inferior to any that may be brought against them, but it is the result of the peaceful attitude and peaceful objects of the British Empire, which renders it necessary to maintain the average strength of her fleet at a figure which seems high as compared with even the maximum strength of a possible enemy.

Illustrations of the margin of superiority which is necessary to a British force can be obtained from the great French wars. In 1793, when war broke out with revolutionary France, Great Britain had 115 battleships. Of these 75 were ready and 40 nearly ready. France had only 76 battleships. Six months after war had been declared, the principal French fleet in the Atlantic was off Ushant with 21 ships, to which Great Britain opposed only 17. In the Mediterranean, at Toulon, France had 31 battleships and England about 22. In the battle of the first of June, 1794, when the countries had been at war for sixteen

months, the British had 25 battleships and the French 26. In 1803, when the war with Napoleon was resumed, the British had 111 battleships and France and Holland together only 75. Spain in 1805 brought about 25 additional battleships to the alliance. When the great campaign of Trafalgar opened in that year Napoleon could count on a total of 74 battleships and Great Britain 116, yet the British ships almost everywhere were in a condition of numerical inferiority. Nelson fought Trafalgar with 27 ships to 33. He was to have had 40 battleships, and in reality he had about 34, but various casualties had reduced the number to 27. The British Admiralty in 1805 was under men inured to war and of brilliant skill; yet the commitments of the British navy all over the world were such as to force these men to pit smaller forces of British ships against larger French and Spanish fleets.

We are told in the state document prepared by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, and submitted to the House by the Prime Minister on Thursday last, that in 1908 Germany's fleet consisted of 9 battleships including coast defence vessels, 3 large cruisers, 28 small cruisers and 113 torpedo boats, and that in 1920 Germany's fleet will consist of 41 battleships, as against 9 in 1898, 20 large cruisers as against 3 in 1898, 40 small cruisers as against 28; 144 torpedo boats as against 113, and 72 submarines as against none in the year 1898. This fleet will be manned by 101,500 men, at an annual cost to the country of £23,000,000. In other words, when my right hon. friend took office in 1896, the effective portion of this navy consisted of four small badly-designed, weakly-armed battleships. The British navy had about 25 battleships, any one of which was probably a match for any two of the German ships. When my right hon. friend resigned office in 1911, the German navy was the second strongest in the world.

Having a very small coast line, which is entirely protected by islands and other obstacles, Germany is not obliged to detach any important number of her vessels for the purpose of coast defence, and is able to utilize her large and well-equipped fleet for the purpose of action on the high seas. In the Mediterranean sea, Britain's interest in maintaining open the route to Egypt, to the Suez canal, and to India, requires the maintenance of a fleet superior to any probable combination which may be brought against it.

It is well to bear in mind, too, in connection with the necessity of Britain's supremacy upon the seas, and the impossibility of her abandoning the Mediterranean and other important positions, that about half of Britain's grain supply comes through the Mediterranean. The figures last year show that over £31,000,000 of her grain supply came through the Mediterranean route, and about £35,000,000 by other lines of approach.

At the present moment both Austria and Italy are building large and powerful fleets of battleships. According to the present programmes, in 1915 Italy will have 6 modern battleships, and Austria will have 4 vessels of the same description, together with a large number of pre-dreadnought battleships, and a fleet of cruisers, torpedo boats, &c., and it will be necessary for Britain to provide a fleet well above the combined forces of these two nations. The expenditure of the great nations for naval defence in the years 1901 and 1912 is as follows:

	In 1901.	In 1912.
France spent..	$66,250,000	$86,835,000
Russia spent..	45,000,000	84,869,000
Germany spent..	45,750,000	108,500,000
Italy spent..	23,580,000	41,000,000
Austria-Hungary spent	8,750,000	28,000,000
United States spent..	76,850,000	127,400,000
Japan spent..	21,325,000	45,400,000

We are told, however, in the document prepared by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, and laid before the House by the Prime Minister on Thursday last, that these figures, though strikingly suggestive of the tremendous advance that is being made in naval power by the nations of the world, give no real idea, in the case of Britain's chief competitor in naval power, of the actual advance, for the size and cost of ships has risen continually during that period, and, apart from increasing their total numbers, Germany has systematically replaced old and small ships which counted as units in her earlier fleet by the most powerful and costly modern vessels. Neither does the money provided for the completed law represent the increase in cost properly attributable to the German navy, for many charges borne on British naval funds are otherwise defrayed in Germany; and the German navy comprises such a large proportion of new ships that the cost of maintenance and repair is considerably less than in navies that have been longer established. Even if no further increases are made by Germany to her naval programme in the interval, the fact remains that the fleet possessed by that power in 1920 will not be inferior to the British navy of to-day. Already, by fifteen years of scientific effort, Germany, from practically having no fleet at all, has raised herself to what is indisputedly a second place among the navies of the world. And the whole of this extraordinary revolution, comprising as it does the building of ships of all kinds and of the most powerful types, the training of officers and men of every specialized grade and rating, the development of naval science and tactics, the pro-

vision of training schools, of vast arsenals, of guns, torpedoes, armour-plate, and every kind of naval appliance, of naval harbours, docks and dockyards, and of marine fortifications on an unexampled scale; all this has been achieved under the guidance and during the tenure of a single minister of marine.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HAZEN: Mr. Speaker, when the House separated at six o'clock, I was making an argument for the purpose of showing that the course which the Government is taking now in making a contribution of three capital ships to the British navy is not only the course rendered necessary and desirable by the present position of affairs, but the only proper course for Canada to take for the purpose of rendering more effective the naval policy of the Empire. It is the course, I might point out to this House, that is recommended in the memorandum submitted to Parliament by the Government and Admiralty of Great Britain, who have studied closely this question. It is the most effective one, and it is desirable in the interest of the naval power of the Empire. In making that argument I pointed out the enormous increase that has taken place in the past comparatively few years, under the administration of a single Minister of Marine, in the naval armament of the German Empire. No one, of course, disputes the absolute right of Germany to take the course that she is taking. No doubt, in increasing the force and power of her armaments, Germany feels that she is acting in the interest of her own country and for purposes which, from her own standpoint, are of a patriotic and praiseworthy character. The causes which have led to Germany increasing and developing her navy are still a matter of dispute. Two divergent views regarding this question are put forward in the debates on this subject which, from time to time, of late years, have taken place in the British House of Commons. These views are antagonistic—one pointing to the inherent effect of the British navy on the German increase, and the necessity of Britain replying from time to time with a larger programme, if she is determined to maintain her naval superiority, and consequently her national existence, and the other insisting that German expansion is due, not to any anti-British feeling, but to the expansion of the naval and foreign policy of Great Britain. In what I believe will be regarded by this House and the country as a most powerful and unanswerable argument, the Prime Minister, on Wednesday last, in introducing the Bill, pointed out that the naval power of Great Britain had certainly not been provocative; and, in support of that contention, he referred to the fact that Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, when he became Prime Minister in 1905, made a most earnest and determined effort to check the rivalry in armaments which was going on between the nations of Europe. But the government of Germany, he also pointed out, had refused to discuss the matter at the Hague conference in 1906; and, although the British construction of capital ships and naval armaments was substantially diminished, the German naval law was passed providing for the addition of six of the greatest ships in the world to the German fleet. It cannot, therefore, I would submit with all confidence, be argued with any degree of force or conviction, that the German naval expansion is due in any measure to the foreign policy of Great Britain or the British Empire.

The statement has been made that the expansion of the German navy is intended simply for the defence of Germany's overseas possessions and her growing sea-borne commerce and mercantile marine. If this were the principal object, we might have expected to see a navy of numerous and powerful cruisers distributed widely over the world, showing the German flag in distant seas, and aiding commerce and colonial development by their presence.

But on the contrary, we find strong fleets of battleships kept concentrated in close proximity to the shores of Germany and the shores of Great Britain. Can it be argued for one single moment that the German fleet exists for the defence of Germany against the attack of a naval power? It must be remembered, in considering this matter, that Germany has a very small coast line and few great harbours on the North Sea, and it would be difficult to find a more unpromising coast for a naval attack than around the small islands with their dangerous navigation, uncertain and shifting channels and sand banks, mists and fogs, entirely apart from the fortifications, crowned by enormous batteries, protecting the principal approaches to Germany from the North Sea. It is impossible to believe that the fear of a British invasion, which has done duty in Germany, can have any influence on the minds of men who direct Germany's foreign policy at the present time. Does not the whole character of this fleet show that it is designed for aggressive and offensive action in the North Sea or the North Atlantic? One cannot avoid, I submit, coming to the irresistible conclusion that that fleet, whatever may be said about it, has been created

for the purpose of fighting, if need be, a great battle on the North Sea or on the North Atlantic against some other great naval power.

While the facts and figures which I have placed before the House this afternoon, fully justify, I think, the course of the Canadian Government in making the contribution which it is asking Parliament to make at the present time to the effective force of the British navy, there are other reasons, entirely apart from what may be spoken of as the German scare, entirely apart from the great expenditures which the other countries of Europe are making for the purpose of naval defence, which will fully justify the Government in the action which it is asking this House to endorse to-day, and which is in line with the recommendation of those who have studied most closely and most carefully in the British Islands the present conditions of naval defence and naval power throughout the world. What are the reasons why Canada should make this contribution, in order that it can be as truly said in regard to the British navy to-day as it was said in the days of Drake or at the time of Trafalgar, that Britannia rules the waves?

In this connection I want to say a few words regarding the British naval expenditure in Canada during the Nineteenth Century. During this century the exterior relations of Canada were protected by the power of Great Britain, and its safety against invasion by foreign nations was assured by the British navy and the British navy alone. Great Britain stationed a military force in the principal cities of Canada during this period, and maintained a fleet in the North Atlantic and another fleet on the Pacific coast, which had as its principal mission the protection of Canada on the Atlantic and on the Pacific. Canada benefited by the power of the whole British navy distributed over the face of the globe, but she was particularly interested in that section of the navy which was attached to Halifax on the east and Esquimalt on the west. The protection thus afforded to Canada constituted as it were the insurance on Canadian commerce against foreign attack, and enabled Canadian traders to extend their business all over the world without fear of interruption, and without fear of hostile action on the part of any country. It is a difficult thing to estimate the total amount of Great Britain's military expenditure which should properly be charged to the cost of ensuring the safety of Canadian trade; but it may be taken that at least the cost of maintaining the fleet off Halifax and off Esquimalt should be directly chargeable to the protection of that trade. I have endeavoured to ascertain from the best information available what was the cost of maintaining this fleet; but it is a difficult task. The naval estimates of Great Britain are not distributed according to geographical limit; the money is voted by Parliament to the Crown and is spent under different heads—such as pay of personnel, stores, ammunition—without any regard to the parts of the world in which the ships are operating. Nor does the information which has been preserved of the strength of the forces maintained in different parts of the world during the last century enable any reliable division of expenditure on this basis to be arrived at for the whole of this period. Certain figures have been obtained, and it has been ascertained that the cost of maintaining the ships on the North American and North Pacific Oceans from 1851 to 1901 was about as follows:—

1851-1861	$21,000,000
1861-1871	27,000,000
1871-1881	19,000,000
1881-1891	19,000,000
1891-1901	23,000,000
	$110,000,000

It will be seen from this that the total cost to Great Britain of maintaining ships on the North American and Pacific stations for the protection of Canada and of Canadian trade and commerce during the last half century amounted in round figures to $110,000,000. This does not include any charge whatever for the first cost of the ships and armament, or for the preliminary training or pensions of the men. The British Admiralty also, during this period, maintained two dockyards on Canadian soil: the Halifax dockyard first established in the eighteenth century, at a cost of installation of $800,000 and the Esquimalt dockyard established in 1855, at an original cost of $580,000. The expenditure on the maintenance of these two establishments, during the period from 1850 to 1900, amounted to over $6,000,000. During the first half of this century there was a naval establishment at Kingston, but no figures are available to show what was spent on it out of naval funds. It was closed in 1853 and handed over to the War Department, being subsequently transferred to the Canadian Government in 1877. In addition to this, the Imperial Government subsidized drydocks at Esquimalt and at Halifax for the purpose of assisting in the defence of Canadian trade and the shores of Canada, at a total cost of some $400,000. Apart from these direct items, the Imperial Government has also incurred the expense of hydrographic service in Canadian waters, exploring voyages in these regions, and in the protection of Canadian vessels and

Canadian citizens in foreign countries. Then, Canada has had during all these many years the advantage and moral and material assistance of the British navy in her foreign relations, without having contributed one single dollar to the cost. This also is exclusive of military expenditure from 1853 to 1873 during which years alone that expenditure was $53,000,000. Prior to 1845 Great Britain spent more money on the military garrisons in British North America, than the provinces raised altogether for their administration and for their own material development. I think I can appeal safely to the members of this House and to the people of the country and ask: is not the fact that during all these years that Canada has remained under the protecting aegis of the British Crown, we have not been called upon to contribute anything to the cost of the maintenance of that navy—without which our overseas commerce and tonnage would be without protection, and without which Canada could not possibly exist in its present free and independent position under its present form of government,—calculated to bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every loyal Canadian? That reproach is one which will be wiped out by the passage by this House of the Bill which has been submitted by the right hon. the Prime Minister.

Mr. CARROLL: Suppose a dreadnought cost in the vicinity of $11,500,000, can the minister tell me how much of this goes to material, how much to construction, and what profit is left for the builder?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not these details with me at present, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that the information can be obtained, and if he wishes I will get it for him. Other overseas dominions, having regard to the protection that has been extended to them by Great Britain, having regard to the fact that they needed to protect their own shores, have taken the view that they should make contributions for Imperial defence, with the following result:

Contribution from overseas towards naval expenditure in 1911:

Australia	£200,000
New Zealand	100,000
South Africa	85,000
Newfoundland	3,000
India	100,000
Canada	

The aid which has been thus given, but more particularly the aid which Canada is now proposing to give, cannot, as has been truly said, be measured only in the value of the ships or in the money which these ships cost. It will have a moral value out of all proportion to the material assistance provided, and it will have a very material effect in bringing about the peace of the world. Had not Canada taken this effective step at this moment, I think the very worst possible impression would have been produced at home and abroad. But this action on Canada's part has not only been re-received with enthusiastic applause and acclaim in every part of Canada itself, but it has been recognized everywhere as a proof and sign that those who at any time may be minded to menace any part of the British Empire will have to contend, not with that part alone, but with the united strength of the whole. True, it is stated in the memorandum prepared by the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty and laid before the House on Wednesday last, that no matter what decision Canada may come to, Great Britain will not, under any possible circumstances, fail to do her duty to the overseas dominions, but it is also stated in that memorandum:

> That any action on the part of Canada to increase the power and the mobility of the Imperial navy, and thus widen the margin of our common safety, will be recognized everywhere as a most significant witness to the united strength of the Empire and to the renewed resolve of the overseas dominions to take a part in maintaining its integrity.

The Prime Minister has pointed out to the House what defeat—in a great naval battle—would mean for the Empire, what it would mean for Great Britain herself and what it would mean for Germany. It has been shown that Great Britain can never violate German territory even after a complete defeat of that power at sea, as her army is not organized for such an undertaking in comparison with the ogranization of the German army. On the other hand, Germany could if she chose invade and conquer Great Britain after a successful naval engagement in the North Sea. Germany has no overseas territory desired by Great Britain, while Great Britain has overseas territories, the cession of which might be demanded by another country after a successful war. A decisive battle lost at sea by Germany would still leave her the greatest land power in Europe, whereas a similar one lost at sea by Great Britain would shatter the British Empire to its foundations and change profoundly the destiny of its component parts. In support of this contention, which is not the view of an alarmist, or a dreamer of dreams, may I quote from 'The Day of the Saxon' by General Homer Lea:

> By the efforts men make to preserve their families from want, from servitude or destruction do we judge their domestic virtues. In such a manner only to a larger degree, should judgment be rendered upon these same men according to the efforts they make toward a like preservation of their race. If a man who gives over his family to the vicissitudes

of neglect is deserving of scorn, how great should be the contempt felt for him who evades the obligations he owes his race and gives over, not alone his family, but all his people to conquest or destruction.

Public fealty is only a nobler conception of the duty a man owes his family. A nation is a union of families; patriotism the synthesis of their domestic virtues. The ruin of states, like the ruin of families comes from one cause—neglect. To neglect one's family is to lose it; to neglect one's country is to perish with it. Individuals are a part of the world only in the duration or memory of their race. It is not so much in the vastness of British possessions that are found conditions provocative of war as it is in its geographical distribution. It is not a segregated sovereignty occupying, as the Russian Empire, a corner or contiguous position of the earth, but forms, on the other hand, a circle around the entire globe, within which is placed all the other powers of the world; and not one of them can follow their lines of natural expansion without, sooner or later, being brought into direct contact with the British dominion.

If the conflict is between an insular and a continental state, the sea becomes the first area of the struggle. If the insular power suffers defeat its war is at an end, since a land defence by an insular nation against a continental power in command of the sea is a political, military and economic impossibility.

If the naval power of the continental nation is destroyed, it results only in a transfer of the theatre of war from the sea to the land, from naval to land forces, since a continental state with land frontiers is economically free from the insular nations control of the sea. Its military forces must be defeated before its internal economies or political powers are affected to the extent of suing for peace. In the recent war between Russia, a continental state, and Japan, an insular nation, this principle is made clear. Had Russia destroyed the naval forces of Japan the war would have ended on the date of that disaster.

It is not necessary, in modern times, to invade an insular state to destroy it.

With the destruction of the British fleet, British capacity to wage war is at an end. England is invaded. This invasion is starvation. Before harvest there is only enough food in the United Kingdom to last for a few weeks; after the gathering of the crops only enough to last a few months. But long before physical starvation sets in moral starvation will have accomplished its work.

It was contended, I think by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition this afternoon, that Canada would be taking a more effective step in the direction of Imperial defence if, instead of making a direct contribution of three of the greatest and most powerful dreadnoughts she would enter upon the construction of a Canadian navy. Without in any way wishing to forestall or even to suggest what Canada's permanent naval policy may be, I think the concluding words of the document laid before this House by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, is a sufficient answer to a contention of that sort. What do the Lords of the Admiralty say, after having sized up the arguments, after having put forward the grounds and the reasons? It is absolutely, I think, unanswerable as to the necessity at the present time of the overseas dominions of the Empire coming to the aid, and the effective aid, of the British navy for the purpose of protection and for the purpose of maintaining peace. The concluding words of that document are:

> The Prime Minister of the Dominion having inquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective, we have no hesitation in answering after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

That is the suggestion of the Lords of the Admiralty. It is the suggestion, in effect, of the present Government of Great Britain, which has devoted a great deal of time to studying questions of this sort. Therefore I say that not only is Canada, in making this contribution, doing what the circumstances of the case require, what a careful perusal of the document submitted by the Admiralty and of other sources of information have convinced this Government is the only proper thing to do; but, she is acting in harmony with the position taken by the present Government of Great Britain, which, after giving due consideration to the subject, has made the positive announcement in the concluding words of the State paper laid on the table of this House on Wednesday last. In view of that, can my right hon. friend or any one else successfully contend for one moment that what Canada is doing at the present time is not a much more effective contribution for the purpose required by the British navy to-day than would be such a policy as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition formulated, when he asked for tenders for cruisers and destroyers in 1910, and which he stated to the House would have been in process of building at Montreal at the present time? If that policy had been followed up, how can it be contended that that would have been a more effective contribution to the British Empire than the contribution which the Government of Canada in all confidence are submitting for the consideration of the House and the people of Canada to-day? I would like again to ask the indulgence of the House to permit me to quote from so high an authority as Silbur on 'The Evolution of Sea Power,' at page 159; and I commend the extract for the consideration of the

House and the country. He is recognized as one of the great expert writers on the subject of Sea Power to-day. (reading):

It would appear, from the turn events are taking in the British Empire to-day, that there are certain ambitious colonial statesmen who would advocate the creation of independent navies, which, in the event of the mother country being embroiled in war, might, or might not, as the cause and course of the war determined, be allied with the British fleets. Now, it is not at all likely that any exception to naval history will occur here. The inherent weakness of naval alliances is simply a principle of sea-power; or rather, let us say, the superiority of a homogeneous navy is a principle of sea-power.

It is to be supposed that, in the event of Canada, Autralia, or South Africa having hostilities forced upon them by a foreign power as the result of some fancied or real breach of treaty obligations, Great Britain, irrespective of the righteousness or cause of the trouble, would throw her sea-power into the breach, and probably at the cost of inestimable treasure and many valuable lives, defend her colony. If the independent navies simply joined in such a war as allies, the fancied privileges and rights of the colonials would hamper and considerably weaken British sea-power; and we might have the puerile bickerings as to responsibility and rank which made the Swedish and Danish alliances in 1780 impotent, and which were even noticeable among the colonial and Imperial officers during the Anglo-Boer war of 1899-1902.

Sea-power, to be truly effective, must be held by a homogeneous navy, in which jealousy of rank, priority of station, distrust, antagonism of colony, dominion, union, or mother country must be eradicated if the British Empire is to include the empire of the seas.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With the hon. gentleman's permission I would like to ask him a question. He has quoted the opinion of an expert—in fact, the opinions of two or three experts. Has he the opinion of Lord Charles Beresford?

Mr. HAZEN: I have not that here on my desk. I know to what the hon. gentle man refers. Now, I understand my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, this afternoon—repeating time and time again as he did that there was no emergency, no condition of affairs that called for this contribution at the present time—to say that he knew four years ago everything that the Admiralty's memorandum of to-day contains. If he knew four years ago everything that the Admiralty's memorandum of to-day contains, I would like to ask him how it is that it is only to-day that he thinks it necessary to move an amendment embodying the idea that there should be a fleet unit on the Atlantic and a fleet unit on the Pacific? How is it that he allowed these four years to pass, with the knowledge in his possession which he says justifies his present position, without having asked this House and this country to take action? I think his remark to the effect that four years ago he knew everything that is contained in this memorandum of the British Admiralty cannot be taken as literally and completely correct. Within the last four years conditions have changed very much. He could not possibly have foreseen or foretold that in the spring of 1912 Germany would pass another navy law making its navy more effective, a circumstance which adds very much to the necessity of having a contribution made by Canada.

The right hon. gentleman talks about a Canadian navy. We speak, as the right hon. gentleman did, of the necessity for a Canadian unit of the British navy; and it is not correct, as stated by the right hon. gentleman, that this would become an annual tribute or an annual contribution. This is not to be the permanent policy which this Government intends to lay before this House. As I have already said we are proposing to the House a contribution having regard to the present state of affairs throughout the world, for the purpose of strengthening the navy of Great Britain so that it may be still stronger and effective to defend the interests of citizens wherever they are found and to protect the interests of Canada, our coasts, our commercial marine and our commerce on the high seas.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would the hon. gentleman please tell us what is the permanent policy?

Mr. HAZEN: If my hon. friend had been in his seat this afternoon, he would have heard me make the statement that this was not to be regarded for a single moment as Canada's permanent part in Imperial defence. We have stated that Canada's participation in permanent defence is a matter that cannot be decided in a few weeks or months; it is a matter for careful consideration, not only with His Majesty's Government of the British Islands, but possibly with the governments of the overseas possessions as well. I think that is a position the justice and fairness of which will be recognized by most members of this House if not by my hon. friend from the city of St. John. That question of permanent defence will be worked out; it will be worked out along proper lines; and we believe that one of the elements that will have to enter into the question of permanent defence will be the one of the representation which Canada and the overseas dominions shall have with regard to foreign affairs and the policy of the British Empire as a whole.

The Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, regard this act of policy as a contribution, and a very great contribution, to the cause

of peace. It is their hope that it will assist in averting the horrors of war, in two ways. For one thing, it will strengthen, in the councils of the Empire, those elements which look with aversion upon adventurous policies and earnestly desire the Empire to continue to follow the paths of conciliation and of aloofness from international strife. For another, it will add to the might of the British Empire, an admittedly genuinely peaceful power, and for a century past the greatest secular agency for good that the world has ever seen. The British Empire, Mr. Speaker, is essentially peaceful. The present situation is one of apprehension of attack from outside, not of aggression by His Majesty or any of the realms which own his sway, and it is the hope of the Canadian Government that Canada's free and loyal gift will help to put the issue of a conflict beyond peradventure. In our strength is our peace; it is to preserve those inestimable blessings that Canada gladly and willingly adds to the one armament in the world which stands for defence, not defiance, for security instead of adventure, for the preservation of industry and the amelioration of social conditions.

I come, Mr. Speaker, from one of that group of little provinces by the sea, where bold and hardy seamen are reared, where the salt breath of the sea is ever in our nostrils, where the limitless road of the ocean lies at every man's threshold, tempting him beyond the horizon to lands afar. In days gone by those provinces excelled in ship-building; the products of their skill were found in every sea and in every port. The coming of the iron age killed that industry; the former days of romance are gone. But it is a peculiar pleasure to me to be able to point to that feature of our policy which provides for the revival of our ship-building industry, and provides for it upon a sound, a well considered and a business-like plan. Under its fostering care, Mr. Speaker, we may look forward with confidence to the day when we again may see our own ships plough the distant oceans, when once more to the man of the Maritime provinces the sea will be his rightful heritage. When that day comes, those trading ships under the Canadian ensign, those peaceful merchantmen gliding backwards and forward like shuttles binding the countries of the globe together in a web of harmony and industry will cross oceans guarded from molestation by the white ensign of the Imperial navy. The trade routes our steamers will follow will be protected by the warships of our navy—ours in reality henceforward—and among those great policemen of the ocean will be Canadian ships, helping to secure our trade from interruption and our flag from insult.

I do not wish to lay exclusive stress upon peace. This world has not yet reached the millennium; lawless passions still are abroad; the clash of war may come. If come it does, I know the blood from which our two great races spring, I know that they will not shrink from the test. Nay, more, if I read my countrymen aright, if the hour of battle comes I know where they will wish Canada's representatives to be. Not as weak coastal vessels hugging a far-off shore, anxiously awaiting the issue of the conflict; not as mere scouts hovering on the fringes of the fray; but in the foremost fighting line where the heaviest work is to be done: there is the place for the ships of Canada to bear the flag that has braved a thousand years the battle and the breeze, the flag that we derive as of right from the strong men of past centuries, the flag for which Canadians already have fought and died and lived.

The Bill which has been introduced to the House, Mr. Speaker, provides for an expenditure from the resources of Canada not exceeding the sum of $35,000,000, for the purpose of building and equipping three of the greatest ships afloat; ships of the largest and most modern description; ships of the dreadnought or cruiser-dreadnought type, as may be agreed upon; the cost of which will in each case amount to about $11,500,000. It has been stated throughout the press of this country that Canada will have to borrow from England the money for the purpose of obtaining those ships and adding them to the navy of Great Britain. Such is not the case, and my belief is that those ships will be obtained and equipped without adding one single dollar to the permanent debt of Canada and the cost mentioned will be taken from the revenue of Canada alone. When this Bill becomes law, it will be the duty of the Canadian Government to enter into a contract for the construction of the ships. Their construction will be subject to inspection by the Admiralty, who will no doubt place at our disposal all the facilities of their organization—an organization which we do not possess—for the purpose of having the contracts properly carried out, and seeing that the ships are of a modern type and of the best possible workmanship and construction. As to the terms and conditions on which these ships are to be constructed, and to become a part of the British navy, that is a matter to be agreed upon, as set out in the last clause of the Bill, by the Admiralty and the Canadian Government. I believe that when the contracts were entered into and the ships are built, there will not be a man in this country worthy the name of Canadian who will not feel proud when he hears of those ships forming part of the navy of Great Britain, and bearing Canadian historical

names. They will be an evidence for all time of the intention of Canada to come to the aid of the British Empire of which she forms so important a part; that she will continue to be a part of that Empire, and to do all in her power to enable Great Britain to for ever maintain the supremacy of the seas, so desirable in the interests not only of the colonies, but of the Empire as a whole, and so desirable in the interests of no part of that Empire more than the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (South Renfrew): In rising to contribute a few remarks on the question now before the House, one cannot but be impressed with the grandeur and magnificence embodied in the words 'British citizenship.' When there is added to that the robust Canadianism exemplified in the people of the northern half of this American continent, we are still prouder. In the discussion of this great question we ought to keep in view two things: first our duty as British subjects, and second, our rights and privileges as Canadians. I am proud to be a British subject, and I am prouder to belong to this particular part of the British Empire than if I were born in London, for, after all:

> That man's the best cosmopolite
> Who loves his native country best.

I have no apologies to make either on this side of the ocean or the other, for speaking in this debate from the standpoint of a Canadian, and none the less of a British subject because I am a Canadian.

I was delighted, in a way, to hear the eloquent peroration of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. It was largely an eloquent apology for abandoning a policy that would have given to Canada a great ship-building industry. I was surprised—and the great nations of the earth will also be surprised—that the head of the Naval Department of this Dominion painted such a pitiful picture of the condition of the forces of the British Empire, and the possibility of England being defeated on the sea, and what would happen if she were defeated. Sir, there is not a word in the memorandum of the British Admiralty—not a word anywhere in the history of the world within the last fifty years—which points to the fact that there is any danger of the British Empire being defeated on the seas. If my hon. friend entertains that fear, I do not, and the Admiralty says there is no danger of such a condition, because it is prepared to take care of the British Empire the world over.

I consider that the policy of my hon. friend is one not only of inactivity, but one of inability as well. It is one of inactivity in that it refrains from developing what would be a permanent policy. My hon. friend quoted figures to prove that there did exist some particular emergency. What do his figures prove? They prove that there is a permanent emergency; a permanent condition that cannot be met by what he himself would not dignify by the name of policy, but terms an expediency—a contribution. It is one of inability, for that he followed his leader in pointing out the inability of Canada to build ships; the inability of Canada to supply men for them, and, the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite is the practical exemplification of that belief, for they do not propose to either build ships in Canada or man the ships they are going to give to the British Empire.

My hon. friend talked very eloquently, and rightly so, of the place that Canadians should have in the firing line—of the place before the enemy, facing the foe, that the Canadian ships with those three distinguished names should have, but he does not supply a man to put in the firing line. It is a reversal of the old rhyme that we used to hear :

> We don't want to fight,
> But, by jingo, if we do,
> We've got the ships, we've got the men,
> We've got the money, too.

It is a reversal of that. Now it is, if Great Britain wants to fight, we will give her the battleships, but not a man; we shall set afloat three of the most powerful battleships that science can devise or that money can procure, and so far as Canada is concerned, any foreign country can come and lug them away; there is nobody to defend them. In the firing line, battleships, but not a man when the enemy has to be faced. Sir, I ask the men of Canada, the descendants of the men from whom my hon. friend sprang, what they think of the policy of a government which publishes to the world that we will give to the Empire our money because we have it, but that we will not give what is more precious, and what would show real devotion, our lives in defence of the country. I ask the descendants of old France in this country, that country that gave us such illustrious examples of fighting valour in the days gone by, what do they think of the policy supported by their own friends in the Government that tells the world and old France, we have got the money, your descendants have made money in Canada, it won't harm us to give the money, but we have lost the fighting spirit you had, we will not let a man go. Mr. Speaker, they misrepresent the men of Canada. I would ask the Englishmen who have come to Canada in recent years, those men who left their sires or their grandsires, or their kinsmen at home, what do they think of the policy of the country to which they have come

as exemplified by the Government, who appealed to them in the last campaign? British born, what do you think of the policy that tells the friends you have left at home, 'here father, here brother, take our money, we are making lots of it, but go and fight yourselves?' I ask the descendants of the men of Belfast, of Dublin, of Ulster, of Tipperary, what think they? What think they of the Government which represents the men descended from the country that has given to Britain the greatest generals her army perhaps ever had, what do they think of the Government which tells the Irishmen at home that their kinsmen will fight when they are in Ireland, but that when they come to Canada they develop cowardice, that they will give their money but never fight? What think the men from the lowlands, the Highlands? What think the descendants of the brave men of Germany of this reflection on their valour? If this Bill is to become law, which it should not, I appeal to the Government, and to the men behind them, to strike out the libel on the Canadian people; and, if they are going to give ships paid for by Canadian money, not to send them afloat as hulks, unmanned, but to give Britain what she wants more than our money—the Canadians to defend the Empire when it is in danger.

My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) was unfair, I think, concerning the time which elapsed between the advertisement for tenders and the letting of those tenders. He said that several months elapsed. You know, Mr. Speaker, that a half truth does not always convey the whole truth. Let me give the House the facts as to those tenders, and let us see if the charge which my hon. friend made is borne out by them: On May 1, 1911, the tenders were received. On May 12, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Militia and the Minister of Marine, the head of the naval affairs of Canada, left for England, to attend the Imperial Conference.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Quite an omission.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not forsaking their duty, but doing just what my hon. friend did this year, although they did not make the same kind of speeches. They left England on the 3rd of July, and arrived in Ottawa on the 12th, and the dissolution took place on the 29th of July. I leave it to the House to pronounce judgment as to whether the hon. minister was fair or not. I want to point out this other side of the question. What a wail or what a protest would have gone up from hon. gentlemen opposite if the Government had dared, after suffering defeat, to let that contract for that great and important work. My hon. friends opposite would have had something to charge the late Government with. As it is, they have nothing to charge them with, and the attempt made this afternoon by my hon. friend shows the weakness of the position he holds, and the delicate and difficult task he assumes in trying to defend something that he refused to-night to call a policy.

Now, let me point out something else. I take a somewhat—I was going to say a wider view, but I should not use that word. I wish to present this view to the House, and I do so without any hesitation, that the return to a system of contribution by the people of Canada is a squint towards a reversal of the constitutional relations existing between the British Empire and her Dominions over the sea, and is a step backwards of seventy years. Allow me to call the attention of the House to a few historical facts. I know my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will not like this, because he objected this afternoon to the historical references of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. In dealing with the record of this particular case, he dared not go back further than 1910. After that he got into difficulty with his colleagues. For one hundred years prior to Canada becoming a part of the British Empire she was ruled by France at long range. The attempt was unsuccessful in so far as any great progress was concerned. In 1763, when we became a part of the great British Empire, that form of government still continued—government from across the ocean by men who could not possibly realize our position or understand clearly the aspirations of the Canadian people or the ambitions with which they were imbued. I will not say, Sir, that a good deal of progress was not made under that form of government, but the full fruition of the people's hopes never came until Canada got responsible government. Let me call attention to another fact. During the last half of the century another important event took place on this continent. New England became separated from the mother country largely through a question of taxation, but I want to call the attention of the House to a particular episode which occurred about this time. I can do it coming from the province from which I do. I have heard it intimated—I have even heard it intimated in the corridors of this House—that we could not absolutely depend on our fellow countrymen who descended from old France when a question of British loyalty was at stake. I utterly repudiate that statement and the history of this country proves my repudiation. About the time that the New England states were separating from Great Britain, emissaries came across the line and visited the old historic province of Quebec. Mark you, the French people had just recently been subdued and con-

quered by the British forces. Even some of the men who protest so loudly their loyalty in these days would have been irritated in that new situation in which they found themselves, and if ever a man would be liable to give way to such solicitations as were then held out it would be at that moment. Sir, these emissaries came across the line and endeavoured to seduce the newly conquered race, or their leaders, into joining them in the rebellion.

Mr. EDWARDS: Of what nationality were the emissaries?

Mr. GRAHAM: I imagine that they would give a contribution if they were in this House instead of sending men to fight. What was the answer given by the recently conquered people, by the descendant of old France? They absolutely refused and, Sir, I say it as a Canadian, an English-speaking British subject, it is possible that we owe to these patriotic Frenchmen the fact that Canada to-day is a part of the great British Empire. He who says aught to reflect on the devotion and loyalty of the French citizens of this country to Great Britain has not read history aright, or else he is prejudiced beyond the point of conviction.

I come down a little further, and I find that in 1791 Canada was divided into Upper and Lower Canada. We still progressed along certain lines, always having the aspiration of being able some day to manage our own affairs with full autonomy granted with the good will and blessing of the motherland. But, that aspiration did not ripen very fast, and let me call the attention of the English-speaking members of this House to the fact that in those days Ontario was not the predominating influence and the rich and populous province but that in those days the province of Quebec occupied that proud position. We were in a different frame of mind from that which hon. gentlemen sometimes now exhibit when they are discussing public questions where an apparent conflict between the two races might appear.

Let us come down a little further to 1812, when we had a difference again, this time with the United States. What happened? Did the Canadian men stand back and say: We will send our guns, but we will not go ourselves? They were ready at the call of the Empire to fight for British supremacy and for the retention of this part of the Empire under the old flag. Now, I come to 1837, a time fraught with significance. I am not going to discuss the actions of those who took part in the revolt of 1837 either in Ontario or Quebec, but let me point out to you, and particularly to you younger men, that in a country's history it very often happens that the rebels of yesterday are the heroes of to-day. In 1837 what was the agitation for?—for the right of the Canadian people to spend their own money and to manage their own affairs. That was finally brought about a few years later. Then, in 1841, we again had Upper and Lower Canada united and this country owes to Baldwin and Lafontaine a debt of gratitude that cannot be estimated. Lord Elgin said, in discussing this matter, that Baldwin himself was worth three regiments of the British army because he had given to the people a privilege for which they had sighed, a privilege which they have long continued to enjoy and under which they have prospered. What has all this to do with this question?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM: Men who have not read history aright cannot tell. Men who have not read it at all dare not try to tell. It means that there was, after years of struggle, a victory achieved by the Canadian people. They were to be allowed, I repeat it, to govern themselves as they saw fit, and not only to contribute their own money but to expend it through the votes of their representatives and not to have it expended through Downing street. I say, and I say it with all confidence, that the introduction of a contribution, disguise it as you will, is a proposal which cannot commend itself to those who look at this question in the light of history. Instead of giving our men, instead of providing what Britain wants with our own money, these hon. gentlemen say: No, we will give you money instead with which to purchase ships. That is not the policy of responsible government, but it is directly opposed to that great principle.

I want to come down now to a later day. In 1867 we had brought about in Canada perhaps one of the most notable events in the history of the nations of the world when Confederation was accomplished, and the men who worked out that problem performed a service for the British Empire far greater than that which can be rendered by the presentation of dreadnoughts, performed a service for the peace of the world, to use the expression of my hon. friend, and performed a service for Canadians, unexcelled in preceding years. It was not an easy task, as those who have since attempted the Government of Canada have found out. But, mark you, that never could have been brought about but for the underlying principle of responsible government, and it could not be maintained, if for one moment we should depart from that great underlying principle. Let me point out that this great question of responsible government was admitted years ago and up to the present moment has never been seriously interfered with.

What happened with regard to the land force defences of Canada? Hon. gentlemen say we must have the protection of the British Empire, and so say we all, and we ever will have that protection; we must do our share, and no man shrinks from doing his share. But there is a right way and a wrong way of doing our duty. What happened with regard to our land forces? For a great many years the soldiers of the motherland defended and occupied our country; British troops were here until 1870 and in 1861 there were 18,000 of them on the soil of Canada. When they departed after having been here many years, and when Canada herself undertook the task of managing her own land forces, did anything serious happen? Sir, when we assumed our own defence on land it was a step in the right direction, the young son having grown into manhood, and needing no further to hang on to the apron strings of his mother, stood for himself to defend his country. What was done with the land force ought to be done with the naval force. Let me read what Lord Grey, Colonial Secretary, wrote to the Governor General of Canada in 1851:

Canada in common with the other British provinces in North America now possesses in the most ample and complete manner in which it is possible that she should enjoy it, the advantage of self-government in all that relates to her internal affairs. It appears to Her Majesty's Government that the advantage ought to carry with it corresponding responsibility and that the time has now come when the people of Canada must be called upon to take upon themselves a larger share than they have hitherto borne of the expenses which have incurred on their account and for their advantage. Of these expenses, by far the heaviest charge which falls upon this country is that incurred for the military protection of the provinces. Looking to the rapid progress which Canada is now making in wealth and population and to the prosperity which she at this moment enjoys, it is the conviction of Her Majesty's Government that it is only due to the people of this country that they should now be relieved from a large proportion of this charge which has hitherto been imposed upon them for the protection of a colony now well able to do much towards protecting itself.

The words of Lord Grey in 1851, as applied to the land forces, might well be applied now in regard to the naval defences of Canada, and we might very well, along the lines suggested there, proceed to relieve Great Britain from the protection of our shores by taking that protection to ourselves. I again call attention to the basis for this doctrine laid down by the Colonial Secretary of that date.

'Canada in common with the other British provinces of North America, now possesses in the most ample and complete manner in which it is possible she would enjoy it the advantage of self-government in all that relates to her internal affairs.'

Responsible government, Lord Grey said, had been given to Canada, and now let her take care of her own land forces. Sir, that principle of self government lies deeply embedded in the history of Canada, and it would be a sad mistake to do anything which may appear to interfere with it now, or at any time in our history. I point out that in dealing with the militia of Canada this great principle was not only kept in view but the fact was emphasized on every possible occasion. In 1861 and 1862 the Committee on Expenses of the militia brought in a report and, referring to the presence of British troops in Canada, that report said:

'The system prevents the development of a proper spirit of self-reliance among the colonists, and enfeebles their national character. By the gift of political government

. . . .

Mark you, based on responsible Government again.

By the gift of political government we have bestowed on our colonists the most important element of national education, but the habit of self-defence constitutes a part, hardly less important to the training of a free people, and it will never be acquired by our colonists if we assume the task of defending them.

I submit the words of this committee to my hon. friends opposite. British Imperialists of the highest order, those who have watched our growth in the years as we have come to nationhood, have always taken the ground since we got responsible government that as rapidly as possible, in pursuance of the granting of responsible government we should assume certain responsibilities, and these responsibilities were not to depart from the principle of self government by making contributions and again bringing Great Britain back to our assistance in times of peace particularly, but that we should learn to help ourselves and develop the national spirit. The fortifications at Halifax and Esquimalt were referred to by the Minister of Marine to-night, and I regret that he neglected to point out that the late Liberal Government had looked after that very important matter. The Imperial troops having left the Dominion in order that we might take charge of the defence of our country by our own militia, and thus develop our self-reliance under political responsible government, there came a time when a further step was to be taken, and Great Britain desired, and the late Government of Canada agreed to it, that she should be relieved of the expense of the fortifications at Halifax and Esquimalt. Has Canada suffered by the change under which the British troops left Can-

ada and our militia took charge of our defence? I leave it to the Minister of Militia to say whether Canada has suffered or not by that change. The fact is that we have to-day in Canada a splendid body of volunteers, not afraid to fight if necessary for the defence of their country, and had the British troops remained in the Dominion of Canada, we would not have a Canadian militia such as we are proud of. But as soon as they were withdrawn, and even before that, the spirit was in the air, the young men of Canada, who are never afraid to fight when occasion arises, joined the Militia of Canada, and to-day the Minister of Militia believes he is at the head of one of the finest bodies of men and one of the finest organizations anywhere in the over-seas dominions of the British Empire.

Hon. Mr. HUGHES (Minister of Militia): Does not the hon. member believe it also)

Mr. GRAHAM: I think it is much better than it would have been under the old conditions. I wish the House to bear in mind that, as our responsibilities have increased, our devotion to the Empire has become intensified, and every new task we have assumed has not made us a separate entity, as some hon. gentlemen would argue, but has drawn us closer to the motherland, and has strengthened the tie that binds us and always will bind us to the great British Empire. It is human nature properly developed that the more responsibility you place on a thoughtful, strong person, the more he feels his responsibility. So it is with the young nation, the Dominion of Canada; and at this moment, instead of adding to the responsibility, instead of allowing young Canada to assume her proper place as a young nation side by side with the Mother Country, we have before the House something not to be dignified by the name of a policy, saying: Stand back, do not go too rapidly, young Canada; you cannot build ships; you cannot man ships; but let us take your money and send it to the old land for the construction of warships.

There have been other developments all based on the great principle of responsible government, that is, of allowing Canada to manage her own affairs. Conditions years ago concerning treaties were not the same as they are to-day. Sixty years ago, Lord Ashburton and Daniel Webster sat down and framed a treaty providing for the division of certain territory in which Canada was vitally affected. No Canadian representative was there. Had there been one there, perhaps the award would have been different. When the Washington Treaty was framed, Sir John A. Macdonald was one of several representatives. This was a little advance. Later, when the Alaskan boundary came to be determined, out of three British arbitrators, two were Canadians. Following down this line we find now, as is exemplified in the treaties with France and other countries that when a treaty is to be made in which Canada is concerned, the Canadian representatives practically make that treaty with the foreign country. Canada at the present time has developed along that line of responsible government and home management to the extent that Great Britain can make treaties in which Canada may not necessarily join, if she does not so desire, and treaties can be made which will give certain benefits to Canada, which do not apply to other parts of the Empire. So great has been our development along this line that Canada is practically a nation within herself.

The people of Canada should not forget that Great Britain has allowed us the utmost freedom, and, as that freedom has been allowed so has our devotion and loyalty increased; but hon. gentlemen opposite, and particularly the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who is an old parliamentarian, will remember that Canada was allowed further privileges. I think away back in 1859 Mr. A. T. Galt imposed a tariff which applied against the motherland, and when the National Policy was introduced in 1879, what was the position taken? Some persons raised the question that the tariff should not apply, in its entirety at least, against the British Empire, and a paper strongly supporting hon. gentlemen now in the Government said 'If it interferes with our relation with the motherland so much the worse for British connection.' They were strong then on Canadian autonomy. Why? Because certain financial interests then might have been involved, that may not be involved in the present surrender of that autonomy.

I come now to the time when Canada was allowed to begin to repay some of these great kindnesses, and that was when the late Minister of Finance, the Hon. W. S. Fielding, introduced the British preference into this parliament. Hon. gentlemen now take the view, as was expressed by the right hon. the Prime Minister, that a permanent policy cannot be evolved until the question of representation in Imperial councils is settled. They took the same ground when the British preference was introduced, that Canada should not give this preference till she dickered and made a bargain to get something in return. The same principle. While the right hon. the leader of the Opposition does not at all minimize the great importance, of the discussion and consideration of that question of representation, he says that the discussion and consideration of that question should not

be held as a barred door against doing something in the way of a permanent policy for the naval defences of the Empire. He does not ask for a quid pro quo. He says that we are prepared in the face of a permanent condition to give a permanent policy, and that while in years to come this other great question may have to be solved, the construction of Canadian ships to be at the side of the motherland in the time of stress must not be delayed, awaiting the settlement of that question, which may mean the indefinite postponement of the adoption of a permanent policy of naval defence. Let me read just two or three quotations from certain gentlemen on this question of managing our own affairs. The editor of the 'Round Table,' referring to the resolutions passed at the Imperial Conference in 1907, said:

> This resolution established the status of the Dominions as naval entities, and entirely distinct from that which inhabited the British Isles. It recognized that the basis of Imperial organization was the co-operation of five nations, not the centralization of power in the hands of the British Government as an Imperial Parliament. It finally destroyed the older conception of Imperial development as a gradual reunion of the colonies with the mother country through representatives in either of the British Houses of Parliament.

Hon. gentlemen will bear in mind that notwithstanding arguments that may be brought forward to divert their attention it is not the British Parliament that is the bond of union, it is the British Crown that is the bond of union. The British Parliament in itself is a body such as we are, responsible to the people who elect it, and it has in its sphere no greater powers than has this Canadian parliament in its sphere. Let me read what Mr. Balfour said in 1911 at the Constitutional Club:

> I cannot help thinking that as we have now thoroughly realized in every one of these great communities that each is to manage its own affairs, carry out its own life, make its own experiments as if it were an independent political entity, as that is a truth understood by every politician of every party of every one of these several communities. I cannot help thinking that upon that solid basis we shall build up something which the world has not yet seen, which political dreamers, in the past, have never yet dreamed of. A coalition of free and self-governing communities, who feel that they are never more themselves, never more masters of their own fate, than when they can recognize that they are parts of a greater whole from which they can draw inspiration and strength, and that each lives its own life and is itself in the fullest sense a self-governing entity, which yet has a larger whole to look to whose interests are not alien to it, on whom it can rest in time of trouble, from whom it can draw experience, to whom it can look, whom it can aid, and from whom it can receive aid.

Always, by all these authorities, so far as I have read them, there is reference back to the giving to Canada and the other dominions overseas of the right of self-government. Mr. Asquith, at the opening of the Imperial Conference in 1911, said:

> Two things in the British Empire were unique in the history of great political aggregations; the reign of law, and the combination of local autonomy with the loyalty to a common head. In proportion as centralization was seen to be increasingly absurd, so has distintegration been felt to be increasingly impossinble. We, each of us, are, and we, each of us, intend to remain master in our own household. This is here at home and throughout the dominions the life-blood of our policy, 'It is the articulus status and cadentis imperii.' It is none the less true that we are and intend to remain units indeed, but units in a greater unity and it is the primary object and governing purpose of these periodical conferences that we take free council together in matters which concern us all.

Again Mr. Asquith bases his remarks largely on the fact that we are self-governing entities and intend to remain such—and with the full consent of the motherland. The London Times, in discussing the resolutions of the Imperial Conference—I think this was the conference of 1909—says:

> Taken as a whole, the memorandum is a well conceived and eminently practical solution of the very difficult problem of bringing three naval forces, possibly more hereafter, which are to be under separate administration into such close and organic relations that even in time of peace, the advantages of a single Imperial fleet will be, to a very large extent, secured and in time of war, an Imperial fleet, single and indivisible in direction and control and imbued with the common inspiration and discipline, will automatically come into existence, subject only to the established autonomy and discretion of the several dominions concerned.

The editor of the Times, it will be seen, bases his comment upon the great advancement that had been made in the autonomy of the dominions across the seas and declares that that autonomy is not to be interfered with.

While I am on the question of autonomy, I wish to refer to a point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) which seemed to excite considerable merriment—the question of the Canadian portion of the Imperial navy being under the control of the representatives of Canada. I ask why not? Why not? If the principle of responsible government is to be maintained, then what the Canadian Government buys with the Canadian people's money the representatives of the Canadian people surely ought to control. Two impossible situations cited, or rather concocted, seem to give point to the suggestion of my hon. friend. It is asked:

If a Canadian warship were to meet an enemy on the sea it could not fire upon it unless Parliament had consented.

Mr. HUGHES: It would not meet on land.

Mr. GRAHAM: It might, if it were a schooner of a certain kind. But my hon. friend shall not drive me from this point. He believes in constitutional government, in responsible government. There is no greater enemy of the old lack of principle that prevailed in Canada under the family compact than my hon. friend, and anything that smacks of family compact, I know will have his disapproval. Let me point out that the conditions of which my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) spoke could not very well exist. If there were an enemy of Great Britain on the high seas approaching the Canadian coast it would be because war had been declared. And surely there is no man in this House but would say—certainly, I hope, the gentleman who is at the head of the naval forces of Canada, which, I hope will yet include a great Canadian navy, will never admit—that, war imminent, the country throbbing at the prospect, he would not have his warships under control, mobilized, ready to act upon his orders in fifteen minutes. It is not true that Parliament has to be called in order to allow these warships to go to the aid of the motherland; that is left to the Governor in Council. Are hon. gentlemen who now occupy the Treasury benches afraid to trust their own loyalty? Thinking men will not be deceived by such declamation devoid of argument. The principle of responsible government means that such a navy should be under the control of the people who own it, just as the British navy is under the British Admiralty and the representatives of the British people who own it. The law provides that the Canadian navy can be placed at the disposal of the British Admiralty by Order in Council, and that if Parliament is not then in session it shall be called to meet in ten days. Why? —hon. gentlemen opposite ask why? Responsible government again. Get away from the family compact idea. Under responsible government, Parliament must meet to vote the money for the fleet that is to join the Imperial forces. Surely, this Government would never send its navy—except the three ships that it is proposed to send, unmanned—without the ships being fully equipped or without money to pay their expenses. So Parliament, if not in session, must be called to vote the money. And I misjudge the representatives of the Canadian people who are here or who are to come here, if they would not be prepared at any time to vote every dollar that is necessary to protect the shores of Canada and to aid the British Empire in every part of the world where danger threatens.

Now, Sir, I refer again to history. I have already quoted some history, but it is, as my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would say, ancient. That part that he quoted about St. John would not be classified as being ancient or modern, but rather as sacred and profane. But I wish to come to more modern history. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) will not object if I again put on 'Hansard' what he said in 1909. It was a good speech, and at that time my hon. friend meant it. I want to say in all sincerity that to my mind it was without exception one of the most eloquent addresses ever heard in a deliberative body. For years I had been considering, as a journalist, the duty of the press and the people of Canada on this question of aiding in the naval defence of the Empire. A portion of the press contended that we were niggardly; we were not performing our duty; we were not proceeding with enough expedition. I for years had taken the ground that, up to a certain time at least, the greatest benefit we could confer upon the British Empire was the development of our own resources. Our resources were then not as large or our revenue, as buoyant as they are at the present time, but as a writer, I had taken that view in a modest way. But it was a question that was rapidly coming to the front, and when as a young member of this House I listened to the speech of my hon. friend, backed up by his leader, now the Prime Minister, I was absolutely convinced not only that Canada should do something, but that the proper way to do that something was to take her share in Imperial defence by building a navy of her own, to act on her own shores in times of peace and to be by the side of the forces of the motherland in times of stress or danger. My hon. friend made the matter so clear and expressed it in such eloquent terms that no one who listened to him could gainsay the matter of his speech, except, perhaps, in one or two points which I considered of minor importance. My hon. friend will, I trust, allow me to quote his words. I want them to be imbedded in the centre of my remarks this evening on this great question of Imperial naval defence. If hon. gentlemen opposite do not believe such of my remarks as they may read, I want them to be in a position to read the remarks made three years ago by the member for North Toronto. They are as follows :

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to

do what we ourselves ought to do; as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neighbour something per month for looking after the welfare and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself. That seems to me, when you work it out, to be a basic objection to this form of aid.

It still remains basic.

It goes still further than that. Suppose you contribute this year your sum, and next year your equal sum, and thereafter year after year. After ten or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years you will have paid out an immense amount of money. You will have been protected in the meantime; but in Canada itself there will be no roots struck; there will be no residue left, there will be no preparation of the soil, or beginning of the growth of the product of defence. Yet some time or other, no one can doubt that with resources and with the population constantly increasing we must and will have in this country a naval force of our own for our coast and home defence.

The interest that we take in a contribution spent by another is not the interest that I desire for Canada. I want to see something grafted on the soil of Canada's nationhood, which takes root and grows and develops until it incites the spirit of defence in this country, leads to a participation in the defence, leads to that quick interest in it, its glories, its duties and its accomplished work, which is after all the one great thing that compensates a people for great expenditures either on land or on sea in the way of defence and of the maintenance of the rights of the country.

Again, it disjoins what has been joined together from the earliest days of the world's existence—commerce and the protection of commerce. After all, the basic idea of a naval force is the protection of the commerce of a country. A commerce side by side with its protector, and its protector side by side with the growing commerce of a country, flourish best together, and are the surest helpers to each other. That is the idea which is in my mind—that when we make our contributions in the way of a fixed sum and it goes from us, and we are not responsible for it, we have none of the inspiration arising from the growth and development of a system of future defence in our own country. We are deprived of the larger benefit ourselves, and in the future we do no greater service to the Empire of which we form a part in this matter of defence.

Then, again, I think this method ignores the necessities and the aspirations and the prospects of a great people such as the Canadian people are destined to become. We must have beginnings; these must at first be small; but some time, or other, as I have said, our country will have its naval force for the defence of this country if for nothing else. The point with me is as to whether it is not the greater wisdom to sow the seed at once and cultivate its growth, as best we may, in our circumstances and with our resources, until at last we arrive at that stage of expansion, which we have reached in other great lines of our country's progress. You will notice that while I have tried to discuss the pros and cons in connection with this method, while I have stated reasons in favour of and others against it, my own mind tends rather towards the employment of another form than that of an out and out money contribution.

The then hon. member for North Toronto, now the Minister of Trade and Commerce, uttered those great truths three years ago in more eloquent terms than I could possibly express them; and if I had nothing else to say on the subject, he has made the case unanswerable even against the arguments adduced this evening by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the head of the naval forces in Canada.

The right hon. Prime Minister also made a speech bearing on this question, in which he impressed upon the House the very same views as were entertained by the hon. member for North Toronto. Above all things I am impartial, and perhaps the House will pardon me if I also read his remarks: My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) did not read from his extracts the words which the present Prime Minister used on a certain occasion about the Canadian navy. This is what the present Prime Minister said when in Opposition.

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to-day outlined the lines of naval defence of this country, I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of opinion, in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that.

He said: 'I entirely believe in that'; no reservation, and I am afraid that a certain movement had not then taken root, as my hon friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce would say:

The other experiment has been tried as between Australia and the mother country and it has not worked satisfactorily in any repect. In Great Britain the contribution has perhaps been regarded as rather unsatisfactory. In Australia it failed, in the end, to meet with the approval of the people for the reason that Great Britain felt constrained to ask Australia that the field of operations of the squadron should be extended to the China and Indian seas; and when the operation of that squadron was so extended, then Australia felt that the contribution which they had been making for some years past was not really being used to give that protection to Australia which her interests demanded.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Put in the word 'Canada'.

Mr. GRAHAM (reading):

So that, the policy of Australia at the present time is to build up a flotilla of submarines and torpedo boats which, in case of war, would co-operate with the armed cruisers and battleships of the British navy.

It was pointed out in discussing this question that Australia in providing a force of that kind would provide a force which it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for Great Britain to send across the seas, and that in thus protecting themselves they were providing the best possible force for the protection of the Empire. So, I am at one with the Prime Minister as far as this is concerned. I am at one with him in this respect also that I think that an expenditure of money designed for that purpose ought, in the main at least, to be under the control of our own Parliament, and that by making an appropriation of that kind, and attending to the defence of our own coasts, by co-operation and co-ordination with the Imperial navy forces, we would be rendering a real service in the defence of the Empire and we would be doing our duty, not only to Canada, but to the Empire as a whole.

An hon. MEMBER: A good speech.

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, let me compliment my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) on the fact.

Mr. EMMERSON: Did he say it should be under the control of Parliament?

Mr. GRAHAM: He said that all the money expended should be, in the main, under the control of Parliament. These were the words uttered by the present Prime Minister on that occasion.

Now, I want to come down to the conference of 1909, and in doing so I desire to call attention to a fact, which was emphasized very strongly by the Prime Minister in the speech from which I have just quoted, that is, the change that Australia decided to make from her former policy. Her former policy was one of contribution which this Government is now taking up where Australia let it drop. Australia has advanced, and has taken up the policy that we advocated, and still advocate. Hon. gentlemen opposite are behind in the march of events. Their policy is unmanned as well as their boats. At that conference of 1909, Australia practically said to the British Government we have been trying long enough this experiment of contribution, and, as my right hon. friend pointed out, it has not worked out. Australia said we are going to take the more Imperial course, the better Australian course, the common-sense course of building a navy to protect our own shores, our fisheries, our commerce in times of peace, a navy which shall be of some assistance to the Empire in time of war. Now Australia is building a navy of her own.

An hon. MEMBER: Where is her dreadnought now?

Mr. GRAHAM: There is one dreadnought, and it will be on the Australian coast when the unit is completed. The unit is under construction; it has not been indefinitely postponed.

Mr. AMES: Where will it be stationed until the unit is completed?

Mr. GRAHAM: Wherever the Governor General of Australia, under their Act, agrees it shall be.

Mr. EMMERSON: By whom will it be manned?

Mr. GRAHAM: That is a touchy question. I want to compare what is under order now for the Australian Government with what is proposed by the Canadian Government. Australia has begun a big programme that will not be completed for some years, but at the present time, working along the lines laid down by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition this afternoon, and having tried the old-fashioned method proposed now by this Government as an expedient and found it did not provide the remedy they are providing a fleet unit of their own:

The Government of the commonwealth has adopted the general lines of Admiral Henderson's report, but at present only one fleet unit is under construction. This consists of a dreadnought cruiser, three unarmoured cruisers of the Bristol class—the same sort which Canada under the Laurier programme proposed to build four vessels—six destroyers, and three submarines, or thirteen vessels in all. These vessels are either in commission or approaching completion. A naval college is also to be established for the training of officers. For the present Australia's dreadnought cruiser will remain in British waters, but it is maintained by the Australian taxpayer.

Mr. AMES: By whom will it be manned?

Mr. GRAHAM: Eventually by Australians.

Mr. AMES: By whom will it be manned while in British waters?

Mr. GRAHAM: My hon. friend is trying hard to get away.

Mr. AMES: My hon. friend might answer that question. By whom will it be manned while in British waters?

Mr. GRAHAM: I suppose by the best available men engaged by the Australian Government and paid by it. They may be British marines, of course.

Mr. AMES: Will they be Australians?

Mr. GRAHAM: A good many of them may be, and possibly they may have the same magnificent privilege that is provided in this Act, of allowing some Australian officers to serve on the ships. That is a privilege of course extended to any qualified officer of the British navy.

Mr. BORDEN: There is not a line in the Act regarding that.

Mr. GRAHAM: But there was in my right hon. friend's speech.

Mr. BORDEN: My hon. friend said the Act.

Mr. GRAHAM: My right hon. friend's speech cannot be dissociated from this Act if it can be from some others. I read the memorandum, and I read my right hon. friend's speech very carefully. If I said it was in the Act it is an error; it was in my right hon. friend's speech, which, to my mind, is fully as important as the Act itself. Now, Sir, let me go a little farther. I want to point out something that occurred at this conference in 1909 about which we have heard so much. Perhaps the House will bear with me if I read from this Admiralty memorandum, page 23:

Imperial Conference.
With Replies of Self-governing Dominions on the Naval and Military Defence of the Empire, 1909.

I shall not read it all, as it is quite lengthy, but let me put on 'Hansard' a few statements made in this memorandum and one of these statements will be as to what constitutes a fleet unit so that the people of Canada and the Empire will know what our policy is in the matter of Imperial naval defence. Section 2 of this memorandum, page 23, says:

If the problem of Imperial naval military defence were considered merely as a problem of naval strategy it would be found that the greatest output of strength for a given expenditure is obtained by the maintenance of a single navy with the concomitant unity of training and unity of command. In furtherance then of the simple strategical ideal the maximum of power would be gained if all parts of the Empire contributed, according to their needs and resources, to the maintenance of the British navy.

Listen to section 3:

3. It has, however, long been recognized that in defining the conditions under which the naval forces of the Empire should be developed, other considerations than those of strategy alone must be taken into account. The various circumstances of the overseas dominions have to be borne in mind. Though all have in them the seeds of a great advance in population, wealth, and power, they have at the present time attained to different stages in their growth. Their geographical position has subjected them to internal and external strains, varying in kind and intensity. Their history and physical environment have given rise to individual national sentiment, for the expression of which room must be found. A simple contribution of money or material may be to one Dominion the most acceptable form in which to assist in Imperial defence. Another, while ready to provide local naval forces, and to place them at the disposal of the Crown in the event of war, may wish to lay the foundations upon which a future navy of its own could be raised. A third may think that the best manner in which it can assist in promoting the interests of the Empire is in undertaking certain local services not directly of a naval character, but which may relieve the Imperial Government from expenses which would otherwise fall on the British Exchequer.

That clause I wish to call the particular attention of the House to as it recognizes the aspirations of any dominion over the sea to lay the foundation of a navy of its own to grow and develop into a strong arm of the great Imperial navy. Now I want to come down to the vital point which I have in my mind; that is the constitution of a fleet unit. After discussing the question of the fleet unit in several paragraphs, section 7 says:

The fleet to be aimed at should therefore, in the opinion of the Admiralty, consist at least of the following:
1. Armoured cruiser (new 'Indomitable' class, which is of the 'Dreadnought' type).
3 Unarmoured cruisers ('Bristol class').
6 Destroyers.
3 Submarines,
with the necessary auxiliaries, such as depot and store ships, etc., which are not here specified.

Such a fleet unit would be capable of action not only in the defence of coasts, but also of the trade routes, and would be sufficiently powerful to deal with small hostile squadrons should they ever attempt to act in its waters.

Twice that is the policy of the opposition in this House. My hon. friend's friends rather thought he scored a point this afternoon when he asked my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition: Why did you not, some years ago, when you had the power, provide for two additional fleet units? Why? Why was not the militia withdrawn from Canada in 1850 or 1860, instead of 1870? Why did it not go? The time had not arrived. Canada to-day has nearly double the revenue she had four years ago. The British Admiralty in 1909 was in favour of a fleet unit on the Pacific coast. I want the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to listen to the position taken on that occasion by the representatives of himself and other citizens of Canada who reside on the Atlantic coast. The Government, or its representatives said then: We have a Pacific coast; we have an Atlantic coast; we cannot at the present moment provide a fleet unit for each and we cannot put a unit on one coast only because the other coast must be protected as well. So the Government proposed a plan by which, with future development, we would have

one fleet unit on the Pacific and one fleet unit on the Atlantic coast. But, in the meantime, they provided for the construction in Canada of a certain number of ships that could form component parts of each of these fleet units when the time arrived for the fleet units to be fully constructed. This policy to-day is a carrying out of the policy which the late Government had in mind when they introduced their naval law in 1910. Canada's resources will now permit of it, and, if we are to believe what my hon. friend says about urgency, he surely will not object to an increased naval programme, even if it is in Canada. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries stated that the memo of the British Admiralty said that the way this Bill proposed was the right way. What did it say? Let me read the memo. I might premise this by saying that the British Admiralty did not discuss a Canadian navy. The promise had been made by this Government that the naval law of Canada would be repealed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: To please the Nationalists.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will come to that—and a request was made by the Prime Minister under conditions which could not admit of anything but a contribution. Now, the British Admiralty was in this position: You are going to give us something, you are bound to give us something, it is not to be a Canadian navy, it is not the policy outlined in the McKenna memo of 2909, you have forsaken that, we have read your speeches, you have promised the Nationalists that you are going to repeal that law, now are you going to give us something and you ask us what we will have.

> The Prime Minister of the Dominions having inquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective, we have no hesitation in answering after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

There is nothing in that which says three dreadnoughts—a certain number—and in the policy propounded on this side of the House we propose to follow that line, and we are going to give two of the highest class of battleships, but attached to that, and in addition to it, we are going to give a balance of two fleet units.

Again, our policy is double what was asked in 1909, and it is nearly double in efficiency what this Government proposes, and it would cost to carry out practically the same amount of money as that proposed now in this contribution. It would be out of place for me to comment on the contents of the document placed on the table of the House to-day by the Prime Minister, but I may say that it is not as strong as it might be; it is not as definite, at all events, as the promise of repeal of the naval law given by the Prime Minister. I may say, however, that I have the utmost confidence in the intent of the British Admiralty to carry out any pledge they make. Let us for a moment analyse that memorandum. The Minister of Marine and the Prime Minister told us that it will take so many years to establish ship-building in Canada that we cannot wait. In fact the policy of the late Government was condemned by the Minister of Marine because it would take too long to build even these small ships in Canada—he is going to get them quicker by postponing indefinitely. Look at the fallacy of the position taken by the Minister of Marine. Mark you, the ships that were to be built in Canada were to be built by one of the great ship-building firms of England. The Minister of Marine tells us they could not be constructed with sufficient rapidity under the late Government and on that account I suppose he cancelled the contract. But, what does he hold out as a solace in his eloquent speech to the people of the Maritime provinces? It is, that these great British ship-builders, several of whom offered to build the ships in Canada one year ago, could not then establish yards in Canada and build these ships here; but when the British Government tells them to, they can do it very well and then we will reap the benefit. But, the same men were going to build the ships in Canada under Laurier as are going to build the ships in Canada under the Admiralty.

An hon. MEMBER: Under the British Admiralty.

Mr. GRAHAM: Under the British Admiralty via this Government. Let me point out another fallacy equally untenable from the Canadian standpoint—this Government promises to pay the difference in cost of building the ships in Canada as compared with the cost in Great Britain, and which, according to the Minister of Marine, is a large amount. And then what? Canada, after paying all this cost, will not own one ship of the fleet, but they will belong to the British Admiralty. Sir, if the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier had been carried out, the British ship-builders would be in Canada now building these ships to be paid for by Canada, and when paid for to be the property of the Canadian people who paid for them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have always opposed the view that we should take a plebiscite on this question, and the hon. member for North Toronto has also opposed it consistently.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not think he voted.

Mr. GRAHAM: I will come to that. He opposed it consistently, and he was right; he had the courage of his convictions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: He did not vote.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am not sure you are right in that.

Mr. FOSTER: Be sure of your facts.

Mr. GRAHAM: I thought I was sure of my facts, but I was not sure of my man. As I have said, I am opposed to a plebiscite. I do not believe in it. I believe that Parliament had the right to proceed as it did with the introduction of a policy such as was introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. But, there is some excuse for these gentlemen in the province of Quebec in demanding a plebiscite. Let us see by whom a plebiscite was promised to them. On February 3, 1910, nearly a year after the unanimous resolution, a motion was moved in this House and there was an amendment to it and an amendment to the amendment moved by Mr. Monk, who I regret is indisposed, and this is the amendment Mr. Monk moved:

This House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of the opinion that the Bill now submitted for its consideration changes the relations of Canada with the Empire, and ought, in consequence, be submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the opinion of the nation by means of a plebiscite.

Now, let me read out the names of those who voted for that amendment. Surely, if the building of a Canadian navy was a departure from the constitutional relations, as outlined in the amendment, existing between the motherland and the overseas dominions, this proposition for a contribution now before us is ten-fold a greater departure. The hon. gentlemen who voted that a plebiscite must be taken were—the Government may be represented in this list, I have not scanned it carefully, but I will read it: Blondin, Broder, Chisholm (Huron), Currie (Simcoe), Doherty, Forget, Hern, Jameson, Lewis, Lortie, Monk, Nantel, Paquet, Sharpe (Ontario), Verville, White (Renfrew), Wilcox, Worthington. Now, I am going to read this amendment again, because if these hon. gentlemen are consistent, they cannot vote for this contribution unless they ask the people first, not through a general election, but through a plebiscite.

Mr. CURRIE (North Simcoe): You forget there has been a general election since then.

Mr. GRAHAM: No, I am in a position not to forget that, and there was also a by-election which my hon. friend will not forget. It does not alter the situation one iota, because my hon. friend never told the electors of North Simcoe about this vote. Let me read this amendment again, because my hon. friend smarts under it, and anything he smarts under is sure to be pretty nearly right.

This House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion that the Bill now submitted for its consideration changes the relations of Canada with the Empire and ought in consequence to be submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite.

'Changes the relations of Canada with the Empire,' to pass an Act to spend money in our own country! It changes them ten-fold to go back seventy years in the history of Canada, and give a contribution. I might say that personally this is what I should like, although it would not really meet the view expressed in favour of a plebiscite: I should like hon. gentlemen, who form the Government to bring in their Redistribution Bill, let us put it through, and then let us go to the country. That will let you out of a serious difficulty; but let us have the Redistribution Bill first, and, if it is fair at all, we will assist you in putting it through. Then let us go to the country, and let the people decide as to what its naval policy is to be.

I want to point out that the men who entertained the view expressed in the above amendment had a good precedent in that some of their leaders entertained the same view. You must not be too harsh now on the fruit of the vine which you yourselves planted. There was a Monk amendment also. I think my hon. friend from North Toronto was absent when the yeas and nays were counted; and the word 'speedy' put into that resolution at the request of my hon. friend, now the Prime Minister, signified no such rapidity as the gait struck by my hon. friend in leaving the House. This is the Monk amendment:

The House regrets that the speech from the Throne gives no indication whatever of the intention of the Government to consult the people on its naval policy and the general question of the contribution by Canada to Imperial armaments.

Just what this is let me see. I suppose that a few of the despised Nationalists voted for this amendment, and hon. frontbenchers did not? My hon friend from

North Toronto did not, and I think very few of the Toronto contingent did, but I have scanned 'Hansard' to find out really the main spokes that revolved around this hub of a resolution. The amendment was negatived. I almost hesitate to read this. I am afraid that the new members will hardly think this is from 'Hansard,' but at page 133, November 22, 1910, of 'Hansard' 1910-11, you will find this record.

Now, who voted for that amendment? Borden——

Mr. LEMIEUX: Which Borden?

Mr. GRAHAM: Not Sir Frederick, Monk, Blondin, Burrell, Crothers, Doherty, Nantel, Perley, Reid and Roche, all members of this Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Shocking.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think my hon. friend the Prime Minister just selected the men who gave this vote, and was bound to have nobody in the Government except those who voted yea on that amendment. I might add that the present Speaker voted for it also. Now let me ask if you cannot have a permanent policy, as you say you cannot, without going to the people, how are you going to annul your vote on going to the country on a question of contribution to Imperial armaments? That is what you are doing—giving a contribution without going to the country, although in November, 1910, practically every member of this Government who was a member of this House then said that on principle he would not contribute to armaments for the British Empire without first consulting the people of Canada.

Mr. COCHRANE: And we have consulted them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I deny that absolutely. Not a single constituency in Canada was consulted on this policy. I thought perhaps I would be questioned when I said that, but my hon. friend the Minister of Marine said himself to-night that he would not call it a policy, and I accept his good judgment in that regard. It is an expediency; it is a subterfuge to get away from a difficulty, not international but interpolitical in one part. It is not international, it is inter-Nationalist.

There has been some question as to what these battleships should be called. Several historic names have been proposed. Will the House pardon me if I propose names that, I think, will be suggestive of this policy? Would the hon. ministers think about it for a moment? I would suggest, in view of the facts, that they abandoned a policy adopted by themselves and unanimously approved by this House in 1909, and dragged this great Imperial question into politics—that they were responsible for certain statements, far from edifying, made in one province concerning this navy—that they were responsible for changing the whole attitude of the Government—that these ships should be called respectively the Monk, the Nantel and the Pelletier. It is no wonder that these ships are to be unmanned. So far as the greatest of these three names is concerned, the Government is unmanned already. For the man who bears that name adhered to the policy laid down by himself, and when it came to a point where he was called upon to sacrifice his principle, he declined. He stands in the same position and no other, that every man stands in who voted for the amendment concerning consulting the people before contributing anything to British armaments. He may be made the scapegoat, but he is not worthy of the distinction. Other gentlemen ought to bear the burden; they bear the salary. Do not condemn too strongly the man who adhered to his views; if condemnation is to be meted out, mete it out to those who forsook their views.

Sir, this question is one of great moment to this country. I believe in the policy outlined by the leader of the Opposition, which is a development of the policy of 1909 endorsed unanimously by this Parliament, as one that stands most firmly not only for Canadian dignity, but for Imperial unity as well. Let me summarize: I am opposed to the resolution on many grounds, including the following:

1. It constitutes us a nation of substituters, willing to allow others to take our places in the firing line in the defence of the Empire.

2. It ignores the true test of devotion—the sacrifice of ourselves, if necessary, as well as our money, in the defence of the common cause.

3. It reverses the policy of the past seventy years and is a retrograde step in the constitutional relations existing between the motherland and Canada.

4. At the best, it is but an expedient, humiliating to both the Empire and Canada, and makes no provision for a policy of permanent benefit to both.

5. It is in no wise a solution of the problem of naval defence, but merely a temporary make-shift without lasting result to the motherland or the Dominion of Canada.

I am in favour of the policy outlined in the amendment:

1. Because it is a real and permanent policy commensurate at once with the needs of the Empire and the dignity of the Canadian people.

2. It will establish and develop a large ship-building industry in Canada, giving employment to many of our people.

3. It will tend to strengthen the tie that binds us to the motherland, and will intensify, if that were possible, the strong feeling of loyalty and patriotism which now exists in Canada, and will afford full opportunity to the rising generation to show their devotion to King and country by being prepared, should duty call, to fight on sea as well as on land.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to say whether the speech which we have just listened to is a patriotic, statesmanlike speech or not; it will be for the country to say whether it is such a speech as we ought to expect under the important circumstances in which we find ourselves. I do not begrudge the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) his wit or his sarcasm—that is all right. But I would ask him, in view of the important duty which we in Canada have to perform, whether this is the kind of speech with which an important proposition like this ought to be received.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard clearly laid down to-day the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite on this question. It appears that it has been somewhat difficult to bring it about, that it was necessary to have three or four—or was it five?—caucuses in order to bring this infant policy into the world. And now we are told, practically, that we ought to hide our heads in shame, that we ought to be held as having insulted the people of Canada, because we are offering $35,000,000 to the motherland. And these words have been uttered by the first lieutenant of the great party on the other side of the House. But, at all events, we have our policy outlined. They ask us: Is that all you are going to do? Is that all your policy? And their hearts bleed because Canadians will not shed their blood and because Canada will not pay more money for the great British Empire. When the hon. member for South Renfrew tells us this Government does not consider that men in Canada will be worthy of those great sacrifices, he may believe that statement true, but he misrepresents the ideals of this Government and of the Canadian people. Men have been found in Canada to do their duty at all times, but governments have been known which have one day said they would not allow Canadians to do their duty, and the following day obliged to reverse their statements because of their fear of being swept out of power. I have no doubt that statements of hon. gentlemen opposite that they do not want any money to be voted, but that they want blood shed, and more money voted for the manning of the ships, is the continuation of the policy adopted by them two years ago. All Canadians will to-morrow be unanimous in stating that this resolution which we now have before us from the opposition, is a splendid piece of architecture. And why? Because 'le grand Canadien Francais'—the great French Canadian—will be able to hold his own anywhere in Quebec on the money question. The hon. member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) appears to be quite pleased, and evidently thinks I have stated the matter correctly. Hon. gentlemen opposite, the great nation builders, are playing politics with this question. The leader of the Opposition began his speech this afternoon by saying that he had received a certain memorandum appealing to him to take this question out of politics, and he told us that these lofty ideas were all right. But then he said: 'I am not going to do it because my adversaries in the last contest did not do it'—meaning to say, I presume: 'if they didn't do their duty I am not going to do mine.' But whatever hon. gentlemen opposite may say in regard to the matter, the policy embodied in the government resolution now before the House is the policy desired by the Mother Country. The hon. member for South Renfrew said a few moments ago, 'That is not going to please England very much,' and the right hon. leader of the Opposition said, 'England doesn't want that.' The Government has reason to know that this is a policy acceptable to England, and we are doing it to please the Mother Country. To hon. gentlemen who want people to go and fight for their country, I say there is at this moment no occasion for these big words and sentiments in regard to fighting.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes, and I repeat it. But the war that is going on is one which, on account of the excessive armaments going on in other countries, is tending to take away from the motherland that supremacy on the sea which she has so long enjoyed. That supremacy on the sea is the life of the Empire, as it is the life of Canada, and the necessity existing is for the overseas dominions, like good daughters of the Empire, to see that the number of ships composing her navy is equal to all occasions, and that they will be so numerous that the supremacy of England on the sea cannot be impaired.

When the right hon. leader of this Government said in England he thought there should be one navy for the British Empire, he had the best of reasons for making the statement, and I may recall to the memory of the hon. member for South Renfrew the fact that separate navies in distant seas may not be on the spot just at the right time to take any share in the great bloodshed which the hon. member seems so desirous of having. Let him remember what

took place in the war between Russia and Japan, during which Japan destroyed in twenty minutes one of the Russian fleets. What is wanted by the Mother Country is ships in the home waters, for reasons which have been well explained by the right hon. the Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries. Whatever pleasure hon. gentlemen opposite have had to-night in the witty remarks made by the hon. member for South Renfrew, I venture to say that when the resolution presented to this House went before the country it created a certain effect and impression, not only upon the people of this country, but in the motherland, and to-morrow morning in the press in England our friends over there will read that this resolution, which has sent a thrill of joy through the heart of every true Briton, of both political parties, has been played with by one of the political parties of this country. Will not my hon. friends only realize for once that they are in opposition and that they are going to stay there? This is a political game. This amendment is before the House because our friends opposite expect and hope that they will, in some way or other, get back their places in the Government which they have lost. Without being a prophet, let me tell them that this country will take little stock and place little credit or confidence in the position taken by my hon. friends opposite. But, Sir, we should not be surprised. Every big thing that has been done for this country, every big measure introduced by the Conservative party has been opposed by our friends on the other side. Excepting some of their best men, they were opposed to confederation; they were opposed to the building of the Canadian Pacific railway; they were opposed to the acquisition of the Northwest territories. They have not been big men; they have been small men. My hon. friend may put what names he likes on the ships. For my part I would rather have no ships than have ships which cannot fight, and I would rather leave Canadians on shore than put them on tubs which go on the Yarmouth rocks. If that is the big navy of which my hon. friend from South Renfrew is so proud, let him have it, but this Government is not going to have any such thing as that.

Mr. MACDONALD: They are not going to have any at all.

Mr. PELLETIER: I am very sorry that our friends are so sore about this. They are sore, they are bitter; they have not yet got over their disappointment of a year ago. What can we do, Mr. Speaker, what means are in our power to make them forget that, so that they will not be carried away, from what they ought to do in really important circumstances like these. I venture to say that in years to come they will regret it themselves.

I do not intend to keep the House very long to-night, but I think that before having the debate adjourned, it is of the greatest importance that the country should not remain under the somewhat erroneous impression which may have been created this afternoon and this evening as to the position taken in the House of Commons in 1909. We have been told that this resolution which provides for one contribution is a violation of the motion adopted unanimously in 1909. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition has stated that in so many words. Now let me put the facts before the House. There was a motion moved by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition who was then Prime Minister, was not satisfied with the text of that resolution, and, without finding much fault with it, as he said, he prepared another one which he put before the House, and which, if it had been adopted as drafted by him, might have justified what he said this afternoon. But it was not adopted in that form; I shall come to that in a minute. The resolution in the original draft proposed by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition as I find it in 'Hansard' reads partly as follows:

The House re-affirms the opinion, repeatedly expressed by the representatives of Canada, that under the present constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the self-governing dominions the payment of any stated contribution—

Mark these words:

—the payment of any stated contribution to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be a satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let the hon. member who says, 'hear, hear,' wait a minute. The House would not vote for that. A substitute for that paragraph was adopted, and this is the way it reads:

The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes,——

And so on. My hon. friend would have the country believe that it was the payment of any contribution to which exception was taken. Not one man voted for that original

motion because the right hon. the leader of the Opposition adopted the draft which I have just read, and which says the House would not adopt a policy of giving regular and periodical contributions. A comparison of the two texts shows that it was the intention of the House that if at any given moment the Government was of opinion that one contribution was necessary it might be given. Any man who can read will understand that; any school boy will understand it. Therefore we are acting now in conformity with that resolution. There is another paragraph here. This is how it reads; it is the last paragraph:

The House expresses its firm conviction that whenever the need arises, the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the Imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the Empire.

Now, that is what was adopted by the House of Commons, and we are within the four corners of that resolution with the measure which is now before the House. Having said this, and at this late hour, I think I shall now move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 11.04 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, December 13, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals for the year ended March 31, 1912. —Mr. Cochrane.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 35) to amend the Customs and Fisheries Protection Act.—Mr. Hazen.

SOUTH AFRICAN SCRIP.

Mr. OLIVER : Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I ask the Minister of the Interior if it is the intention of the Government to provide for any further extension of the South African scrip.

Mr. ROCHE : Last year's Act provided for an extension of time to the original holders only; such extension to last until the 31st of December of this year. It also provided for the granting of $500 to any person who desires to surrender the certificate to the Government. There has been no appropriation made for the payment of that $500 and there will have to be an appropriation this session for that purpose. Many requests have been made to extend the provisions of last session's Act for another year. I have not finally decided as to that. I have held out no hope as yet that that should be done.

Mr. OLIVER : It is very desirable that a decision should be come to as soon as possible, because it may be that some men are holding scrip who find it inconvenient to locate, and if they knew there was going to be no extension of time, they would certainly get it located. I urge that a decision be reached at the earliest possible moment.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of and concurrence in the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General) (resuming): Mr. Speaker, a great effort has been made both by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and his friend and neighbour the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) to make this policy of theirs, as set forth in the amendment, look important and Empire-like. Boiled down, what does it amount to? What is there in it if we look at it unaccompanied by that flourish of trumpets with which it has been presented to this House? Well, Sir, it amounts to nothing practical and useful at the present moment. Nay, if it did accomplish something for the moment it would be to a certain extent to hamper the British navy. There is a great desire on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite—in words of course—to be in the firing line, to be right at the front, but they have arranged it in such a way that the ships will be far from where the fighting will take place. The trial of strength, when it comes, will not be in Canadian waters. Nobody believes or suggests that it will. If the moment for fighting should come, and we all hope it will be postponed as long as possible, the battle will be fought in the North Sea or near the home waters of England or Germany, and then, at that vital moment, we will have these two big units of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, where they will doubtless remain until everything is over. Sir, these gentlemen of the Opposition are the great warriors we have before us to-day. They tell us they want to man the ships. They have manned the Niobe and the Rainbow

and the least that can be said about that experiment is that these ships were certainly undermanned. But, notwithstanding their failure in that direction, they want to man some more ships. Do they know that practically they could not get men in this country even for the Niobe and the Rainbow? Do they know that we must go to England to get men to man those ships? Do our friends know what wages are paid on board those ships, and what wages are paid on board British warships? It is an interesting matter to know this, when these great men are launching this great policy. Let me tell them. In Canada ordinary seamen are paid 50 cents a day; in Great Britain they are paid 28 cents a day. In Canada able seamen are paid 70 cents a day; in England 40 cents a day. Petty officers here are paid $1 a day; in England 66 cents. Stokers here are paid from 90 cents to $1 a day; in England they are paid from 40 to 50 cents. Let me give the House and the country the percentage of the proposed Canadian rates in excess of the British rates, and the House will soon see the importance of it.

As regards the officers, for captains our rates are 20 per cent more; for the commander, 20 per cent more; for the lieutenant, 50 per cent more; for the sub-lieutenant, 120 per cent more; for the engineer captain, 50 per cent more; for the engineer commander, 18 per cent more; for the engineer lieutenant, 25 per cent more; for the engineer sub-lieutenant, 80 per cent more; for the assistant paymaster, 75 per cent more; for the warrant officer, 75 per cent more. This long list of officers may interest our friends who are walking in the dark in regard to this great navy.

We will now take the men: seamen, 90 per cent more; stoker petty officer, 60 per cent more; chief stoker, 70 per cent more; stoker, 75 per cent more; chief machinist, 40 per cent more; machinists, 33 per cent more; artisan, 50 per cent more; sick berth staff, 100 per cent more; writers, 60 per cent more; cooks, 80 per cent more; ships' police, 50 per cent more; officers' cooks and stewards, 120 per cent more.

Now, if hon. gentlemen opposite have, at the present moment, when we cannot do it, this idea of theirs adopted, do they think of paying the men less than the rates which I have given here, which are already so high over and above the rates paid in England? I do not suppose they do. Will those rates not take away men from the British navy, and induce them to come here? That is as plain as A B C. Will we not then oblige Great Britain to increase enormously the pay of their men, and increase their budget accordingly? Is that a method of helping the Mother Country? I put the question fairly, and I think I am entitled to a fair answer. I may safely say that I do not think that we are exposed to war here at the present moment, and I hope that we are free from apprehension in that respect for years to come.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No Canadian Navy?

Mr. PELLETIER: We are about to celebrate with our neighbours to the south the centenary of peace, and there is not a man in this House who does not hope and believe that this celebration will be the beginning of a new era of peace between our neighbours to the south and ourselves. We have, and Great Britain has given it to us, a most fortunate and happy treaty of peace with Japan, which will not expire for eight or nine years. In that treaty, which has been renewed lately, there is one clause which is new. That clause stipulates that if a general arbitration treaty be passed between Britain and the United States, the treaty with Japan will not be broken on that account. Nothing in that treaty prevents Canada from having her full liberty as regards immigration, so that they can try to keep this country for the white man. Why, then, do what is not urgent, and ignore what is urgent? According to the figures given a moment ago there is nothing possible and nothing practicable in these two big units about which my right hon. friend opposite speaks. It is impossible to man these ships with Canadians, unless we double or treble the pay which we give now, or have conscription.

Mr. TURRIFF: You have done that with the mounted police.

Mr. PELLETIER: It is the immediate consequence of the so-called policy of my right hon. friend. It is not on account of cowardice on the part of Canadians, and I do not think my hon. friends on the other side have the right to call it so; but what do we see in this country? From all the countries of old Europe, men are coming here to take a part in the building of our great public works, and there are not enough men in Canada for that purpose. Men come from Italy, from Bulgaria, from everywhere. Men from Bulgaria, since I mention them, after having come all the way to Canada to earn their living, when they heard from across the seas and from the tops of the mountains that there was war at home, left everything here to one side and hurried back to help their country in its difficulty and in its glorious victory which has just been achieved.

An hon. MEMBER: They went themselves; they did not send their money.

Mr. PELLETIER: But they took back the money which they had earned in this country to help; and I will show the House,

before I resume my seat, that that is what Canada has done in a glorious manner in the past. Everybody knows—complaints are made daily—that the sons of our farmers are rushing to the cities. There is work, and plenty of it, for every one, and at wages that are really surprising. Longshoremen on the wharfs of Montreal, as I was told this morning by one of the men who knows, earn as much as $40 and $42 a week; and a man does not need anything but a little experience to become a longshoreman. Now, do we expect—can we expect—that this great policy which is not matured, which has not been studied, which has not been looked into, is possible under the circumstances, except with the result which I have indicated? Is the right hon. leader of the Opposition in favour of increasing pay, or is he in favour of conscription? Let him come out from behind Torres Vedras, for once, and tell us all. Is the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux)—well, he is not here. The hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland)—would he vote in favour of conscription?

Mr. BELAND: No. Are you in favour of it?

Mr. PELLETIER: Where, then, are you going to find your men?

Mr. BELAND: We are going to find them in Canada.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let me tell my hon. friend from Beauce, who was Minister of Marine and Fisheries for a few days, that, without either increase of pay or conscription, he would not get enough men in Canada for a starboard watch. Now, our hon. friends have told us they are not in favour of conscription. But their theory does not hold together, their policy does not stand on its own feet. I have here something that may help them. I have been handed a little Bill, which never saw the light of day very much but on which I find the following words:

Fourth Session, Ninth Parliament, Edward VII., 1904.

An Act constituting the Naval Militia.

It has the name on it of Mr. Préfontaine, who at that time was Minister of Marine and Fisheries in the government of my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I find embodied in this Bill conscription, enrollment—and six months in jail for every man who will not be enrolled or go under conscription. I am sure my right hon. friend will recognize this child.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: No, I do not.

Mr. PELLETIER: The right hon. gentleman is going very far when he treats his own baby in that way. The Bill was not presented to the House—if it had been, the parent would not renounce his own child—and even, I understand, the plates were ordered to be broken after this was printed in the Printing Bureau of Canada. But the germ, the idea, is there. I did not have this printed. As hon. members will see it is getting yellow with age. It has been preserved, safely preserved, and here it is. I thought it might help our friends on the other side to launch the great project which they have given us of the so-called great navy of which they spoke yesterday afternoon.

Mr. MACDONALD: Did you get that from the Minister of Militia?

Mr. PELLETIER: Let my hon. friend possess his soul in patience. We heard yesterday something about members of this House smarting under an attack; it is their turn; let them take their medicine. They began slowly—this Bill is only a beginning.

Now, I thought it would be interesting for this House to get a statement concerning the Niobe and the Rainbow, showing what it has cost this country for these two magnificent relics of the statesmanship of our hon. friends on the other side:

Cost—Niobe.

Purchase price..	$1,046,333 33
Works and stores in connection with alterations..	75,107 74
Heating apparatus..	8,181 83
Wireless apparatus..	5,207 33
Total cost to Aug. 31, 1911.. ..	$1,134,830 23

Of the Rainbow, I shall give only the total, as she is only a small thing. The total cost was $263,049.98. Now, let us look at the annual cost:

Annual Cost—Niobe.

Upkeep and maintenance.	$373,183 63	
Special expenditure for stranding..	145,705 20	
		$518,888 83

Rainbow.

Upkeep and maintenance.	$163,472 01	
Special expenditure for armament..	102,118 18	
		265,590 19
Total Niobe and Rainbow..		$784,479 02

Thus you have a total expenditure of over three-quarters of a million dollars a year. The Globe newspaper, which is, I take it, the principal organ of my hon. friends opposite, in a quite recent issue has spoken in this way:

The Borden proposal is a very cheap substitute for the programme of the Laurier Government, which contemplated the formation of a naval force to be built and maintained by Canada. The debate on the Navy Bill in the House of Commons in 1910 made it clear that the annual cost of maintaining six cruisers, six destroyers, a naval college for

training officers, barracks and recruiting facilities for men and bases at Halifax and Esquimalt would be $3,680,000 a year. Including interest and depreciation on the first cost of the vessels, which was estimated at $11,730,000, the total annual cost to Canada was to be $4,253,000. This expense the Laurier Government was prepared to face that it might begin the work of building up a Canadian naval defence force. This is two and a half times as much as the interest on the Borden gift.

These figures are very interesting when we couple with them the fact that the cost of maintenance, if the rates of pay for the men be increased, will be, not $4,200,000, but at least eight or nine million dollars a year. It should also be remembered that the naval policy of the last two years would result in a navy powerless, defenceless, and useless for the purposes to which it should have been devoted. Such a policy is useless to Canada and useless to the Empire. What we propose is a plan not only more effective, but costing the people of Canada a much smaller amount.

What does the policy expounded by my hon. friends opposite amount to? Bombastic remarks, empty words, peanut politics. We have no shipyards; we have no trained officers; we do not possess the necessary equipment, yet our friends opposite want to have these big ships here at once. They would have the baby talk and walk before it is born! We have had tons of words and carloads of statements, but what Canada wants to-day is action. The country is getting sick of words.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER: Hon. gentlemen opposite pound their desks, but they do not remember, perhaps, that their leader and other hon. gentlemen talked and talked yesterday, but for nothing. Some remarks were made last night about the front benches on this side of the House. Apparently they are not filled to the satisfaction of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). The right hon. leader of the Opposition has had on this question the opportunity of his life to prove himself a big man, above party. He is on the front bench, but he has not proven himself equal to the occasion. The hon. member for South Renfrew,—who was referred to at Arnprior by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) as being the probable successor of the right hon. leader of the Opposition—will not be offended, I trust, if I tell him that he has treated this important matter with levity, and even with flippancy.

But we have another front-bencher, the great leader from the West; the hon. gentleman who is this year supposed to represent the backbone of such hope as is left for the future of his party. He is on the front bench, but he sits tight on certain occasions. I do not envy him, nor would I like to have been in his place on a certain occasion which I have in mind.

We have been told in a somewhat sarcastic, and I may perhaps say, impertinent manner, that certain names were to be given to these three ships. In making a choice of names, we may perhaps call the ships Western Canada, Central Canada and Eastern Canada. We may perhaps call them Lafontaine, Baldwin, Macdonald or Cartier. Or we might recall to the memories of hon. gentlemen opposite that some Liberals have in the past proved themselves to be above party on great questions, and we might call one of them George Brown. Certainly we shall not designate any of them by the name Minnie M, nor shall we call them Laurier and Torres Vedras, or Oliver and Reciprocity.

I yesterday alluded to a certain fact which was well stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), and, after having slept over it, I am now even more satisfied of its truth. This policy, Sir, is no policy; My hon. friends opposite know it. They know that this matter must be carefully looked into, considered, and arranged before it is launched before the country. But they have an object in view. As I said last night, they have had caucus after caucus, and, moreover, we are told—of course the little bird that gives us this information may not be very accurate; but we are told that apart from members of this House, there are other poor orphans who have no seats in the House, but who would like to have a little chance to try again; men discredited on account of their reciprocity record, men who are trying to play politics here in order to, if possible, bring on a general election in the hope of getting back into this House. These are facts which we see, and which the country sees, and that is the part played now—not to extend unanimous help to our Empire and to our country, but to play a little game in order to gain some little political advantage. This is what the policy of our hon. friends, boiled down, amounts to, and the country will see it; the country knows it now.

We heard a great deal from the hon. member for South Renfrew about Downing Street and about the family compact. Why, Sir, I think my hon. friend is becoming a Nationalist.

Mr. GRAHAM: Somebody had to take your place.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. PELLETIER: I knew that the hon. gentlemen were after our places.

Mr. GRAHAM: Not in that respect.

Mr. PELLETIER: All this talk of Downing Street and of family compacts is a thing of the past of which nobody speaks now. It tends to create prejudices in one part of this country against the British Empire and against Great Britain. There is no escaping from this; these words have been pronounced for a purpose, and what the hon. member for South Renfrew had in mind when he pronounced those words is as plain as daylight. I may tell him that this country has lived long enough now and has learned enough not to be carried away by these old war cries which have died out and which ought to be left where they were buried.

We are told that we are asking this country to become tributary to Great Britain and to pay tribute. The two hon. members on the other side who have spoken on this question have not used the word 'tribute,' but their papers are full of it. They have had too much self-respect to use it themselves, but it is the war cry which is raised throughout Canada as one means of creating a hostile public opinion against the measure of the Government. Everybody should know that a tribute is a duty levied by a conqueror upon the conquered. It is duty imposed by a superior power on an inferior power, and this duty the inferior power is bound to pay. Is this our case when, of our own free will, we decide to ask the people of Canada to make a contribution, voluntarily in all respects, to help the motherland? Surely the people who use these arguments have come to the conclusion that the people of this country have lost their ordinary common sense. Is it tribute when there is no pressure whatever? Is it a tribute when we see in this document words like these:

> The Admiralty set the greatest store; by the important material, and still more important moral assistance, which it is within the power of Canada to give to maintaining British naval supremacy on the high seas, but they think it necessary to disclaim any intention, however indirect, of putting pressure upon Canadian public opinion, or of seeking to influence the Dominion Parliament in a decision which clearly belongs solely to Canada.
>
> The Admiralty therefore confine themselves in this statement exclusively to facts, and it is for the Dominion Government and Parliament to draw their own conclusions therefrom.

Is that paying tribute? Let us look at one of the other most important parts of this memorandum. It has been read several times, but it should be read over and over again so as to be in the memory of every member and of every Canadian worthy of the name:

> Whatever may be the decision of Canada at the present juncture, Great Britain will not in any circumstances fail in her duty to the overseas dominions of the Crown.
>
> She has before now successfully made head alone and unaided against the most formidable combinations and she has not lost her capacity by a wise policy and strenuous exertions to watch over and preserve the vital interests of the Empire.
>
> The Admiralty are assured that His Majesty's Government will not hesitate to ask the House of Commons for whatever provision the circumstances of each year may require.

Is that telling Canada: You are going to pay us this, that, or the other amount? On the contrary, they say: We put the facts before you and leave you to decide, and we sit here as a parliament, not taxing anybody without representation. We ask this Parliament and this country to do a thing which, as I said last night, we know will be acceptable and pleasing to the people of Great Britain.

I may say, en passant, that we have not been in England as partymen. We did not meet there a government whose opinions and whose name in politics would be anything like the name of the Liberal-Conservative party on this side of the water. We have dealt with the Government of the Mother Country, and for us there was no Asquith or Bonar Law, no Churchill or Balfour; but there was the Government of the Mother Country. That is the view we took of the situation, and we have dealt there with a government led by the successor of Gladstone, that great statesman whose policy my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has so often proclaimed throughout this country. If he doubts our word, let him make inquiry whether the policy now before the country is acceptable to the Government and the Opposition of Great Britain; because in the motherland when these questions come up, in a moment—— these questions come up, in the form in which they have sometimes come up, in a moment of pressing need, both parties go into the same lobby and vote in the same way. We are not paying tribute, we are doing better than that: we are to-day becoming a partner with Great Britain. By our action we are mounting to a higher plane than Canada has ever before achieved. When I heard the hon. member for South Renfrew say that we were insulting the motherland, I thought that surely he did not mean that, and, some day—

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say that.

Mr. PELLETIER: —when he finds that the effort he made before the House proves abortive—

Mr. GRAHAM: I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. PELLETIER: Then, what did my hon. friend say?

Mr. GRAHAM: If my hon. friend wants me to, I will tell him.

Mr. PELLETIER: I do not want to put words into the mouth of my hon. friend.

Mr. GRAHAM: Well, I will tell you what I said. In speaking on the point of consulting the country about this resolution, my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) said that it had been consulted. I said rather that under this policy the Canadian people had been insulted, not the British Empire at all—meaning, of course, that the fighting spirit of young Canada had been insulted.

Mr. PELLETIER: Then, it is the Canadian people who are insulting themselves in doing what is at the present time so much needed by the motherland. I can only repeat what I had begun to say, that when the hon. member for South Renfrew has found that the effort which he made last night is fruitless and abortive, he would change his mind in that respect.

Mr. GRAHAM: Give us a chance.

Mr. PELLETIER: Hon. gentleman want to have a chance! Where would the hon. gentleman run if he had a chance?

Mr. BUREAU: He would run in Quebec county and beat you.

Mr. PELLETIER: Surely that should not be said in this House by a man representing the minority in his county, and elected by a judge.

Mr. BUREAU: Anybody can sit for the majority.

Mr. PELLETIER: That is true, but it depends on the amount of self respect. I probably have to beg my hon. friend's pardon for being so prompt in replying to him, but these interruptions will provoke answers. Sometimes you may go a little beyond what you intend, but it is the fault of the man who interrupts.

Mr. BUREAU: The hon. gentleman's remarks are very welcome and very interesting.

Mr. PELLETIER: I said a moment ago, before I was interrupted, that we are becoming partners of Great Britain; at all events, we are getting closer to Great Britain, and this will be one of the big steps in that direction. We are ceasing to be a colony, and we are becoming something more important. That is the view which the right hon. leader of the Opposition has himself expressed on many occasions and principally on the other side of the Atlantic. Let me read what he said in Glasgow:

> We are free to-day but we are colonists. Will I break your hearts if I tell you that we aspire to be something more than colonists; we aspire to play a greater part in the Empire of Great Britain. . . . Our ambition is to remove what disparity there may be between an Imperial subject and a Colonial subject. It is the intention of the colonists to go onwards until we have a fully United Empire—the British Empire.

Here is what he said at Edinburgh:

> The relations of the colonies to the motherland to-day are satisfactory; but they are not permanent, they are temporary. The time will come when the present relations will not be satisfactory and when that time comes the relations must become one of two things—either they must break altogether or they must become closer.

Is not that the policy which is contained in the resolution before us? Is it not calculated to bring the Mother Country and Canada closer together? This may be a tribute in some way, but not in the odious way which is suggested in the Grit papers of this country. It is a tribute in two ways: It is a tribute from the heart in one respect, and it is at the same time a tribute to our self-respect. In that way you can call it a tribute. Everybody knows, and everybody is proud of the fact that we are becoming a nation. Where would we be to-day if, during the childhood, the infancy, of this country, we had not been protected by the British flag and the British navy? Why, Sir, at the moment when we are becoming a nation, when we are entering upon the stage of nationhood, we realize that we would be to-day a part and parcel of some other country if we had not been protected by the British flag and the British navy when we were young and defenceless.

We have been told in some quarters that we have lost territory and rights on account of treaties which have been made. Whatever may be my personal opinion in that respect, I shall not discuss it now; but I think that upon important occasions, to say the least, if we have lost rights, it has been because of the attitude taken, not by gentlemen from Great Britain, but by a man appointed by the preceding Government to act as an arbitrator with regard to an important matter. These facts are well known, and therefore it is of no use to reproach England with that. At all events, would that be enough, even if it were true, to justify what has been said in that respect? I do not think it would. I said a moment ago that but for the protection to which I have alluded we would be to-day part and parcel of another country. Have we not reason to be satisfied with what we are to-day, and with what we are going to be to-morrow? After years of toil and hardship, while Canada is within sight of the promised land, we find ourselves possessors of half a continent; we have a united, happy, contented people;

the future is before us; we have a great mission ahead of us; and the time has come when the Prime Minister of this country has said in England that Canada would be the adjunct of no one, not even of the motherland. When the country has reached that stage, we ought to be proud of ourselves, and if we have reached that stage it is because of the protection we have received. A greater destiny than that of throwing in our lot with the people to the south of us has been steadily kept in view. We are moving onward in the march of progress, and we all believe that we will have a great country in ten, fifteen, or twenty years.

My right hon friend the leader of the Opposition has spoken of an emergency; and before that the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) had even looked up his dictionary to find what 'emergency' meant. Evidently this word is quite as unfamiliar to the ears of hon. gentlemen opposite as it is to some of the press of this country. But, let us not stop at words, let us look at big things in a big way. There is nothing in a name but there is in a big deed when you come to look at it in a proper light. We claim that there is an actual and pressing need. We claim that a situation confronts us which has got to be met now, because if we do not meet it now then when the time of danger has arrived it will be too late to take the necessary precautions. We are given three arguments by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House against our policy. We are told that British statesmen, the members of the British Government, have proclaimed from their seats in the House of Commons that there is no danger; that old England is all right, and that she can hold her own. We are told in the second place that there is no German war scare, and in the third place it is said: the Empire is not in danger, let us sleep soundly. Declarations made by the Ministers of the Crown in England have to be read with some common sense. Our hon. friends opposite find in the words of British ministers a certain meaning, their newspapers find a certain meaning also, while others will quote the same words or others and will derive from them an absolutely different conclusion. That all goes to show that the statesmen in England have exposed the two sides of the question and further, the British ministers have to speak with restraint. It may be the part of a great soldier at a given moment to express his anxiety in words that ring throughout the world, and even if he should speak the truth, diplomacy and policy may require that these words should be to a certain extent contradicted or explained I feel that what I now say will be thoroughly understood by hon. gentlemen in this House. We are told that there is no quarrel between England and any other country, and I am glad of it, and I do not pretend there is. But I do know, and nobody can deny it, that at any moment one spark may set the whole of Europe ablaze; a fact of which we had an example during the last few months, and it may be that the danger is not over. The danger of actual warfare may come at any moment, and who will dare say that the Empire must not be prepared for it. And even supposing for the moment there is not that danger of actual war to-day, is it not the duty of every nation to look to what may happen to-morrow. What will that to-morrow bring? Facts, important in themselves, have been put before this House by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Marine, and it is not necessary for me to deal further with them than to say that nobody will deny that the supremacy of Great Britain at sea is not to-day what it used to be. Is not that a situation which should be met, and met in a patriotic way? What has become of the splendid isolation in which Great Britain was years ago and which she then could well afford? We have now the triple alliance. Great Britain made with France an entente cordiale in 1904, and in 1907 that entente was extended to Russia. The two-power standard is gone.

Mr. BELAND: It is not gone.

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend knows what I mean by saying that the two-power standard is gone; it is now three to two. If my hon. friend takes the number of battleships and cruisers and so on and figures it out for himself he will find that my statement is correct.

Mr. BELAND: The two-power standard is not gone.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let my hon. friend make the calculation I have suggested, and he will find that I am right.

Mr. BELAND: I say the two-power standard is not gone, and Mr. Churchill says it also.

Mr. PELLETIER: I happen to know what Mr. Churchill said.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Then tell us; some more secrets?

Mr. PELLETIER: Will the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, from his seat in the House—I will not say play to the mob, because I have too much respect for him; but will he not say that there are secrets and confidential things which the Government must not reveal?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I would be sorry to believe that any British statesman would say in public what is not true.

Mr. PELLETIER: I do not mean that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have read the speeches of Mr. Churchill as well as my hon. friend has, and I took it that he was speaking the truth.

Mr. PELLETIER: That is not at all what I meant, and the right hon. gentleman knows it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I do not know it.

Mr. PELLETIER: I made a statement as to a fact to this House, and somebody from the back benches called out: 'Is it confidential?' At that moment I called the attention of the leader of the Opposition to the incident, and asked him if he was going to play to the mob by approving of cries such as that I heard coming from his supporters behind him. My right hon. friend cannot get out of it by saying that Mr. Churchill has told the truth. Certainly Mr. Churchill has told the truth. My right hon. friend has been a member of a government for fifteen years, and will he say that a minister of the Crown has to tell everything to the public? He will not say it and nobody else will.

Mr. BELAND: The number of ships that are being built is not a secret.

Mr. PELLETIER: It is not necessary for any reasonable man to go into secrets. We have enough before us for any reasonable man, who is not playing with politics on this question, to be fully convinced. This document from the British Government, which we have before us, says, 'We have protected you and your trade, and we will do it again.' After that, momentous facts are given, and the conclusion, which we cannot read too often in this House, is as follows:

> But the aid which Canada could give at the present time is not to be measured only in ships or money. Any action on the part of Canada to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy, and thus widen the margin of our common safety, would be recognized everywhere as a most significant witness to the united strength of the Empire, and to the renewed resolve of the overseas dominions to take their part in maintaining its integrity.

A schoolboy will understand what that means without asking for any secret documents or communications. Every one will understand that, except those who are blind or want to be blind for political party purposes. In order to have something which is pressing, it is not necessary that there should be actual war. The words found by the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) himself in his dictionary were that 'emergency is a pressing need.' Those words are sufficient. I alluded a moment ago to this defunct child, the draft navy bill of 1904, and I find there a definition which will exactly correspond with the actual situation. Emergency is defined there to mean, 'War, invasion, riot or insurrection, real or apprehended.' Now 'danger apprehended' creates an emergency. This word is to be found in the naval law of 1910. Put the word 'apprehended' side by side with a resolution which provides for the construction of ships, and you will have the whole thing worked out and easily understood. It is for a danger apprehended that these ships are going to be built. They will not be ready to-morrow; that is not what is needed for actual war. There is an apprehended danger, and to meet the situation, ships will be built which will take their part in the common defence of the Empire.

Mr. PUGSLEY: May I ask my hon. friend a question? My hon. friend seems to have been studying the situation carefully. Can he tell the House, in view of the present activities in all the shipyards in England, owing to the great number of ships that are being built, both commercial ships and war vessels, how long it would take to have these three dreadnoughts constructed in England?

Mr. PELLETIER: I do not know exactly in months, but one thing I am sure about is that it will take one half the time to build them in the old country that it will take here.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is not answering my question. I would ask my hon. friend the question again. If my hon. friend can tell me, I should like him to do so; if he cannot, it makes no difference.

Mr. PELLETIER: As I told my hon friend, I could not say exactly.

Mr. PUGSLEY: How close could my hon. friend come to it?

Mr. PELLETIER: About two years or two years and a half on the other side, but we have been told by the late Government that it would take three or six years to build a navy in this country.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If the agreement which has been referred to by my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) says six years, does not my hon. friend know that that means for the whole eleven war vessels, and that there are to be two vessels constructed every eighteen months?

Mr. PELLETIER: Will my hon. friend allow me to answer this question to the point?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Certainly.

Mr. PELLETIER: The suggestion that we would have a Canadian navy carries with it, I suppose, the fact that we are going to have a navy which could do something, and which would be a unit to be depended upon. Now, the policy of my hon. friends on the other side was to have twelve ships of that description, and I take it that these ships were needed for the purposes in view, and it is those twelve ships which it would have taken six years to build. My hon. friend is satisfied now, I suppose?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not see that my hon. friend has answered the question.

Mr. PELLETIER: If that is no answer, I do not see what answer will satisfy my hon. friend.

I will not make the quotations; as I said a moment ago, quotations are made on both sides, and everybody finds in them what he wants to find; but I was most impressed on the 10th of July last, when I heard in the British House of Commons, Mr. Bonar Law, leader of the Opposition, tell his countrymen that the German navy, ever growing in strength and efficiency, at twelve hours' distance from the English shore, was almost like a loaded cannon pointed all the time at England. I was impressed with those words, and I looked into the situation and tried to understand it. Words like those convey a meaning which nobody here will underestimate.

We have been told that we are going to lose our autonomy. How can any reasonable man outside of this Parliament assert that we are going to lose our autonomy, because we choose at an important moment to do what we are doing now? Where is the Parliament that is going to legislate for us? If we lose any particle of autonomy, surely somebody else will legislate for us; we have not been told yet who will, and I should like to hear an answer to that question. This Government by the mouth of its leader has said that whatever is the permanent policy later on, the people of this country will be consulted, and, moreover, the people of this country will have a voice in the councils of the Empire. Is that losing autonomy or is that gaining in importance and becoming greater than we were before? I claim that what we are doing now will not only help the motherland and the British Empire, but is in our own interest as a country. Great Britain tells us that she is prepared to continue to do for the spoiled child all that she has done in the past. That is very well. But human nature is human nature. If, while other parts of the Empire are doing the work of Empire, we the strongest, the largest of the overseas dominions, sit and look on, may we not expect that, at any moment, the motherland will become more lukewarm to our interests than before? I think that is a fair question. We have known in the past the most important British statesmen to make certain statements about the colonies. One of the greatest men of England, Mr. Gladstone, spoke once of what he called 'the wretched colonies' as being 'a millstone about the neck of England.' And Mr. Disraeli, who afterwards became Lord Beaconsfield, suggested at one time that the colonies should be given over to the United States in settlement of outstanding difficulties. This state of things—I thank Providence for it—has ceased to exist; and you find that to-day, in the old country, everybody takes the same interest in Canada, almost, as we Canadians do, and Canada is truly and really considered over there as part and parcel of their great country. Are we prepared to return to the state of things in which these ominous words were pronounced in the days gone by? I say no.

There are three courses open to us to-day. One is for us to become part and parcel of the United States? Now, as my hon. friend himself said yesterday, if that question were put to the people of Canada, there would be for answer, a loud and unanimous, No! from one ocean to the other. Well, if that is not to be our future destiny, are we going to be an independent country? We are to-day, Sir, to all intents and purposes practically an independent country. Why, we have the right even to tax importations from the motherland; we have the right to settle as we choose every question pertaining to Canada. We are an overseas dominion. But what do we lose by it, what do we suffer by it? We gain everything and lose nothing by it. But, if we were an independent country what would be in store for us? Should we not, if we were an independent country, be under the necessity of contracting alliances? All the important countries in Europe, all the important countries throughout the world, are uniting their strength in order to be able to face any future situation. What would that involve? Would not that involve something more, something much heavier and much more difficult to bear, than the present situation? But, Sir, everybody in Canada to-day, except a very few, is satisfied with the present situation, and believes that the third solution, which I now intend to speak about, is the only one for us—that we shall remain part and parcel of that great Empire on which the sun never sets. But, can we do that without doing what is our proper share for the common good? The answer to that question is not forthcoming.

We have been told in certain quarters that we should continue to build railways and dig canals, and that our situation in

the world would be well taken care of if we did that. But, Sir, this is a question of give and take. If we receive help, protection, will we be content merely to build railways and pay our gas bills regularly? I do not think we will. The situation, as I understand it, is simply this: We are doing something which is agreeable to the motherland, something which she prefers. And what does it amount to? It amounts practically to a loan of Canadian ships, which, when this country has been consulted and has decided the question, will come back to us. And what shall we have lost? Simply the interest on the amount—that is, $1,750,000. And this instead of the useless navy of hon. members opposite which would have cost between $5,000,000 and $10,000,000 a year. On the whole, Sir, I think, we are making a good bargain for Canada.

Look at the situation of the near future. Everybody is interested now, in seeing what is to happen about the Panama canal. The western situation has to be taken care of, and Canadians, of all parties, must prepare for the increased production of grain in the West. Now, I think it may fairly be said that when the Panama canal is open, probably from points east of Saskatoon, grain will continue to come eastward for export. But from points west of Saskatoon, it is very likely that some proportion of the grain of Canada will seek the west coast and go through the Panama canal. Is it not important that the question of fees and tolls on the Panama canal should be settled and well settled? In a way we are more interested in that question than even Great Britain herself. Could we, alone, settle this question as advantageously as we can settle it with the help of the motherland, and with her statesmen at our back and helping to have the situation solved as it should be solved? That is only a sample of the many advantages which we, as Canadians, have to expect. And for these advantages we should be ready to do our duty. A motion was presented in this House during the debate on the Address to the effect that Canada should not do anything in this matter until she had a voice in the councils of the Empire. I do not wish to refer to that at length, but I would like simply to say a word. This measure now before the House, coupled with the speech of the leader of the Government, provides for a temporary thing. With this temporary step we have a preliminary voice in the councils of the Empire. And when we come, if it comes to that after consultation with the people, to a permanent policy, then we shall have a more important voice in those councils. Is that not all that was contained in the amendment? If the amendment had not been presented to the House at all, the proposal now put before the country meets the situation, I think fairly well. Shall we indulge in discussing past declarations? The hon. member for Rouville has stated that it is a false principle to take part in the wars of the Empire, but I shall not discuss this matter in that way. Hon. members on the other side of the House may do it if they choose, but I think these tactics of party warfare are not suited to the discussion of such an important question as we now have before us. This matter should not be settled by scrapbook oratory or argument; it is too big for that, and, in my humble opinion, scrapbook arguments will not be appreciated by the people of Canada as forming an important feature of the settlement of so vital a question. This policy is either good or bad. If it is good, past declarations by the ton will not make it bad.

In view of the fact that this measure has to be judged by the facts before us, I was astounded to hear the right hon. leader of the Opposition say that four years ago he knew everything which this memorandum states. Truly he must have been a prophet or a great guesser, because important events have taken place in the last four years, and I rather think my right hon. friend went too far when he made that assertion. Events which have transpired during the present year have created a completely new situation in the British Empire and in other countries. We all know that about twelve years ago Germany had practically no navy, and that what is called the fleet law was passed in 1898. I have before me the new law passed in 1900, and I may say that the memorandum from the Admiralty refers to a paragraph in the preamble of that law. In order to put before the House and the country the nature of the German law, I quote as follows, from the fleet law of 1900 when referring to the law of 1898:

> The fleet law does not provide for the possibility of a naval war against a great naval power, because when it was drawn up in the summer of 1897, the chief point was to ensure the carrying out of the fleet scheme of 1873 in up-to-date material, the increase being limited to the small number of battleships necessary in order at least to carry out the organization demanded by tactical considerations for a double squadron.
>
> 'The argument, to the fleet law allowed of no doubt as to the military value of the battle fleet. It is expressly stated that 'against the more important naval powers the battle fleet has solely the significance of a fleet for surprise attack.' That is to say, the ships are to do their utmost. What is possible in this respect becomes apparent when it is borne in mind that the fleet law provides for a total of 42 cruisers, while, for example, the greatest naval power of today possesses 206 cruisers (ready and in

course of construction) and has besides at its disposal bases and coaling stations on all the principal trade routes.

I will now quote from the German fleet law of 1900:

For the attainment of this object, viz., protection of our trade and colonies by assuring peace with honour, Germany requires, according to the strength of the great naval powers and with regard to our tactical formations, two double squadrons of first-class battleships, with the necessary attendant cruisers, torpedo boats, &c. Since the fleet law provides for only two squadrons, the construction of third and fourth squadrons is proposed. Two of these four squadrons will form one fleet. The tactical formation of the second fleet should be similar to that of the first as provided in the fleet law.

Information as to the actual number of additional ships required, prepared on a definite basis, as in the case of the battle fleet, cannot be given for some time. If the demand is made that the foreign service fleet is to be in a condition—

(1) To powerfully represent German interest everywhere in time of peace;

(2) To be equal to operating against foreign countries possessing fleets of no importance worth mentioning, an increase of at least five large and five small cruisers, besides one large and two small cruisers as a material reserve, appears necessary.

The House will bear me out when I say that up to the year 1900 there was in the two fleet laws mentioned, no apparent ambition on the part of Germany, to take away from the Mother Country the supremacy of the sea.

This is where we were in 1911. We will now look at the proportion as attained in 1912:

I have here the German naval law of 1912, and what does it say? Members of the House will see that it is no more the humble words which Germany used before.

The organization of the fleet still suffers from two serious defects. The one defect consists in the fact that in the autumn of every year the time-expired men, i.e., almost one-third of the crews in all ships of the battle fleet are discharged and replaced mainly by recruits from the inland population. Owing to this the readiness of the battle fleet for war is considerably impaired for a prolonged period.

The requisite ships for this third active squadron are to be derived and so on.

And then, further on :

This means that the maintenance in commission of ships in the reserve can be reduced by one-half in consequence of the increase of active organizations, the formation of a third active squadron in commission of three battleships, three large and three small cruisers, &c.

But listen to these words :

The second defect consists in the fact that at the present time with an establishment of 58 capital ships only 21 capital ships are available at first, if the reserve fleet cannot be made ready in proper time. Since the fleet law was drawn up, this latter has become more and more unlikely, as the moment at which the reserve fleet can be ready for war gets more and more deferred. This is a consequence of the ever-growing complexity of modern ships and of the steadily growing difficulty in training large organizations. At the present day, therefore, the reserve fleet only comes into consideration as a second fighting line; but in view of our great numerical strength, &c.——

What does this mean ? It is easily understood and may be briefly put. Before 1912 Germany never thought of being ready at once for war, of having a big array of battleships in the first fighting line, but here in 1912 those are the words she speaks, and what does she do ? She not only provides for new battleships and cruisers to be built, but she takes out of the reserve fleet one-half of that fleet and puts it with the active fleet ready for war at any time, and not in the second fighting line. Did my right hon. friend know these facts four years ago ?

What is the result of these figures ? That whereas in 1911 Germany had in the active battle fleet 17 battleships and in the reserve battle fleet nine battleships, the change has operated so that now she has 25 battleships in the active battle fleet and only four in the reserve. They have gone up in one year, by one stroke of the pen, by one piece of legislation, from 17 to 25 battleships. Is that nothing? Has it any meaning or not?

Let us take now the battle-cruisers. The active fleet had four cruisers and the reserves had two. They have made it for the future eight in the active battle fleet and one in the reserve. The small cruisers have gone up from twelve to eighteen, just as a result of this law. Who will say, in fairness that this has not created a completely new situation?

This fleet is not meant as a pure ornament. The Minister of Marine has represented to this House that Germany is an unassailable power by sea, and this is an undisputed fact. She is protected by enormous batteries, protected by everything which human science can devise, protected by a long line of islands beginning at Heligoland and going as far as the Frisian Islands. There is not one ship or twenty ships of the British navy to-day which could do anything to the small German coastline. We had before what might be called a land-locked navy as far as Germany is concerned. But what do we see to-day? We see that three great naval stations of Germany—Emden, Williamshaven, and Cuxhaven—have become the strongest points in the world except Gibraltar, so far as defence is concerned. We

see also that the great warships of Germany which formerly could not enter the North Sea by the canals have perfect freedom of movement. The Kaiser Wilhelm canal and the Kiel canal have been deepened so as to bring the war vessels into the North Sea by the shortest possible route. Instead of making the long detour, the big ships—the Oldenburg, the Moltke, and the Von der Tann—will be able to come into the North Sea at short notice, in a few hours. Is that situation new or not? Are British statesmen bound to look at that situation as it is created? I think I am justified in saying that no one will deny that these facts should be taken into account. The consequence is that a new situation has been created and we should face it before it is too late. To put it colloquially, I would say that it is useless after the wreck has taken place to get the life-saving apparatus, and that it is too late after the fire has occurred to organize and equip a fire-brigade.

We are told that the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite would lead to the revival of the ship-building industry in Canada. By that policy we were to strive by leaps and bounds to build ships, although we had no shipyards or equipment. But by the measure which we have placed before Parliament, well worked out, matured and well arranged, we will begin at the beginning: shipyards will be constructed, and ship-building, one of the old industries of Canada and of Quebec, will be revived; the place held in Quebec by the wooden ship-building industry of years ago will be taken by the building of vessels of steel.

We have a precedent for what we are doing to-day, and, in the second place, this precedent has shown to us the path of duty. I shall not refer to what took place in this country in 1775 or in 1812. Those facts are well known, and public men very often speak about them. But, I shall put before the House certain documents which will show that instead of doing the thing that is considered degrading on the other side of the House, we are simply doing what our own ancestors have done in the past. I have here a photographic reproduction of a circular which I want to put before the House and which is dated 1793. This is not 1775, nor 1812, but it shows the constancy, the continuation of those things. It is a circular letter signed by the Roman Catholic bishop of Quebec who had then the whole province of Quebec under his jurisdiction and who wrote to the priests under him and told them what their duty was at that time. This document is somewhat lengthy and I shall not read the whole of it. I shall translate a few paragraphs and if the House does not object we might perhaps put the whole of it on 'Hansard.'

An hon. MEMBER : Read it if you want to put it on 'Hansard.'

Some hon. MEMBERS : Read it, read it.

Mr. PELLETIER : It is not because I have anything to hide, but because I desire to save the time of the House. (Reading):

Gentlemen: notices received from New York within a few weeks give us to understand that a French fleet which has left the coast of the United States of America has, or may have, the intention of coming over to the province of Lower Canada. The circumstance has appeared to us to be of sufficient importance to justify us in soliciting your attention and in doing this our duty and our inclination are entirely in accord.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm): (Translation.) May I inquire from the hon. gentleman whether the documents he is quoting from is written in French?

Mr. PELLETIER : Yes.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Then I shall request him to read it in French to begin with.

Mr. PELLETIER: I shall proceed as I have a mind to, and my hon. friend will be at liberty to correct any mistakes by comparing my translation with the French text which he will find by Monday in 'Hansard.'

Mr. LAFORTUNE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of order. I maintain that, considering that document is written in the French language, it should be read in French to begin with. How can we know whether the translation he gives us is correct?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I fail to find anything in the rules of the House which compels the reading of this document in the French language, especially after the statement just made by the hon. minister that he intends having the original document inserted in 'Hansard'.

Mr. PELLETIER : The hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) may rest assured of one fact: I am translating it to the best of my ability, but the translation and the French version being in 'Hansard,' whatever is wrong with my translation will be corrected by any person who sees it.

It is not because we have any anxiety about your personal conduct in this matter in case of some enterprise on the part of the French fleet or power in our province. The complete loyalty of the clergy of this diocese, which was shown during the invasion of 1775, is a guarantee of your zeal in defending on all occasions the interests of the Government, those of the religion of which you are the ministers and those of the country in which

you live and which, by the admirable disposition of Providence, are so closely united and bound together. But, as we have to fear that the farmers of this country, mainly in the country districts, may be struck by the name of French and may therefore not exactly understand the line of conduct which they should follow in circumstances like that, it has seemed to us absolutely essential that you should put before them the following considerations:—

1. That, by the capitulation of Quebec in 1759 and of Montreal in 1760, and much more by the treaty of Paris in 1763, the ties which bind them to France have completely disappeared and the fidelity and obedience, which before were due to the King of France, they now owe to His Majesty the King of England.

2. That the oath taken by them or their ancestors to the King of England when this country was conquered binds them in the same manner, that they should not violate that oath and that if they did they would be guilty towards God as well as towards themselves.

3. That, independently, of the obligation which results from an oath like that, the conduct, full of humanity, kindness and benevolence, that the British Government has always shown towards them, should suffice to attach them inviolably to the British Crown.

4. That, in particular, the constant protection granted to their religion by the same Government makes it a bounden duty for them to exert their efforts in order to prevent themselves from passing under any other domination.

5. That the spirit of religion, subordination and attachment to the Government, which hitherto was one of the glories of the realm of France, has been replaced in later years by another spirit of independence, anarchy,——

And so on. I have had some difficulty in translating this, but, at all events, I have given the main parts of it which I wanted to put before the House in English, and it is with the greatest pleasure that I put it on 'Hansard' in French, because I want it to be there.

Mr. LAFORTUNE : What is the name of the bishop who signs that ?

Mr. PELLETIER : The name is Bishop Deneault. The circular as it appears in French is as follows :

Circular to the Parish Priests.

Gentlemen: notices received from New York within a few weeks give us to understand that a French fleet which has left the coast of the United States of America has, or may have, the intention of coming over to the province of Lower Canada. The circumstance has appeared to us to be of sufficient importance to justify us in soliciting your attention and in doing this our duty and our inclination are entirely in accord with the wishes of His Excellency the Right Hon. Lord Dorchester.

It is not because we have any anxiety about your personal conduct in this matter in case of some enterprise on the part of the French fleet or power in our province. The complete loyalty of the clergy of this diocese, which was shown during the invasion of 1775, is a guarantee of your zeal in defending on all occasions the interests of the Government, those of the religion of which you are the ministers and those of the country in which you live and which, by the admirable disposition of Providence, are so closely united and bound together. But, as we have to fear that the farmers of this country, mainly in the country districts, may be struck by the name of French and may therefore not exactly understand the line of conduct which they should follow in circumstances like that, it has seemed to us absolutely essential that you should put before them the following considerations:—

1. That, by the capitulation of Quebec in 1759 and of Montreal in 1760, and much more by the treaty of Paris in 1763, the ties which bind them to France have completely disappeared and the fidelity and obedience, which before were due to the King of France, they now owe to His Majesty the King of England.

2. That the oath taken by them or their ancestors to the King of England when this country was conquered binds them in such manner, that they should not violate that oath and that if they did they would be grievouly guilty towards God, nee enim habebit infantem Dominus eum qui assumpserit nomen Domini Dei sui frustra, Exod. 20.9.

3. That, independently, of the obligation which results from an oath like that, the conduct, full of humanity, kindness and benevolence, that the British Government has always shown towards them, should suffice to attach them inviolably to the British Crown.

4. That, in particular, the constant protection granted to their religion by the same Government makes it a bounden duty for them to exert their efforts in order to prevent themselves from passing under any other domination.

5. That the spirit of religion, subordination and attachment to the Government, which hitherto was one of the glories of the realm of France, has been replaced in later years by a spirit of independence, anarchy and parricide which, not content with putting to death or sending into exile the sound portion of the French nation, has sent to the scaffold their virtuous sovereign and rightly filled with indignation all the great powers of Europe; and that the greatest evil that might befall Canada, would be to undergo the rule of such revolutionists.

6. That under the present circumstances, the Government is not alone interested in warding off these Frenchmen from the province, but that every loyal subject, every true patriot, every good Catholic, desirous of conserving his liberty, his laws, his morals, his religion, is particularly and personally interested therein.

We flatter ourselves, gentlemen, that the spirit of God, your zeal for the salvation of the people confided to your care, and your loyalty to the Government under whose rule we have the happiness to live, will enable

you to enlarge, whether in your public instructions, or in private conversation, on the principles which we have merely pointed out herein. And should you consider that the publication of this our letter is likely to give greater weight to your entreaties, we hereby authorize you to read it at church meetings for divine service, leaving it to your own judgment to decide how often it should be read.

Meanwhile, we entreat you to join with us in praying to Heaven that our diocese may be be spared the innumerable evils which would result from the introduction in this country of that new spirit of impiety, independence and debauchery.

I remain, gentlemen, with a sincere and retire devotion

Your most humble and obedient servant.

‡JEAN FRANCOIS,
Bishop of Quebec.

Quebec, November 9, 1793.

Not only were these principles preached by the head of my church, but they were put in practice as well. In 1798 an effort was made to have Parliament vote a sum of money to aid Great Britain in her then difficulties: but the country was poor and the Government was poor and it was thought not opportune to impose a special tax for that purpose. Then, a great act of patriotism and devotion was witnessed in Lower Canada and the whole people. French and English came together and organized a subscription to raise money to send it as their humble contribution to the Mother Country to help her in her wars. I have taken from the archives, our glorious archives I call them, the documents I now have in hand. A movement to start subscriptions for the purpose I have mentioned was started in Montreal, another in Quebec, another in Three Rivers, and another in Sorel, and from all these centres the lists of subscribers speak with vivid eloquence of the patriotism of the Canadians, French and English alike, of that day. At the head of the list is the name of the patriot Bishop of the province of Quebec with a subscription of £50 and most of the priests of the more important parishes gave their contributions, and opposite the names of many of them is the undertaking that they will continue their subscription yearly so long as the war lasts. The subscription list for Montreal contains the following statement at its head, and follows the names of the French subscribers, some of whom I shall read:

Being desirous of assisting in the glorious struggle which, should it please Providence to crown by a successful issue, cannot fail to secure to the British Government the gratitude of millions yet unborn throughout the civilized world have agreed to contribute the sum affixed to our respective names in aid of the general cause and to pay the same on or before the fifteenth day of October next into the hands of His Majesty's Receiver General, to be disposed of as His Majesty shall be pleased to direct.

And we also of the more laborious class, having just emerged from the disadvantages of a long and rigorous winter and being about to make provision for that which is to ensue, do now for the first time experience an additional mortification in being unable to testify our zeal in a manner suitable to our wishes, at the same time trusting that our humble mite contributed with cheerfulness will be favourably accepted as a pledge of our affection to a most benevolent Sovereign and of attachment to our most free and excellent constitution:—Louis Chs. Foucher, Montreal, £25; Louis Plessis Bellair, Ste. Geneviève, 2s. 6d.; Le Séminaire de Montréal, Montreal, £500; Rev. Malard, ptre, Lac des Deux Montagnes, £2; Ignace Lacroix, Montreal, £10; J. B. L'Affricain, Montreal, £1; François Levesque, Montreal, £6; Major Chs. St. Ours, St. Ours, £20; J. Bte. Raymond, La Prairie, £10; N. de Labrevoir, ptre, Lachenaie, £4; N. Pouget, ptre, Berthier, £5; L. Lamonthe, ptre, Lavaltrie, £4; Pierre Panet, Lachenaie, £25; M. Bertrand, ptre, Rivière du Loup, £5; Ls. Ed. Hubert, St. Denis, £3 10s. 9d.; Joseph Duval, ptre, Longue Pointe, £3 10s.; Pierre Juervat, St. Denis, £10; M. Déguire, ptre, Vaudreuil, £6; Jos. Déguire, vicaire, Vaudreuil, £1; J. Bte. Déguire, Vaudreuil, £1; Joachim D'Abreuil, père, Vaudreuil, 5s.; Jos. E. Jonnet, Montreal, 5s.; Pierre Confroy, curé, Boucherville, £5; F. X. Bender, Montreal, £6; Paul Lacroix, Montreal, £1; Gabriel Franchère, Montréal; £2; Rév. Lemaire, ptre, St. Martin, £5; François Duberon, ptre, Varennes, £16; Ls. Montizambert, père, Montréal, £1; — Jilbert, curé, Sainte Anne, £2; Chs. Borduine, Cascades, £5; Ant. Girouard, ptre, Pointe aux Trembles, £4; J. P. Leprohon, Montreal, £10; Noel & Shorto, Montréal, £10; P. F. Cherrier, ptre, Saint-Denis, £10; P. C. Berthelot, ptre, Saint Henry, £3 10s.; Legras Pierreville, Boucherville, £4; Rev. Raimboult, ptre, Pointe Claire, £5; Ls. Chaboillez, notaire, Montreal, £4; Rev. Faribault, père, Berthier, £1; Jacques Cartier, père, St. Antoine, £10; René A. DeBoucherville, Boucherville, £10; Jos. de Cabruère Montarville, Boucherville, £10; Pierre Ls. Panet, Montreal, £40; François Desrivières, Montreal, £25; Charles Labruère, Boucherville, £5; Jos. Périnault, ptre, Montreal, £4; J. Donnagairy, Montréal, £10; Pierre Fortier, Montréal, £5; S. de Beaujeu, Montreal, £10; Jos. Provain, Montreal, £5 11s. 2d.; Alex. Henry, Montreal, £25; Ls. Dulongpré, Montreal, £2; Pierre Huguet Latour, Montreal, £3; J. F. Hébert, ptre, £3; Rosina McClement, Montreal, £15; David David, Montreal, £12 10s.; Michel and Samuel Dumas, Montreal, £8; Jos. Périnault, fils, ptre, Rivière des Prairies, £4; Etienne Deschambault, Longueuil, £3; F. Laperière, Boucherville, £10; Jos. Bédard, Montreal, £6; Maurice Blondeau, Montreal, £6; Pierre Constantin, Montréal, £1; Frs. Compain, curé, St. Antoine, £2; Christophe Marchesseau, St. Antoine, 5s.; Jean Bte. Levesque, Montreal, £1; Samuel David, Montreal, £5; M. Panet, curé, Verchères, £5; Louis Cadieux, Montreal, 10s.; Michel Jaubert, Montreal, 10s.; J. M. C. De les Derners,

Ste. Anne, 10s.; George Meyer, Pointe Claire, £2; Eustache Parent Montreal, £2; François Fillau, Montreal, 10s.; St. Georges Dupré, Montréal, £4; P. R. St. Ours, L'Assomption, £20; M. Réard, ptre, St. Hyacinthe, £2; Jean B. Boucher, curé, Laprairie, £4; François Rolland, Laprairie, £4; Edmond Henry, £4; Joseph Hébert, Laprairie, £4; Jos. Ignace Hébert, Laprairie, £4; Joseph Nolin, Laprairie, £2; Simon Baruret, Laprairie, 5s. 3d.; J. Bte. Perras, Laprairie, £2; Louis Lefebvre, Laprairie, £4; Simon Nixon, Laprairie, £1 3s. 4d.; Antoine Dupré, Laprairie, 5s.; Michel Boucher, Laprairie, 5s.; Frédéric Hintz, Laprairie, 5s. 6d.; Veuve Dupuy, Laprairie, 10s.; François Dupuy, Laprairie, 5s.; Joseph Porcheron, Laprairie, 10s.; Pierre Perras, Laprairie, 5s.; Jos. Tremblay, Laprairie, 5s.; Grant & Laframboise, Montreal, £12 10s.; Christophe Sanguinet, St. Philippe, £6; François Malhiot, Verchères, £8 5s.; François Milloni, Montreal, £6; Louis Charland, Montreal, £2; Lambert St. Omer, Montreal, £2; J. Bte. Desève, Montreal, £1; Charles Martel, curé St. Marc, £2; Pierre Fréchette, curé, Melœil, £2; —— Gadebois, Capte. Milice, Belœil, 15s.

I call attention to the fact that foremost amongst the names is the Roman Catholic Seminary of St. Sulpice of Montreal with a subscription of £500 and a declaration that the same sum of £500 would be given to England every year even for a war with France. We have a similar list for Sorel and amongst the names of subscribers there I find one Mr. Cardin. We have a similar list for Quebec, another for Lavaltrie, another for La Prairie. Permit me to read a very illuminating letter from the parish priest of Lavaltrie, who writing to the Secretary of the Governor General says:

> Allow me to send my humble subscription to help for the cause of the war against France. It is only £4 but it will be the same during the whole time of the war.

There is amongst these papers another document which is very touching indeed, and it says:

> We people do not subscribe the large amounts which other people do, but it is because we are so poor. The little we can give shows our heart and our desire.

These men subscribed, some one shilling, some two shillings, and some less, but the good-will was there. Now, Sir, I ask this House, cannot the Canadians in 1912 do as their ancestors did in 1879. I have here documents which show that similar subscriptions were made in 1800, 1801, 1804 and 1816, and which show that the people of Canada, French and English alike, loyal as they had become to the British Crown and the British Empire were giving what they could afford to help old England in her difficulties.

We are told in certain quarters that we should not do this at the present moment, and some people have used harsh words in telling us that. I wish to say to them that we are doing this, because we believe it to be our bounden and sacred duty, and that no harsh words will prevent us from doing that duty to the limit, as we think we ought to. We, the French-Canadians in this country, have traditions and a history of which we are proud; we ought to maintain those traditions. Once there was in this country a flag which was a beloved flag for us; but it has gone away; it has been replaced by another one. We saw those two flags at war after that for many years, and our hearts bled; but we stood where we were, true to our new allegiance and true to the duty which we owed to Britain. To-day our hearts have their reward, when we see those two flags of old on the horizon, interwoven and intertwined, and when we have the satisfaction of knowing that in defending one we are helping the other. Let us do what comes straight from the heart to the lips. It may be a big contribution, but Canada will soon be big and count for much. I have great faith in the moral effect of what we are going to do with this measure. I believe that we are here working and striving in our humble way for the peace of the world. I hope and trust that our action will have a world-wide effect. If it has, what has that in store for us? Let me read here a quotation which appears in an important German paper, which is the organ of the German naval and military world:

> It should serve to tranquilize us that Canada attaches to her gift an important condition, demanding henceforth a seat and a voice in the Government of the British Empire. The other large colonies will doubtless follow suit.
>
> We shall no longer have to do with England alone, whose half-anxious, half-menacing stare across the North Sea for years kept all Europe in a state of the worst nervous tension.
>
> Rather will this collaboration in Imperial counsels result in a wider outlook, through the participation of men for whom the British world-Empire has other and higher tasks than a constant challenge to a continental power which, for over forty years, has given more than sufficient proofs of her love of peace.

These words from this very important German paper begin to show the more or less important effect of what Canada is doing to-day. We have in this country, and we glory in having in this country, many noble sons of the German Empire amongst our best citizens. If in the end we are an indirect means of bringing about an understanding between Great Britain and Germany, will not that make us glad? Our German compatriots will help in bringing that about, and perhaps Germany will find that four hundred thousand sons

of hers in this country will then send her a message of joy, of gratitude, and of happiness.

I will now conclude by expressing the confidence and the hope that my compatriots will do their duty in this matter. Circumstances have placed me here in an important but difficult position, a most difficult position indeed, because I feel and understand thoroughly that I cannot fulfil the duties devolving upon me as the co-operators of Sir John A. Macdonald would have done. We are going through momentous times and momentous events, and, calling to my help from my seat here the patriotism of these men and of my worthy and honoured leader, I think it is my duty, and I do it to sound the bugle call of duty to all the French-Canadians, as well as to the other races in Canada. Our forefathers have done their duty; let us do ours and rise equal to the occasion. Our duty is much easier than was theirs; let us fulfil it with a glad heart. If there are some men who want, whilst the process is going on, to stay by the roadside, carping and throwing insults, never mind them; let the others march nobly on with unfurled flag for the defence of our common heritage and our common Empire.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montcalm) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister who has just taken his seat (Mr. Pelletier) has been warmly applauded by his friends on account of his utterances concerning the navy. What a change from former days. I wish you had heard the hon. Postmaster General when he was scouring the province of Quebec, in company with his leaders, Henri Bourassa, the masterly mind, and Armand Lavergne, the beloved one. He loudly applauded these gentlemen when they poured out their invectives before Quebec audiences: Monstrous navy! fatal Bill! iniquitous law! I can assure you he was in a desperate state of mind in those days; he groaned, he almost wept. Just think of it, would he say, we are going to build battleships, we are going to send our children away to be butchered, to be decapitated, to be pierced with bullets. They will be torn away from their mothers' arms. He may have delivered some fine oratory to-day, but it was quite another kind he had in store at the time. Those poor Canadians, he would exclaim, they are making preparations to help Great Britain to whom we owe nothing. Great Britain wants us to supply her with ships, but is she not the wealthiest nation on the surface of the earth? Such a proud nation as Great Britain to come and beg ships from Canada, is not that a shame? Thus did the Postmaster General speak, and the Nationalists the same. They even went so far as to say: D.....navy!

Mr. PELLETIER.

They came to wage war against me in my own constituency, because I had voted in favour of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's navy. They cried out on every husting that the end of the world was coming, such was their idea of the proposal to build ships for the defence of Great Britain. There was no emergency then, no necessity for it, oh, no; such a proposal smacked of national treason.

And what do they say to-day? To-day they say that Laurier has not done enough. The right hon. Prime Minister then called the vessels purchased by the Government a 'tin-pot' navy. But the Nationalists, on the other hand, were going through the province of Quebec claiming that Laurier was doing too much, there was no sense in it. Among them there were able men, forcible speakers, and they succeeded in deceiving the people. They brought defeat to several of our candidates who had voted for that measure. In my constituency, the master mind, as I said, came to meet me. I remember he stated among other things: The children and grand-children of those members who supported the navy Bill will curse their forerunners. How nice, to thus advise our children to curse us. I voted for the Laurier Bill without fear or misgivings, and I am not sorry for it. Those who branded us as time-servers, because we supported that measure, are in a very different disposition to-day. What do you think of it?

Mr. Monk, who condemned the policy of his leader, later on accepted a portfolio in his Cabinet. That is a thing I would never think of doing. He used to say that Laurier's policy was iniquitous, but that Mr. Borden's policy was still more objectionable. And those same gentlemen are here to-day loudly praising the Government. They would say to us: You are time-servers, sheepish men, devoid of honour or character. You vote like a lot of sheep. We answered: We are not deserving of such aspersions any more than you are; we love our country, our children, our wives, and we realize what is our duty. You may be sure that should we go through the ordeal once more, I would not hesitate to fulfil my duty as before. I see that the hon. Postmaster General is leaving the House. He is running away, unwilling to hear what I have to say concerning himself. He avoids discussing the navy question, and that is why he kept away from the meeting at Jeune-Lorette. While listening to him, I satisfied myself that he had copied the speech of the hon. leader of the Opposition in support of the navy. But previous to the last elections, he would not listen to a word concerning the navy. He has undergone a wonderful change since

September 21, 1911. He has just repeated what the leader of the Opposition had said, viz, that we are a nation. A queer nation, surely, if we admit our inability to do anything by ourselves, and the necessity under which we are said to be of having our ships built abroad. Does Great Britain order her ships from Germany, Italy, Denmark, France, China, or Japan? No, she has them built at home, and from the very beginnings of the navy, that was the policy she followed. Where does Germany procure her ships? Is it in England, in France, or in some other foreign country? No, at home. Do the United States order their ships from British, French or Japanese firms? No, they build their own vessels, and they build them at home. In following such a policy as is proposed, will we succeed in proving that we are a nation? Why should we apply elsewhere? Oh, it is objected, it will cost too much to build such vessels in Canada? Well, admitting it would cost a little more, it should on the other hand be taken into account that the money would thus remain in the country, those millions would be spent in Canada. But no, that did not suit the views of those gentlemen. They made up their minds to send that money to Great Britain, for the benefit of the workingmen in Manchester and other great British centres, and we will be lookers on while they earn our millions, without ourselves deriving any benefit from it. And those same gentlemen exclaim: Long live the Mother Country! Long live the navy! Long live the contribution to the British navy!

However, the Laurier navy was a Canadian navy, under the control of the Government and of Parliament. The Postmaster General and his friends, statute in hand, succeeded in making the people believe, during the Drummond and Arthabaska election, that it was an Imperial navy. The hon. minister, with all his good Nationalist friends, cried out that Laurier was no longer a French-Canadian, that he was an Englishman who was selling out Canada to Great Britain. These gentlemen went through the province of Quebec exhibiting that famous resolution adopted at St. Eustache and at the Ontario street rink in Montreal. They went to St. Jérome, Nicolet, Chambly and Verchères, everywhere repeating that it was national treason to undertake the building of a navy. Have we not heretofore got along very well without a navy? They would ask, why should we start building one now, it is the country's ruin. Bourassa had two long statements showing the cost of navies in the United States, France, Great Britain, and all great countries in the world. And to better show that it was an extravagant policy, if not a ruinous one, considering that we had always fared well, lived happy and grown prosperous without a navy, he added: In 1901, Mr. Laurier acted right, and similarly in 1903, in London, in 1906 and in 1909; but to-day he has grown old, he is losing his head, he proposes to build a navy in his declining years, you can see that he is not all there. Such were the statements of these gentlemen. Was I not right a moment ago in asserting that they are wonderfully changed?

The Hon. Mr. Monk, of course he is entitled to that appellation, having been a minister for a short time—thus expressed himself at Lachine: Just think of it, I have to break away from my leader; how sorry I feel! Borden is even worse than Laurier, he wants to build a navy and provide a contribution of twenty million dollars. What would he have said at the time had he been told that the contribution would be thirty-five millions? I think he would have given him a pretty stiff dressing down. Surely his disappointment would have been much keener. Why not build the Georgian Bay canal, he would ask, why not carry on the deepening of our system of waterways; why not build new railway lines, help on colonization, build great national highways? We have innumerable requirements at home, and now they are going to take the people's money to build ships. Such were the statements made by Mr. Monk, who with tears in his eyes condemned his leader. How sorry he was! Laurier's policy was objectionable, but Borden's was still worse. In consideration for having thus condemned him, the Prime Minister offered him a portfolio in his Cabinet. Did I suspect that by condemning my leader, I might secure a similar reward, I might be tempted to follow suit.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, no.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: So I say, in any case, why should not the ships be built in this country? Do hon. gentlemen object to protecting Canadian labour, or workingmen who settle in our midst, or those immigrants who are reaching our shores by hundreds of thousands? Why should not our own raw material be utilized in such work? We have wood, iron, steel, tin, nickel, etc., in abundance. Why should we order from Great Britain ships which we are in a position to build here? And these same gentlemen will be appealing to the patriotism of Canadians.

Our primary duty is to protect those who live in Canada, to protect our wives, our children, to consult the country's interest, to expand our trade, to develop our resources, to provide work for those who live in our midst. But this Government seems unable to realize that. They are anxious to have ships constructed for Mrs.

England. I say: No. I love England as I love the Crown under whose protection we live. But what is there to induce us to send our money to support the workingmen over in Europe, and particularly over in Great Britain? We are not in a position to exert any control over that expenditure made in Great Britain. When the hon. Mr. Monk contended along with a good many others, that we owed nothing to Great Britain—and I am not ready to say that I agree with him on that point—his objection would hold good as regards a contribution of thirty-five millions as well as regards any other amount. When has the people ever authorized such a contribution to the British exchequer? Have we authority to give away what does not belong to us? In doing so are we assisting the people? No, we have been sent here to see to it that our national resources are developed, that equitable laws are carried out without injustice to any one, that the public funds are properly expended, in such a way as to satisfy our constituents.

It has been stated that we enjoyed the full privileges of representative government. That is so. But as representatives of the people, have we such a right? When accounts are rendered, it is incumbent on us to inquire from the ministers why they spent ten dollars on such a man, or applied some other amount to such or such a purpose. We look into the accounts and are entitled to know about every detail. We are bound, on the other hand, to justify, to the satisfaction of our electors, vouchers in hand, the whole of that expenditure. Now, if those ships are to be built in Great Britain, will we have the right to inquire what use has been made of our moneys? Show me the accounts, so that I may know to whom you have paid these thirty-five millions? No, will they answer, that is none of your business, you hold no brief from the British House of Commons, you are a Canadian member of Parliament, and consequently you are not entitled to look into the vouchers for that expenditure.

What becomes of representative government under such a system? Will it not soon be a dead letter? And that representative government has cost us the lives of many patriots, some of whom have died on the scaffold for having claimed that privilege.

So I lay down as a principle that under a system of representative government, not a single cent should be spent without authority from the representatives of the people. Would you, Mr. Chairman, be justified in taking a single cent of the indemnity voted as a remuneration for your honourable services, previous to its being voted by Parliament? Are not hon. gentlemen in this House in a similar position? Is not His Royal Highness the Governor General in the same case? So I say that the people have precedence over the King, precedence over the Government, and that they are entitled to know for what purpose and to whom the public moneys have been paid. Hundreds of millions have been expended on building railways, tunnelling mountains, running through glen and prairie, bridging over great rivers, and all that with a view to opening up our country, discovering and developing its resources; but that has always been done with the consent of Parliament.

What would become of our great national undertakings, if we had them carried out elsewhere? Why should we not have our railway cars built somewhere else; why should not our wharfs be constructed by foreigners; and our great factories, and also our crafts for inland navigation? Why, in fact, should not the running of this House be farmed out to foreigners?

This Government is powerful, no doubt, with that honourable majority at its back; but the ministers should bear in mind that they have as their master the people, whose memory is long. Whatever the Government does will be submitted to the people and discussed on the public platform. The people will ask a strict account of the moneys expended outside of Canada without due authority. When the Laurier Naval Bill was brought up, we were told: You have no right to build that navy, as the question has never been submitted to the people. The objection was urged over and over again at the last general election. Well, when has this Government ever called on the people to vote those thirty-five millions? Was that the principle laid down at the last general election? Certainly not; these hon. gentlemen were desirous of getting into power on side issues, and they succeeded in doing so. As Mr. Monk put it: We are here and you are there. Some day the Government will be called to account for all the promises made by these gentlemen, and I am satisfied that the people will grumble some, and when the people grumble, some one has to suffer for it. As I have just stated, in a young country such as ours, I am inclined to think that Mr. Monk was right in contending that we would be making a better use of our millions by investing them in great national works rather than making presents out of them as is proposed.

Nothing more is heard of those great undertakings. There is not a single member of the Cabinet to utter a word about these great improvements which were to be carried out with the funds taken up by the navy. Have they changed their plans? I think the former Minister of Public Works was right in stating that we had too great a need of these moneys for carrying

out improvements in our own country to be able to afford sending them abroad. Why should we spend millions towards helping Great Britain, was urged at the last elections, when our farming community is so much in need of assistance in every shape? The former Minister of Public Works represents a constituency almost wholly made up of honest farmers, and so he had no end of sympathy for the farming class. He was anxious to protect them, to make them more prosperous. Why not assist our cheese factories, our butter factories, and protect the farming industry against outside competition? Why not build canals, irrigate the dry belt, spend the people's money for the people's benefit? I think that before donating thirty-five millions we should look into our requirements. Before sending our money over there, let us come to the assistance of the most numerous class, the farming class.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at Eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

RICHELIEU AND ONTARIO NAVIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO moved second reading of Bill No. 20 respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. Lespérance.

Mr. CARVELL: When this Bill came up on a previous occasion, I raised the objection that it seemed to me there should be some explanation of it. Later on I had a conversation with the promoter of the Bill, and he assured me that he would give an explanation which he thought would be satisfactory to the House. I do not want to delay the passage of the Bill, but there is such a remarkable proposition contained in it that I do feel that the House is entitled to a statement from the hon. gentleman in charge of it.

Mr. SPEAKER: As the hon. member is not present, perhaps it would be better to allow the Bill to stand.

Mr. CARVELL: I think so.

Bill allowed to stand.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 29 to incorporate Canada Western Trust and Mortgage Company.—Mr. Meighen.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of and concurrence in the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) At recess, Mr. Chairman, I was answering those hon. gentlemen on the other side who contend, or rather who contended, that we owe nothing to Great Britain, seeing that it is due to our own efforts if we are still under the British Crown, and that therefore there is no reason why we should build vessels for the defence of the Mother Country. It was even contended that the liberty we now enjoy, we had won at the point of the sword; that to breathe the air of liberty, we had been forced to bore bullet holes through the British flag. Such language is surely energetic enough, and easily understood when coming from those who opposed the building of a Canadian navy. It had been necessary to bore holes through the British flag, to tear it up, in order to enjoy the liberty which is now conceded to us. The statement was reiterated in several localities and at large political meetings. The followers of these gentlemen loudly applauded such statements. They were making a great deal of noise to show that Laurier's naval policy was no good. I challenge those hon. gentlemen to repeat such statements on the floor of the House. When I heard the member, or rather the would-be member, state at St. Eustache, in the county of Bagot, in Chambly and Verchères, and wherever he went: Just think of it, we are called upon to build ships for Great Britain, although British soldiers in 1837-38, did not hesitate using the churches as barns for their horses and making them drink from the chalice. And his followers would cry out vociferously: Hurrah for Marcile!

The hon. Postmaster General knows something about it; he attended a large number of Nationalist meetings, and though one of the most prominent of them, he never protested. To-day he is a thorough-going Imperialist. He wants us to give all our possessions to Great Britain, his newly-adopted country. It is by means of such statements that they succeeded in defeating the Laurier Government. Some contended that we did not owe anything to Great Britain, while others said that Great Britain owed us all; that if she still held Canada, the finest of her colonies, it was due to the loyalty and devotion of the French Canadians. And where are these hon. gentlemen now? I am anxious to hear them speak out on the floor of the House. They have not done much talking since the opening of the debate, but they have modified their former attitude. What has happened since September 21, 1911? Would it be their coming

into power which caused such a change? Would it be the result of promises made, of rewards kept dangling before their eyes? I cannot understand such a right about face. Since September 21, what appeared to be worthless lead is transformed into pure gold. There is some mystery about it. Now, be careful, the people do not readily forget; the people will remember all you said previous to September 21, and will remember as well all you say in the meantime, and the people will not be fooled again.

If only it was shown to us that when the Canadian Cabinet ministers were in London they had concerned themselves with the interests of the farming class; if as a condition to that gift of 35 millions it had been understood that the embargo would be removed off Canadian cattle, I would say something had been achieved. But no, farmers are attended to in election time, when their support at the polls is needed. And when it comes to contributing thirty-five millions to the British exchequer, the interests of the farming class are forgotten. Canadian cattle shipped to Great Britain are stopped at the landing place; they must be slaughtered right there and then to protect Irish, Scotch and English breeders.

Had you been in Drummond and Arthabaska and had you heard the utterances of the then members of the Opposition, you would fully realize that they are not playing the same tune at present. I was present in Drummond when the navy question was being discussed. It was represented as an invention of Laurier's, as something iniquitous, a national treason to build warships, that Canada was in no need of any, being at peace with all other countries and having nothing to fear from any, that this was only a foolish notion that entered Mr. Laurier's head. Where are the fools to-day? Where are the dreamers? Those who spoke thus do not court publicity to-day; they modestly keep in the background, unwilling to reiterate their former statements. There is something puzzling about it. Talented men, fluent speakers, are to-day as mute as fish. They are such fine speakers, who express themselves so much better than I can, if we are to believe a certain fellow who sits in the press gallery and writes disparagingly of the people's representatives, being paid so much a line for the work; I long to hear these masters of oratory who speak so well the tongue of Boileau, while I speak it so poorly, says that gentleman in the gallery. But I, at any rate, have the courage to speak my mind.

The Government attracts settlers to our shores, and why? Because, of three essentials in the make-up of a great country, there is one which we lack. We have the territory, we have the finest waterways in the world, but we are wanting in population. Our country covers an area eight times as large as France, ten times as large as Great Britain, fifteen times as large as Belgium and twice as large as the United States, but our population is very sparse. The Government is taking every means to attract immigration, but after they have reached our shores, what will we do with them? We cannot hope increasing our population unless we have bread and high salaries to help support it, unless we provide work for those who have taken root on Canadian soil.

If we have our ships built in London, that will be of no advantage at all to our public exchequer, while if the contrary plan were adopted, our raw material would be utilized, and our money would be spent in our own territory. Differences of opinion are permissible on questions of procedure, but on an issue such as this there can be but one opinion. The people who toil, who are hard workers and thrifty, will take you to task on that account. They have not appointed you trustees of the public funds only to send them over to Great Britain; they are anxious that you should retain them in Canada, to increase the national exchequer and compensate us for our sacrifices. There cannot be two views about this matter, unless political partisanship should throw a mist over the mind.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Translation: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order; the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel) is smoking in the House.

Mr. LAFORTUNE (Translation.): Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to the hon. minister smoking; possibly that is the only privilege left to him, and very likely he will not enjoy it much longer.

At the start of this debate, if the information tendered by the right hon. Prime Minister be correct, we were evidently on the verge of war. The outlook was threatening, black clouds overhung the horizon. He heard the guns roar, he could smell the powder; all indications pointed to war. I was scared; I began to write out my will. Just think of it, Sir, a war that might have wiped us from the surface of the earth; it was time to settle our accounts with Providence. In the meantime, matters have taken a better turn; for, if we are to believe the Postmaster General, the outlook for war is not so threatening; the sky is clearing up, the guns are no longer heard in the distance, war is less to be apprehended. These hon. gentlemen do not agree in their statements; if they do not agree any better in the council chamber, they must have a time of it.

Let us suppose that Germany should declare war against Great Britain and the latter make preparations, puts all its forces in line. What would there be left here to protect us? Would Great Britain send here the ships she is so much in need of, to defend our coasts, our fisheries, and prevent smuggling? What would there be available then in Canadian waters to protect us? We would not even have a row boat or a punt, we have nothing at all. We could not use Yankee aeroplones, for fear of breaking our necks. What part of the world would benefit the most in time of war? Would it not be Canada, the Empire's premier colony? When a country is at war, trade is at a standstill, so is agriculture, there is a stoppage of all activity. Now, where will England, essentially a manufacturing country, find supplies for her forces? In Canada, of course, in the Northwest territories, where there are so many millions of bushels of wheat available. How will Canada protect those millions of bushels of wheat for export, if we have no ships? Shall we borrow them from the United States, Germany, Italy, China or Japan? We need a few ships for Canada's protection in the first place, and besides that, ready to assist the Empire in case of need. I say that the measure put through by Mr. Laurier is the only necessary one, the only practical one as regards the safety of Canada and the Empire. When I listen to what these hon. gentlemen have to say to-day, I cannot have faith in their sincerity. What they propose is not practical and is a subversion of our country's constitution.

The hon. Postmaster General made some rather surprising statements this afternoon. He went pretty far back into our past history; he even read some circulars, which he would not have read to the electors of Drummond and Arthabaska, and had he done so, the outcome might have been different. They made fun of Mr. Laurier's navy, the member for Chambly and Verchères among others, saying that it was good for nothing, an old tin-pot navy, made up of old discarded ships, which Great Britain had no longer any use for. Had they spoken then as they do to-day, Mr. Gilbert would never have been returned. True, he did not remain very long in this House, and as soon as the electors were given a chance to make amends, they hastened to send him back home again. The hon. Postmaster General thinks that we should not lose sight of the morrow. Right he is, and that is why Sir Wilfrid Laurier who saw far into the future, resolved on making preparations. Let us provide a navy for ourselves, let us begin by building our own ships, and by degrees as circumstances permit, we will do more. We will be content with having two or three ships at the outset, but before long we will build more. These hon. gentlemen opposite will not have time to build any, for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that before long they will have to change places with us and then we will be able to say as one of them said: We are here and you are there. When the Laurier policy will be compared with that of this Government, and the people is put in a position to judge, you may be sure it will not take two years for the verdict to come out. The electorate will have no hesitation in condemning that antinational policy. The people may be fooled once, but you cannot fool them twice in succession. And that you will find out at the next election. It is all right to think of the morrow but at the same time it is too late to do so when the house is on fire. That is what Mr. Laurier had understood when he was getting ready for future wars. In speaking as he has done, the Postmaster General has merely given his endorsation to Sir Wilfrid's policy. His measure provided for the defence of the territory, the protection of our fisheries. I say it was necessary and I will prove what I say: the new ships were barely completed and in Canadian waters than they had to be sent out to seize foreign ships poaching in Canadian waters to the detriment of the public exchequer. Is not that sufficient proof that the policy of the late Government was necessary?

Reference was made at the time to the Niobe and the Rainbow. I heard former candidates say: Those ships are worthless, and if we are carried to power, they will soon be disposed of. I have yet to hear that this has been done. Where are the Niobe and the Rainbow to-day? Are not these hon. gentlemen using them? Are they not part of the fleet? Such is their sincerity. When they are in Opposition, the Niobe and the Rainbow are worthless, the money spent on them was simply wasted. But as soon as they reach power, they go around with them, they make trips in them here and there. Hurrah for the Niobe! Hurrah for the Rainbow! They had a new coat of paint put on them; a new rudder made for the Rainbow, and a new pilot provided. Hurrah for the Rainbow!

These gentlemen spoke thus to the electors of Chambly and Verchères, Yamaska, Berthier, Bagot and Dorchester: Should we get hold of power, that infamous Laurier legislation will be repealed, we will wipe it off the statute book. Where are their promises to-day? The people was to be consulted; that poor people would be called upon to vote by means of a plebiscite. Let us not vote any funds or any contribution, unless the question is

beforehand submitted to the people. Has the people been consulted concerning this gift of thirty-five millions? These gentlemen are like sister Ann in the song, who is all the time looking ahead for somebody who never comes. They will be left a long time in expectation, for, neither repeal of the Laurier Bill, nor plebiscite will be forthcoming. With a view to purchasing the Niobe and the Rainbow, the then Government had obtained a vote of about a million and a half each; and our opponents would say: You have not consulted the people, you have not referred to such a scheme in the course of the last election; therefore you have no right to spend that money. These hon. gentlemen are now in power—I will not say that they are in the manger, as they said of us, I have too much consideration for them to say such a thing, and I do not wish to be in the least sarcastic—but have I not the right to look into their sincerity? Why have they so quickly changed their minds? How comes it that when the Liberals acted in such a manner, it was all wrong, and now that the Conservatives are doing the same thing, everything is all right and sweet?

As to the use to which public funds may be put, differences of opinion are permissible; but I hold that there can be but one opinion as to the principle that the people's representatives are not sent here to give away our money. The people's money should be spent on the people. Whether we vote $2,000 or $100,000, I have the right to ask for the papers and look into the expenditure, so as to know who has profited by it. Have not hon. gentlemen on the other side shown that they were unwilling to give up that privilege? When, at Sorel, in the county of Richelieu, it came to light that the Government had sold some paint to a member, the aforesaid gentlemen, unwilling to sacrifice any of the popular franchises, insisted before the Public Accounts Committee that an inquiry be held, so as to make a clear breast of the whole business. Their action was entirely justified. But if this proposal is agreed to, thirty-five millions will be sent over to London and spent there, without the representatives of the Canadian people having a word to say about it, or being called upon to control, and criticise the expenditure, or audit the accounts. I maintain that such a departure is unconstitutional. Under the constitution we have the power to establish a navy, but there is not a word empowering us to have ships built abroad.

I say 'abroad,' meaning that it is outside the jurisdiction of the Canadian House of Commons, outside our jurisdiction. This work being carried out in Great Britain, we will have no control over the expenditure; therefore I say the measure is unconstitutional. The Government may carry through the measure in spite of the constitution; they hold power, they can get their majority to put it through; but I maintain such action will be contrary to all principles of representative government, of the government of the people by the people and for the people. The Postmaster General stated that is was no time for words, but for deeds. Let us see how he follows the rule laid down by himself. How about his former statements, promises and criticisms? He has not done a single thing to carry out his pledge to the Canadian electorate. Words are of no use, he says, deeds are in order. Very well then, be the first to apply that principle: when one states that there is no use for a navy, the words must have a meaning, or was it resolved even then that the Navy Act would remain in the statute book?

An hon. MEMBER: (Translation.) What about the Empire?

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) What does he want, and where does he hail from? At any rate, he must be a stalwart. Reference has been made to Canada's autonomy. For many years back, I hear that question debated. What should we understand by the country's autonomy? I for one consider that the country's autonomy means the maintenance of the rights and privileges which we enjoy. Are we really preserving the autonomy of Canada when we sacrifice the rights and privileges which the House of Commons enjoys of controlling public expenditure and looking into the Government accounts? Have we the right to delegate to some other country the powers of the House of Commons, its right to control public expenditure? Can we delegate those rights to another country? What is there to justify such action on our part? Have I the right to state to my constituents that I have delegated my powers to some other country? No, I have not that right, and my electors are entitled to know how the funds voted have been expended and whether they have been properly expended. I should be in a position to give them some assurance that I have looked into the accounts, controlled the expenditure, ascertained to whom the moneys have been paid and for what purpose. After all this has been done, I must be able to draw the conclusion that the money of the Canadian people has been put to proper use. How could I arrive at such a conclusion without having the data in hand if I am not posted as to any of the facts, and how could I under such circumstances put myself right with my constituents? I say that the Government's policy is unconstitutional, and I protest with all my might against its being carried out.

It is contended that it would cost more to build those ships in Canada than it would to build them in Great Britain. Well let us, for the sake of argument, admit the truth of this contention. What about it, if the money is spent here? Our people would get the advantage; they would supply the raw material, the coal, the iron, the steel, in short all that is required for building these ships. The mechanics in the large Canadian centres are interested in having these ships built in the country. You will not find a single mechanic to approve of the idea of having these ships built outside of Canada. Just try to impress them with that view at some public meeting and you will find out how they feel about it. All will agree in stating that such works should be carried on in Canada.

Meanwhile we are offered something great in the shape of consolation. The Postmaster General joins in with the Prime Minister to inform us that we will have a representative yonder. What a thundering representative, what a powerful protection in the councils of the Empire! One representative to control the British House of Commons. I pity that poor Canadian, he will have a hard time in making himself heard up there. Canada does not want anything of the kind. It seems to me that the voice of our House of Commons would have a better chance of making itself heard. whoever is sent thither, whatever his personal and political worth, his influence will not amount to much over Imperial decrees when it comes to deciding between war or peace, and once it has been resolved to spend our money differently from what we would have liked. When this Government introduces a measure, it is thoroughly overhauled, and the Opposition has the right to offer criticisms. So I say that such a system of representaion is not satisfactory, is unconstitutional and besides affords no protection whatever.

The Postmaster General stated with a great flourish of trumpets: Great Britain is proud of us. Of course she is, otherwise she would certainly be difficult to please. Just think of it, a gift of thirty-five millions. If instead we had given fifty millions, she would be still prouder of us: and if we reached the one hundred million mark, she would exclaim: 'Now, now, aren't those Canucks well fixed!' But we will have no share in that gift over here. We will not be invited to the feast. You may be sure that we will not be seen at the dance.

A moment ago I said a word in reference to the Georgian Bay canal. Why not carry out this great work, which is so necessary for the transportation of our products, from lake Huron, along French river, the Mattawa, the Ottawa, the des Prairies and St. Lawrence rivers to Montreal, whence shipments would be made direct to Halifax or London without breaking load, thereby effecting a saving of 400 miles on the journey?

The former Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) stated time and again that we owe nothing to Great Britain and that we would be acting more wisely in spending our funds on the Georgian Bay canal. He was right. But we are told in answer that the Welland canal is to be deepened. To my mind that would be money ill spent. Already several millions have been spent on that canal, and hardly is that work carried out than there comes a further proposal for deepening it and turning it into a ship canal.

The Postmaster General greatly amused me when he said in connection with those thirty-five millions: It is a loan we are making. Did you ever hear it stated, Mr. Chairman, that it is the lender who pays interest on the amount of the loan? I for one never heard before of such a transaction. And where will we find those millions which are destined to Great Britain? In Great Britain, no doubt. Now if Great Britain is in a position to lend us thirty-five millions, what need has she of such a gift from our hands? Such is the argument of the Postmaster General. It is a loan, he says, and he adds: It is a good piece of business. If that is the way he transacts his own private business, I do not expect him to grow rich very fast. He is a wealthy man and well deserves it, but I do not think it was by means of such a policy that he obtained that result.

When Mr. Laurier proposed the building of a navy, he stated at the same time that those vessels would be built in Canada. That gave us the assurance that we would get something in return for the expenditure. When a farmer purchases a farm with a view to starting in life one of his boys, he is not any poorer on account of that purchase. He has acquired a farm whose value is equivalent to the money paid out or borrowed. He is neither richer nor poorer on that account. Let us suppose that the two warships bought by the Laurier Government cost on an average one and a half million dollars each; anyway, after the purchase we were owners of those ships. But when one makes a gift, he gets nothing in return. When I give Christmas boxes to my employees, I get nothing in return, and we will be in the same position if we get into the habit of making presents. Do you think that pays? What a transaction! We will be called upon to pay the interest on thirty-five million dollars, and the Postmaster General thinks it is good

business. Had he spoken in that sense to his constituents previous to September 21, he would not be here to-day. A mere statement of the principle satisfies one as to its falsity, its utter falsity. Such statements cannot be made seriously before intelligent people. The minister stated that was only preliminary; well, then, what are we to expect next ?

Mr. PELLETIER : (Translation). What I said was preliminary is the granting of a representative in the councils of the Empire.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) But we will have still more to pay when we are allowed several representatives in that council. And if the intention is to allow us several representatives in that council, does it mean that we are on the straight road leading to Imperial federation, through representation in the British House of Commons? Shall I be permitted to go there and represent my constituents? But the very men in the gallery who think I speak so poorly would never agree to that. If this is only the beginning, I am going to take up arms. I refuse to sit in an Imperial council; I am only anxious to maintain our privileges, our constitution and our representative system. If this is only preliminary, a first step, does it mean that we shall be called upon to donate another thirty-five millions next year? When that matter was brought up for the first time, the then leader of the Opposition, to-day the Prime Minister, moved for a grant of twenty millions, but since his trip to Great Britain he has got rich, and now he gives away thirty-five millions. The more one takes, the more one wishes to take.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side say, through their papers and on their own responsibility: Let us be patriotic, let us not put any politics into this question. They even went so far as to request Sir Wilfrid to help them out. Yes, we will help you to jump overboard. What have these hon. gentlemen done with the resolution of March, 1909, which was unanimously voted by this House? When Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his ministers went off to England to carry out what had been resolved upon here, they did not do so of their own movement. They were carrying out the mandate of the whole Parliament concerning the establishment of a navy. At the time hon. gentlemen on the other side did not put any politics into it; they acted on the spur of the moment's happy inspiration. But when they found out that Laurier had carried out what the House had empowered him to do, they changed their mind and blamed him for it. And to-day they come to us and say: Do not put any politics into this question, act as free and independent men. Are they sincere in asking that of us? However, we would comply with the wishes of these hon. gentlemen if we considered it necessary, if there was no better means of settling the matter. But we will not do so seeing that we have no control over what you are going to do, and I dare say you would not follow a different course.

The then Opposition refused to vote the subsidies in 1911 on account of reciprocity. These hon. gentlemen said: You have not consulted the electors on that point, and kept business at a standstill in the country for months and months. It is our turn now. The present Opposition has as much energy, tenacity and devotion as the former Opposition. Do you think we are going to let you pass such a measure? I, for one, am quite disposed to spend many a night here before letting such a proposal go through.

My constituency will not submit to such treatment. And when I address hon. gentlemen on the floor of this House, it is not your humble servant who is speaking; it is the representative of an immense county, settled by a hardy race of men, who are anxious to keep what they have. They would say to me: When agriculture was in such need of help, when irrigation works were needed, when there were hills to level down, canals to build, railways to provide, and which were so sadly wanting in your county, and lastly when a post-office, the necessity for which cannot be denied, was being refused to you, it was bad management on your part, and you had not the right to make such a gift.

The hon. Postmaster General stated that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was no prophet. He is not, but he was right in his guess when he foretold that his opponents when in power would fight among themselves over that navy question. He was a pretty good prophet then. It is objected that it would require too much time to build ships in Canada. But if Great Britain is in a hurry, she could lend us a hand. She might send her most skilful workmen over here, men with a practical and technical training. These men would spend part of their salaries here, and those millions would remain in Canada. Our country would derive some advantage therefrom. To my mind the child should not be expected to assist his father, but rather the father to assist his child. When the young man is anxious to settle down he says to his father: I am of age, and I wish to get married, provide for me. And so the old gentleman purchases a farm, a store, some business, and provides for his son. But in the present case, the child is expected to provide for his father. The end of the world must be at hand. I

am not afraid of war, but I fear that the world will soon be coming to an end.

The hon. Postmaster General stated that our mechanics were earning high wages. That is so. Why? Because our industries are in full blast, because, since the coming into power of the Liberal party, great industries have grown up in Canada. The Liberal Government has protected agriculture and those who have settled in the Dominion live comfortably on high wages. That was not the case previous to 1896. Our workingmen were leaving the country, crossing the border. To-day the people find employment and are well paid for the work they do. We have no shipyards to build such vessels, it is contended; well, let us start some. It is an easy matter to provide shipyards, to build factories, to procure all that is required for the building of warships. I stated that the Laurier scheme at any rate gave to the people their money's worth. But of what benefit will this proposal be to us?

The hon. Postmaster General used to say: Act before it is too late. There is no denying that; it is too late to make preparations when the fire is started. The fire brigade must be organized before the fire is on; it is no use then to send for an engine across the seas; extinguishers should be at hand. That is what made Laurier say: Get ready for war in time of peace. Do not wait until the thief has been around to close the stable doors. To-day these gentlemen are the first to say: Do not delay until the fire is started. Well, that is further evidence of their lack of sincerity.

The hon. Postmaster General read a document prepared by a certain Mr. Denault. I have not known that illustrious bishop, he lived long before my time; but I have had occasion to read some of the things written by that great person. That is why I inquired from the minister whether what he was reading was written in French. I am willing to believe that he gave us the correct English translation; but it happens sometimes that there is slipped in a word which does not exactly convey the meaning. I shall go over the report in 'Hansard' and find out what the minister's translation is worth. But that document was not read to the electors in Drummond and Arthabaska, or in Macdonald or in Richelieu. It might have been a good thing to do so at the time; the people might have realized more fully what should be done for the defence of the Empire and their views might have been altered in consequence.

The hon. gentleman stated that at the time the Government was poor. But we have had a rich government since 1896. But is Great Britain poor? All governments under Conservative rule are poor; Can the financial prosperity of the Mother Country be seriously questioned? I believe not, and if Great Britain is not poor, if she is in a position to lend us millions, why should we send her such a gift. I feel indignant at what is going on, and, in spite of my efforts to keep cool, my blood is boiling. Why such a gift when our lands are in need of irrigation, when we have so many things to do? Let us carry on necessary improvements, instead of us giving Great Britain thirty-five millions, let Great Britain give us an equal amount. That would be a difference of seventy millions. When I think this is only the beginning, it makes me mad.

The hon. Postmaster General gave a list of the presents which were made to Great Britain in times past? Of course, he would never have read that list to the electors previous to September 21. He stated that was the list of Great Britain's benefactors. He spoke of 'our sacred duty'; that is all very well, but our primary duty is to assist and protect our wives and children, not other people's. Our primary duty is to make this country prosperous, such is 'our sacred duty.' What would we do if war broke out between Germany and Great Britain? How could I, a farmer, ship my products abroad on board vessels which would leave Halifax and might be captured on the way by some small German warship. As is known, in time of war there is no insurance against piracy and looting expeditions. We would be ruined and our products would be for German consumption only, since we would be without warships to protect them. In time of war, to the . . . .

An hon. MEMBER: (Translation.). To the victor, the spoils.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) Just so. Who will protect our cargoes of agricultural products? All that requires consideration, and the English and Scotch people, who are practical men, business men, know to what straits farmers are put at times to make both ends meet; what an amount of labour, of spirit, of self-denial, of frugality, make up the life of a successful farmer. How will our shipments of horses, of cattle, of cheese and butter be protected in time of war, considering we have no vessels at Halifax to ward off privateers and freebooters ?

The Postmaster General waved the French flag; I almost thought he was going to make a gift to France as well. Why should we not give France thirty-five millions, seeing that both countries are so friendly and united by the entente cordiale? You will be making somebody jealous, by giving thirty-five millions to one and nothing to the other.

Who are the people who defied the Mother Country? They were not the French settlers. Who were the men who in 1774 fired at the British flag in Boston harbour? They were not the inhabitants of New France. They were settlers who had come from London and had settled in what was known as New England. And why? Because the Mother Country wished to levy taxation on them as she is trying to do at present in our case. Who defended the British flag in this country of ours? It was the French Canadians who, after Canada had passed under British rule, prevented Canada from returning under French rule. Flag-waving, bragging of one's loyalty, reminds one of those women who loudly proclaim the purity of their lives; it makes one suspicious. The old saw is right: a guilty conscience needs no accuser. I say that there is no need for any flag-waving in this House. When the Mother Country was made to suffer, it was through her own progeny; when she had to fight, it was against her own children. Of course, I am not taking sides in the quarrel; but if one hundred million people are separated from the Mother Country, that was accomplished after the guns had roared.

The Government have had to go before the people in Macdonald, Richelieu and Hochelaga, but in none of those constituencies have they made known their policy; that is, their intention to grant that thirty-five millions to Great Britain. Not a word was said about it. We will give it out on the floor of the House, they said. But it was before the electorate, properly their judges, that Government should have expounded their policy. The Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) should have intimated to the electorate in Richelieu. We have made up our minds to give thirty-five millions to Great Britain. It was feared that this policy of the Government would be rejected by the people; that is why they kept their mouths closed on the subject. In spite of all that, they were licked in Richelieu. They won in Macdonald, but in Hochelaga there was practically no fighting, the right hon. leader of the Opposition having expressed the wish that the Government candidate be not opposed, considering that their stand on the navy question had not as yet been announced. But in all three constituencies you should have made known beforehand to the electors your intention of donating that thirty-five millions to Great Britain.

I understand that the former minister of Public Works is sick; I am sorry to hear it, and I hope he will promptly recover. When he comes back, I intend asking him why he changed his mind, and I will not be the loser for waiting a while. He used to say in Jacques Cartier, and he repeated it in Montcalm: Let us strengthen our defences. Several Nationalists propounded the same views. The boundary line between Canada and the United States is a thousand miles long and there is not even a 3-foot fence to cut us off from the neighbouring republic. Let us spend on our land defences the amount Mr. Laurier is anxious to spend on a navy. What has made him change his mind? To-day the proposal is to have ships built in England for Great Britain's use. Those gentlemen used to say: There is no danger for Canada, and if ever war breaks out between us and the United States, it will not be through the port of Halifax, or that of St. John, or that of Quebec, that the enemy will penetrate into our territory, neither will it be by following the rivers or water courses. So let us build up our land defences. There is no more said about that nowadays, no more defences to build, those were stories good in old father Adam's time.

When we had difficulties with the neighbouring republic over our fisheries, we obtained fifteen millions compensation for the fish taken in Canadian waters. Which shows the need of vessels to protect our fisheries, as the same events may recur again. Mr. Chairman, the general cry, and rightly so, is educate the children. Let us have schools and schools again to prepare the young generation for the struggles of the future. Let us send our children to classical colleges, commercial schools, technical and engineering schools. The country is going to a great deal of expense to equip the rising generation for the struggles of their grown-up days. But why should we get them educated, if they are to be left aside when it comes to carrying on our government works? Of what use will that education be if those works are farmed out abroad? I say that we have in this country skilled and experienced workmen, capable of catering to all the country's requirements. It is objected that we have not the necessary equipment. To that I answer: If that is the case, let us equip ourselves right now. Would not the people of the maritime provinces, who are so proud, and rightly so, of their fine seaports, see with pleasure the building of those ships carried on in their midst? Would not Halifax, Sydney or St. John gladly undertake such works, build ships on our own territory, seeing that they have on hand all that is required for that purpose: wood, iron, coal, etc. The people of the maritime provinces should with one voice demand of the Government they support that the ships required be built right there, failing which, our Government would not be doing its duty. I appeal to the representatives of the mari-

time provinces and urge them to ponder over my words. I believe they will reach the same conclusion as I have, and say that those ships should be built on Canadian soil.

Have we had to apply to outsiders for the building of wharfs at Halifax, Pictou, Gaspé, Quebec, Lévis, Montreal and elsewhere? No, we dispensed with British labour in the building of those wharfs. We now have at Montreal something wonderful, I mean a dry dock. To what use are we going to put it? Was it brought over here only for the show? Apparently the new Government have resolved to follow up what their predecessors had undertaken. True, this Government has not initiated the work, but it carried to completion what the previous administration had started. What will be the use of a dry dock, if the work is carried on abroad? We did not require the services of outsiders to build the Lachine, Soulanges, Beauharnois, Rideau, Welland, Chambly and Sault Ste. Marie canals, the latter possibly the most important in the world. That shows that our country is in a position to carry out all the improvements which may be required. We have the intelligence, the muscle and brains of the French-Canadians and Canadians generally, and with that I see no need of calling in outsiders. The Victoria bridge, which at one time was classed among the marvels of the world, and rightly so, was built entirely by our people, and solidly built, too. It was opened in 1860, and never went down. The Quebec bridge did go down through an accident, but it will be rebuilt and carried to completion without any need for calling in help from Great Britain. We have also bridges at St. John's, Terrebonne, Charlemagne and many other points, and all those important works have been carried through without our being obliged to get mechanics from the Old Country. Our Canadian workmen did it all.

The French-Canadian workmen are bright; if you enter factories on the other side of the line, you will find French-Canadians at the head of the most important of them. Our compatriots have shown cleverness, skill and a good disposition. Everywhere in those large centres, in the great manufacturing industries, they have evidence of skill, and if you visit those establishments you will find many French Canadians as managers. Why should it turn out otherwise in regard to this new undertaking? Our compatriots are better educated now than they were formerly. Our schools have turned out men of ability, and I can assure you that those who have settled on the other side of the line are a credit to the Dominion. All that testifies to the efficiency of our mechanics: Who built the most powerful elevators to be found in any part of the world? I mean those at Montreal? Are the elevators in Philadelphia, New York or Boston comparable to them? Americans come here to learn what is being done in Canada in that line. All those elevators have been built by Canadians.

If any further evidence was needed of our country's progress in the matter of equipment, I would point out to the establishment here of a branch of the Royal mint; we now turn out in Ottawa the coins which formerly we could obtain from England only. According to the Government's contention, we should never undertake anything new, but everlastingly follow in the beaten path. When the spinning of cotton was introduced into this country, much fun was made at the expense of that valiant Montreal merchant, Mr. Victor Hudon, who started the first factory at Hochelaga. That renowned establishment is the finest in Canada. The same might be said of the factories established at Valleyfield and Point St. Charles.

When we started building railways, it was done under government supervision, and Sir Etienne Cartier did not put in the statute: You will have your ships built in the Old Country, no, not in Great Britain, but in Canada. And when he sang 'Oh, Canada, my country, my love,' he did not mean that England should be employed to do our work. Just now twenty-five million dollars are being spent to build a tunnel from the village of St. Laurent, where I have the honour to reside, right through Mount Royal and terminating at Dorchester street, in the city of Montreal. Canadians are doing that work. There are 2,500 men so employed. That brings money to the storekeeper, the butcher, the grocer, etc., everybody profits by it. Nobody thinks of getting men from Great Britain to do the work.

But, Mr. Chairman, is there not a statute which shows how jealously we should watch over the interests of the working classes in this country? The Alien Labour Act forbids the importing into Canada of foreign labour, except in cases where skilled workmen are needed and cannot be procured here. Recently I summoned before the magistrate the manager of the Windsor hotel, Montreal, who had procured abroad some help for his kitchens. The manager was arrested and fined under the Alien Labour Act.

A word more in connection with the labour question. In order to show to this hon. House what measure of protection the law affords to workingmen, I may recall what is being done in the great city of Montreal. They have regulations there to prevent outsiders from competing with the local hands. Policemen must reside within the city limits. All that is done with a view to

protecting the city's interests. What Montreal does on a small scale, we should do here on a larger scale, and consequently not allow our funds to be spent outside Canadian territory.

Who were the men who showed the greatest devotion to the Mother Country at the time of the Boer war? The Nationalists would not hear of any help being given. The master resigned his mandate and appealed once more to the electors of Labelle, because the Government had decided to assist Great Britain in a war which did not concern us. His object was to get returned especially for the object of opposing that measure. But Sir Wilfrid Laurier was not affected by such considerations and did not for one moment falter in the path of duty. The Opposition was unanimous in approving the stand of the Laurier Government. Canadians were left entirely free to enlist, but they are a generous people and volunteers were not lacking. Some of them were killed, others wounded, all that through mere devotion to the Mother Country. On that occasion the Liberals fulfilled their duty in spite of the protests and opposition of the Nationalists. Some expenditure was incurred and it cost us a good deal of money to perform our duty. It seems to me that to-day the Mother Country should compensate us, do something for the Canadians in consideration for the services rendered and make us a present of a few ships. She should say: Here are two or three warships, make use of them and if ever we require them, you will return them to us, but in the meantime we are anxious to help you on.

Canada owes at the lowest four hundred and fifty millions. That is a large amount. It will take us a long time to pay that up, and the interest charges eat up a considerable amount. If we add to that amount thirty-five millions, that will bring the capital of the debt close to five hundred millions. Is that wise policy? Should the people's money be administered in that way? If we were clear of debt, I would not complain so much; thirty-five millions for a wealthy country does not seem so very much. But considering that we already owe four hundred and fifty millions, that we have the Quebec bridge to finish, the Hudson Bay railway to build, other works also which will cost at the lowest twenty-five millions, the Welland canal to deepen, I say where will we find the money for all that? Are we in a position to make presents? No, we should not think of it. What would we say of a farmer who having a mortgaged farm would keep on making presents right and left? We would consider him crazy; we would say to him: Pay your debts first, pay your dues to the priest, your taxes, etc., and after that you will make presents if you have a mind to. Before making presents, Canada should pay her debts. The rule is the same whether it be the state or an individual. That money belongs to two classes of persons: to the people, in the first place, and then to the creditors. The rule is the same the world over. Now, I inquire from the Government whether it has consulted the people? We all know that it has not done so. Did it consult Canada's creditors?

Mr. PELLETIER: (Translation.) We never thought of that.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) There are a good many other things of which you never thought. The rule of common law is well known; one has no right to give what does not belong to him. Now the thirty-five millions which it is intended to give away are not the property of the Government. What is the oath which every member takes in this House? To faithfully and conscientiously fulfil his duty as representative of the people. Have not the ministers been called upon to take that same oath? It is very strict. The hon. minister may laugh to his heart's content . . . .

Mr. PELLETIER: (Translation.) I am not laughing about that.

Mr. LAFORTUNE: (Translation.) You may laugh, but a time will come when it will be in spite of you.

Mr. Chairman, I have detained the House rather long, but I feel that I have done my duty, nothing more than my duty, and in taking my seat I wish to sum up in two words what I have said. The people will decide whether the policy expounded by the Government is beneficial or not. But the people cannot so decide unless they are consulted. We should go to the polls. The advantages and disadvantages should be set forth, and then we will know whether your humble servant is in the right.

I appeal to all members of this House, but particularly to former Nationalists. I cannot say how they propose voting. Of course, that is their own business. They are not obliged to consult me any more than I am obliged to consult them; but I say that this grant for the navy should not be put through previous to consulting the people. No contribution without a plebiscite, without hearing from the electors, our judges in the nature of things. I cannot wish them success for their contention is wrong. Let their electors decide. But the electors have good memories, and when an opportunity offers they will show you that they have not forgotten the statements you made previous to September 21 as well as your behaviour since that date.

Mr. AIKINS moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Pelletier for the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before the House adjourns I might say that it would be very advantageous during this discussion to have the plans for the lay-out of the proposed shipyard at St. John in connection with the dry-dock under construction there; also the plans relating to the proposals for dry-docks at Sydney, Cape Breton and Montreal, together with any correspondence which has taken place between the owners of the dry-docks or any one on their behalf and the Department of Marine and Fisheries or any member of the Government. I would ask my hon. friend if he would be good enough to lay these documents on the table of the House when the discussion is resumed on Monday.

Mr. HAZEN: I think that most of the documents to which my hon. friend refers in connection with the construction of dry-docks are under the control, not of my department, but of the Department of Public Works. If my hon. friend, however, will give me a memorandum of the documents he wants, I will do what I can to see that they are produced.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In the tender of Cammell, Laird and Company, a copy of which was laid on the table of the House recently, the plan for the lay-out of the ship-building plant is specially referred to, and, as it states that a copy was forwarded to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, my hon. friend will have that at all events.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, December 16, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PETITIONS FOR PRIVATE BILLS.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That, as the time for receiving petitions for private Bills, and the time for presenting private Bills without an additional charge will be curtailed by the Christmas adjournment, be it resolved, That petitions for private Bills be received by the House if presented on or before January 23, 1913, and that the time for presenting private Bills without the payement of the additional charges provided for under paragraph (b) and (e) of subsection 3 of rule 89, be stended until February 6, 1913, and March 6, 1913, respectively.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

THE GEORGIAN BAY SHIP CANAL.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to construct the Georgian Bay Ship canal?
2. If so, will an amount be included in the Estimates of the present session for the purpose of commencing the work?

Mr. ROCHE: Information will be given when Estimates are brought down.

GOVERNMENT AUTOMOBILES.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

1. How many automobiles have been purchased by the Government or by any of its members since October 10, 1911?
2. Were such automobiles purchased after competitive prices had been received by tender?
3. What was the cost of each automobile so purchased?
4. In addition to the purchase price, what further amount has been paid for repairs, fittings, upkeep, storage, &c., of the said automobiles?
5. By whom are the said automobiles used?
6. How many of them are used for other than official business?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Department of Militia and Defence.—Answered last session (see unrevised 'Hansard,' page 4117).

Post Office Department.—Two.

2. Department of Militia and Defence.—Answered by No. 1.

Post Office Department.—No.

3. Department of Militia and Defence.—Cost of car, fitted with Dunlop traction tread tires, top glass, front, speedometer, gas lamps and generator, 3 oil lamps, horn, kit of tools, tire repair outfit and pump, $850; additional equipment, viz.: 1 spare traction tread cover, 4 tubes, 1 tire envelope, 1 set of tire holders, 1 top envelope, 1 jack, 1 cutout, supplied for $101.60; total, $951.60.

Post Office Department. — (Quebec), $1,550 and (Ottawa) $4,500.

4. Department of Militia and Defence.—Statement of expenditure from time of purchase to 15th November, 1912, for running, repairs, fittings, upkeep, storage, &c., of twelve automobiles and three gramm trucks.—1st division, $72.42; 2nd division, $75.80; 3rd division, $7.19; 4th division, $81.29; 5th division, $58.91; 6th division, $135.27; 10th district, $133.46; 11th district,

$32.60; 13th district, $111.55; headquarters, $78.38; Petawawa, $201.97; total, $988.84.

Post Office Department. — (Quebec), $292.21; (Ottawa), repairs, $80.50; fittings (including tires, battery, speedometer, presto light tank, slip covers, &c., $971.75; upkeep (gasoline, oil, grease, &c., $201.03; wages of chauffeur, $497.33; storage, $93.80; —$1,844.41; total, $2,136 62.

5. Department of Militia and Defence.—Answered by No. 1.

Post Office Department.—For the use of the department.

6. Department of Militia and Defence.—None.

Post Office Department.—For the use of the department.

Mr. RAINVILLE:

1. How many automobiles were purchased by the Government or by any of its members, previous to October 10, 1911?

2. Were such automobiles purchased after competitive prices had been received by tender?

3. What was the cost of each automobile so purchased?

4. In addition to the purchase price, what further amount has been paid for repairs, fittings, upkeep, storage, &c., of the said automobiles?

5. By whom are the said automobiles used?

6. How many of them are used for other than official business?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. At Toronto—2 auto trucks and 4 motor mail vans purchased 5th June, 1911. At Montreal—1 purchased 19th July, 1910.

2. At Toronto—Yes; at Montreal, No.

3. At Toronto—Auto trucks, $3,000 each.. .. .. $ 6,000
Motor mail vans, $2,500 each.. 10,000
At Montreal—Cost, $4,260; duty, &c.. .. ..

6. An inquiry for the minister's information was also made by his secretary. He was occupied one week. Warden Platt's is of date 10th of April, 1912. The secretary reported verbally on his return to Ottawa and submitted depositions.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Has Dr. Platt tendered to the Government his resignation as warden of Portsmouth penitentiary? If so, when?
2. Who is at present acting as warden of said penitentiary and how long has he been performing the duties of that office?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Yes, June 20, 1912.
2. Inspector Stewart—since May 1, 1912.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY MANAGEMENT.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Did the Minister of Railways and Canals, or did any other member of the Government authorize Mr. M. G. Siddall to make an announcement to the effect that a change would at no distant date be made in the management of the Intercolonial railway?
2. Did the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any other member of the Government give any assurance to Mr. M. G. Siddall or to any other person that any promise given to the effect that there would at no distant date be a change made in the Intercolonial railway management would be given effect by the Government?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No.
2. Answered by number one.

FREIGHT AT PICTOU, N.S.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou):

1. What amount was paid for the handling of freight at Pictou during the season of 1910-1911 in connection with winter service with Prince Edward Island?
2. What quantity of freight was shipped and received at said port during said season on said service?
3. What amount was paid for the handling of freight at Pictou during the season of 1911-12, in connection with said service?
24. What quantity of freight was shipped and received on said service during 1911-12 at said port?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. $4,575.
2. 8,340 tons.
3. $5,368.
4. 7,549 tons.

STE. ADELAIDE DE PABOS BREAKWATER.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has a contract been awarded for an extension to the breakwater at Ste. Adelaide de Pabos, county of Gaspé?
2. If so, to whom and at what figure?
3. Who were the other tenderers, if any, and what were the figures of their tenders?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. Arthur Nadeau and Edmond Nadeau for $6,485.
3. J. E. Bernier.. .. .. $6,950
J. Wilfrid Begin.. 7,200
David Duguay.. 9,000

SALMON RIVER INDIAN SCHOOL.

Mr. KYTE:

1. What was the number of pupils enrolled in the Indian school at Salmon river, Richmond county, in each school year from 1890 to 1911 inclusive, and the grade of each?
2. What is the number of pupils enrolled there at present time and the grade of each?
3. What was the number of adult Indians of both sexes at the Indian reserve at Salmon river during each year of the years from 1890 to 1911 inclusive?
4. What is the number of adult Indians of both sexes at the reserve at the present time?
5. What was the average school attendance in each year from 1890 to 1911 inclusive?
6. What is the average attendance at the present time?
7. What is the number of children between the ages of 5 and 15 years on said reserve in each year from 1890 to 1911 inclusive?
8. What is the number of children between the ages of 5 and 15 years on the reserve at the present time?
9. What are the hours each day during which teaching is to be carried on?
10. Is the school conducted under the regulations of the Nova Scotia council of Public Instructions?
11. If not, who prescribed the regulations governing the school, the grading and the course of study?
12. Is the school under the inspection of the public school inspector for the district?

Mr. ROCHE:

1.

Year.	Enrolment.	Standard of Grade. I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.	VI.
1890	24	Standards not given.					
1891	32	"	"	"			
1892	27	"	"	"			
1893	27	"	"	"			
1894	30	11	7	7	4	1	..
1895	29	16	8	4	1	..	..
1896	33	16	10	4	3	..	..
1897	23	12	7	3	1	..	..
1898	26	6	10	5	3	2	..
1899	24	7	8	5	..	1	3
1900	25	7	7	2	5	2	2
1901	25	14	3	3	3	1	1
1902	25	17	3	2	2	..	1
1903	28	17	8	1	2	..	..
1904	21	10	9	..	2	..	..
1905	26	10	15	1	..	..	..
1906	27	16	9	2	..	..	..

Year.	Enrolment.	Standard of Grade. I.	II.	III.	IV.	V	VI.
1907	16	9	5	3	1	..	..
1908	23	9	8	4	2	..	..
1909	26	16	4	4	2	..	..
1910	26	14	6	5	..	..	..
1911	23	15	5	3	..	..	..

2. Present enrolment, 20 pupils; Standard I., 13 pupils; Standard II., 5 pupils; Standard III., 2 pupils.

3. There are no returns showing age or sex of Indians on this reserve previous to 1901.

Year.	Male.	Female.
1901	32	22
1902	33	28
1903	26	26
1904	35	39
1905	24	25
1906	25	26
1907	23	23
1908	27	25
1909	18	21
1910	24	25
1911	24	25

4. Twenty-nine males, 31 females.

5. 1890, 6; 1891, 12; 1892, 7; 1893 10; 1894, 10; 1895, 17; 1896, 10; 1897, 8; 1898, 9; 1899, 5; 1900, 8; 1901, 5; 1902, 5; 1903, 7; 1904, 5; 1905, 8; 1906, 8; 1907, 6; 1908, 7; 1909, 8; 1910, 7; 1911, 8.

6. Ten.

7. No returns are given for any year previous to 1901. Census returns only show the number of children between the ages of 6 and 15 years which are as follows: 1901, 35; 1902, 26; 1903, 27; 1904, 25; 1905, 24; 1906, 35; 1907, 22; 1908, 28; 1909, 37; 1910, 32; 1911, 32.

8. Ages, 6 to 15 years, 18 boys; 17 girls. The census returns only show the number of children between the ages of 6 and 15 years.

9. The morning session is from 9 a.m. to noon, and the afternoon session from 1 p. m., with a recess during each session of not less than 15 minutes and not more than 20 minutes.

10. No.

11. The Department of Indian Affairs.

12. Yes.

COMMISSIONER W. E. DORSETT.

Mr. TURRIFF :

1. Is W. E. Dorsett a commissioner appointed to hold investigations as to partisanship of Government officials?

2. Does he take evidence under oath?

3. If so, under what authority does he do so?

Mr. CODERRE :

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

Mr. ROCHE.

3. Under authority of an Order in Council, dated 27th November, 1896.

THE GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY —SHIPMENT OF FREIGHT.

*Mr. MURPHY :

1. Has the attention of the Government been directed to the report of a speech alleged to have been delivered before the Dartmouth Board of Trade by the hon. member for Shelbourne and Queens on October 15, 1912, and to the statements therein attributed to the said hon. member, namely, that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company will not ship its freight from a Canadian port?

2. If so, has the Government any information showing that it is not the intention of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to ship its freight from a Canadian port?

3. If so, what action will be taken by the Government to prevent the company from carrying out such an intention?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. Yes, by the question of the hon. member.

2. The Government has no information indicating any intention on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to depart from the terms of its contract in this respect.

MR. VINCENT BRENNAN.

Mr. LAW :

1. Has Vincent Brennan, of Woods harbour, Shelburne county, N.S., been appointed fishery guardian?

If so, is said Vincent Brennan a British subject, and when was he naturalized?

Mr. HAZEN :

1. Yes.

2. As far as the department is aware, he is a British subject. His name is on the voters' list.

BARRINGTON FISHERY INSPECTOR.

Mr. LAW :

1. What salary did Andrew Robertson, of Barrington, N.S., fishery inspector, receive at the time of his dismissal?

2. What salary does Ward Fisher, fishery inspector, receive?

Mr. HAZEN :

1. $700 per annum.

2. $1,200 per annum.

MR. ELZEAR FISET.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has Mr. Elzéar Fiset, an advocate at Quebec, been appointed to a situation in the Post Office Department at Quebec or at Ottawa?

2. If so, what do his duties consist of and what is his salary?

Mr. PELLETIER :

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS IN QUEBEC.

Mr. ARTHURS :

1. For how many towns, villages or parishes, in the province of Quebec, having a population of 2,000 or less, has money been voted by this Parliament for public buildings during the past five fiscal years?
2. What is the population in each case?
3. What is the amount of gross postal revenue in each case?

Mr. ROCHE :

	Population.	Postal Revenue.
1. 22.		
2. Arthabaska,	1,458	$2,123.90
Berthier (en haut)	1,335	2,000.04
Cookshire,	996	3,620.89
East Angus,	No information	2,042.32
Iberville,	1,905	1,791.06
Knowlton,	885	2,790.52
Laurentides,	1,128	1,375.50
Louiseville,	1,675	2,322.74
Marieville,	1,587	1,455.64
Murray Bay,	1,449	1,970.36
Napierville.	1,000	612.07
New Carlisle,	1,104	1,556.38
Pierreville,	1,363	2,206.30
Plessisville,	1,559	1,706.81
Rigaud,	856	1,401.96
Roberval,	1,737	3,068.44
Rock Island,	861	4,809.58
St. Casimir,	2,640	1,303.93
St. Gabriel de Brandon,	1,431	1,431.53
St. Laurent,	1,860	1,386.66
Weedon Station,	1,254	742.75
St. Jacques Montcalm	No information	783.69

VALLEE DES ERABLES POST OFFICE.

Mr. BOYER :

1. Did not the previous Government decide to open a post office in a part of the parish of St. Polycarpe, called Le Ruisseau, under the name of Bourbonnais?
2. Does the present Government intend to proceed with the creation of this new office?
3. Who has been recommended for postmaster and by whom?

Mr. PELLETIER :

1. Yes.
2 and 3. This office has been opened under the name of Vallee des Erables, with Mr. Ludger Bourbonnais as postmaster, on instructions of the Postmaster General.

GEORGE DICKIN.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Is George Dickin a homestead inspector?
2. If so, when was he appointed and what salary is he paid?
3. To what land district is he attached?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes. George Dickin.
2. 5th of December, 1911.
3. He is located at Manor, Saskatchewan, and attached to the Estevan agency.

CHARLES R. INMAN.

Mr. MICHAUD:

1. Was Charles R. Inman, immigration agent at Aroostock junction, N.B., dismissed from office? If so, when and for what reasons?
2. Was an investigation held into his conduct? If so, by whom?
3. Was the evidence taken at such investigation reported to the Department of the Interior with a recommendation thereon?
4. Did the department make the dismissal on such recommendation?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes. 15th of April, 1912. Active partisanship.
2. No.
3 and 4. Answered by No. 2.

RIVER SCIBOUIT PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. MARCILE (Bagot):

1. What amount was spent by the Department of Public Works in the River Scibouit, parish of Ste Helène, county of Bagot, during the months of May and June, 1912?
2. What are the names of the persons who worked under the direction of the engineer of the Department of Public Works, and how much did each person receive?
3. Have Messrs. Eusèbe Petit, Cléophas Laforme, Alaric Rivet, Joseph Pariseault, Alphonse Beloal, U. L. Collette, and Trottier, been employed by the said engineer? If so, how much has each of these persons received?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. $137.
2. J. E. Petit.. .. .. $44.00
   S. Gadbois.. .. .. 18.50
   A. Beloal.. .. .. 18.50
   A. Rivet.. .. .. 22.50
   Joseph Parizeau.. .. .. 10.00
   C. Laforme.. .. .. 23.50
3. J. E. Petit.. .. .. 44.00
   Cleophas Laforme.. .. .. 23.50
   Joseph Parizeau.. .. .. 10.00
   Alphonse Beloal.. .. .. 18.50

U. L. Collette, not employed; Allaric Rivet, not employed. Paul Trottier, assistant engineer, employed at a fixed salary. He had supervision of the above-mentioned work.

STELLARTON PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Who was the owner of the land acquired at Stellarton, Nova Scotia, for a public building?

2. When was the said land acquired by expropriation?
3. What was the price?
4. From whom were options taken and what was the price agreed upon in each case?
5. Has any vote been made for the public building in Stellarton? If so, when?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Mrs. Mary McKay.
2. Expropriated by authority of Order in Council of April 30, 1912.
3. $4,000.
4. Acadia Coal Co. offers lot on corner of Jubilee avenue and Main street for $3,500; M. Douglas offers lot on Main street, 120 x 220, for $5,000, or part of lot 70 x 100, for $3,000, and another offer of a lot, 60 x 100, for $2,700. Mary A. McKay offers lot on Main street, 98 x 130 feet, for $4,000. No options were given on the Soby lot, adjoining the Acadia Coal Company's lot, but could be purchased, 50 x 100, for $3,000, and the Culton lot, 90 x 100 feet, could be purchased for $5.500.
5. Yes, $4,000 in Estimates for fiscal year 1911-12.

DE WOLFE McLEAN.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has de Wolfe McLean, of Hopewell, N.S., been paid for his services as special fishery guardian in 1911?
2. If not, when will he be paid?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Answered by No. 1.

PARSBORO GOVERNMENT BUILDING

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Who is the inspector of the Government buildings being erected at Parrsboro, N.S.?
2. What remuneration is he receiving?
3. Is the same person the Indian agent and Indian medical doctor for the Half Way River Reservation, Cumberland county, N.S.?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. J. C. McDougall.
2. $4 per day.
3. Yes.

HOBSON'S NOSE LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Were any repairs made during 1912 to the Hobson's Nose lighthouse, Lunenburg county, N.S.?
2. If so, what is the total expenditure made and the nature of the work performed?
3. Who was the foreman in charge of the said work?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. The estimated cost is $2,600. Accounts received to date, $2,380.81. It is not certain that all accounts have yet been received. The work performed consisted of extensive repairs to the cribwork breakwater protecting the island.
3. M. A. McKinnon.

BRIDGETOWN DRILL SHED.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Was the drill shed at Bridgewater, N.S., painted during the year 1912?
2. If so, what was the cost of the same, and who performed the work?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Yes.
2. $665. William S. Messer.

AMHERST POINT WHARF.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

Who was recommended to the Department of Public Works as a foreman for the spending of money upon the Government wharf at Amherst Point, Cumberland county, N.S., in 1912?

Mr. ROCHE: Stanley Fullerton.

FISHERY INSPECTOR WARD FISHER.

*Mr. KYTE:

Is Ward Fisher, one of the fishery inspectors for Nova Scotia, at Shelburne, N.S., authorized to use a part of the Government building at Shelburne, N.S., set apart for the use of customs officials, in the discharge of his official duties as fishery inspector?

Mr. ROCHE: Yes.

IMMIGRATION OF ORIENTALS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Have any steps been taken, or is there any intention to in any way alter or amend the arrangements made by the late Government with the Government of Japan, as to the immigration of Japanese into Canada? If so, what are the alterations or amendments?
2. Have any steps been taken or is there any intention to in any way alter the arrangement made between the late Government with the Imperial Government, as to immigration from India to Canada? If so, what are the alterations?
3. Has any request been made to the Government by companies or contractors carrying out large works in British Columbia to allow them to import Asiatics for employment on such works? If so, has such request been granted?
4. Has the Government any proposals for increasing the restrictions upon Orientals coming into Canada? If so, what are they and when will they be put into force?
5. Have any alterations been made in the regulations adopted by the late Government with respect to Chinese, Japanese or Hindoos coming into Canada? If so, what alterations have been made?

6. Have any restrictions been imposed by the present Administration on the immigration of Japanese, Hindoos or Chinese into Canada? If so, what are the restrictions?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The subject is under consideration in connection with the treaty between Great Britain and Japan signed on the 3rd. April, 1911. In the meantime no alterations or amendments have been made.

2. No steps have been taken to alter the existing arrangements. The future policy of the Government will be a matter for consideration.

3. No.

4. The Government will announce in due course any alteration in policy upon which it may determine.

5. No.

6. No additional restrictions have been imposed.

FISHERY LICENSES TO JAPANESE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many licenses were issued by the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Nanaimo in the years 1911 and 1912 to Japanese fishermen to carry on herring fishery in Canadian waters?

2. How many of such licenses have been issued during the months of October, November and December, 1912?

3. Has the policy of the Government in regard to the issue of fishery licenses in British Columbia been modified? If so, in what way?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. No licenses issued except to British subjects. Two licenses were to British subjects of Japanese extraction in 1911. five in 1912.

2. Five.

3. Yes, in the northern district of the province. The salmon fishery licenses in the past were issued in connection with the canneries. For the coming year licenses, independent of any cannery, will be issued to bona fide white fishermen owning their own boats and gear, who may apply for such. A sufficient number of licenses to cover all such applications, it is anticipated will be received, is being reserved for this purpose.

PROPOSED LONG SAULT DAM.

Mr. WILSON (Laval):

1. Has the International Waterways Commission, created by an Act of the United States Congress, approved July 13, 1902, and concurred in by the Canadian Government, made any interim or fiscal report upon the project of the St. Lawrence Power Company and the Long Sault Development Company for the construction of a dam on the Long Sault rapids, opposite Cornwall, Ontario?

2. If the Commission has made such a report, is it the intention of the Government to lay the same on the table of the House, and when?

3. Are the two above-named companies still making efforts to obtain from the Government of Canada permission to develop a water-power on the Long Sault rapids?

Mr. BORDEN:

1. The International Waterways Commission has not made any report upon the project of the St. Lawrence Power Company and the Long Sault Development Company for the construction of a dam at Long Sault rapids, opposite Cornwall, Ontario. Reference is made to the fact that the commission in the annual reports of the Canadian section for the years 1907, 1908 and 1909.

2. Answered by question 1.

3. No such application has been made to the present administration and the Government is not aware of any such efforts.

DEPOSITS IN BANKS AND WITH GOVERNMENT.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What were the total amounts on deposit in the Post Office Savings bank and the Government Savings bank on October 1, 1912, on October 1, 1902 and on October 1, 1892?

2. What were the total amounts on deposit in all the chartered banks in Canada on October 1, 1912, on October 1, 1902 and on October 1, 1892?

3. How many depositors had money on deposit with the Government on October 1, 1892, 1902 and 1912?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds):

1. October 1, 1912, Post Office Savings Bank, $42,661,908.96; Government Savings Bank, $14,553,354.81. October 1, 1902, Post Office Savings Bank, $42,725,979.69; Government Savings Bank, $16,145,890.82. October 1, 1892, Post Office Savings Bank, $22,633,-101.72; Government Savings Bank, $17,173,-185.46.

2. Total amounts on deposit in the Chartered Banks of Canada on September 30, 1912, $1,096,859,279; September 30, 1902, $397,856,183; September 30, 1892, $164,734,-983.

3. Total number of depositors, October 1, 1892, Post Office Savings Bank, 112,320; Government Savings Bank, 46,615; October 1, 1902, Post Office Savings Bank, 164,959; Government Savings Bank, 46,615; October 1, 1912, Post Office Savings Bank, 148,306; Government Savings Bank, 35,129.

SAINT JEAN IMMIGRATION BUILDING.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Is the Government informed that the Grand Trunk Railway company, in conformity, as alleged, to a Government order, has caused to be constructed at its station at

Saint Jean a wing for the detention and examination of immigrants?

2. If so, is this building intended for the immigration service, under control and special care of a federal employee?

3. If not, does the Government intend to appoint some one to this position?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.

2. It is used by, and is under the control of inspectors who make their headquarters at Rouses' Point, St. Albans and Alburg, and inspect trains on railway lines converging at St. John's.

3. The appointment of a caretaker at St. John's is under consideration.

RATES OF INTEREST TO AGRICULTURISTS.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

What are the minimum and maximum rates of interest charged by the banking institutions of the various provinces of Canada in the agricultural class?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): The Government has no information which would enable them to answer this question.

On the Orders of the Day being called.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. KYTE.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.): Mr. Speaker, I desire to speak upon a question of privilege. In the Halifax Herald of Thursday, December 12, appears the following despatch:

Ottawa, Dec. 11.—Mr. Carroll, M. P. for Cape Breton, in the course of a debate this afternoon, made a most brutal attack on the Rev. Father MacDonald was a partisan of a Father MacDonald had been quoted as having stated that he considered H. P. Duchemin's conduct of official investigations was fair, and Mr. Carroll, in heated terms, stated that the Rev. Father MacDonald was a partisan of a most extreme and violent type and incapable of expressing a fair opinion. The declaration was loudly applauded by Messrs. Chisholm, Antigonish; Sinclair, Guysboro; Kyte, Richmond; MacKenzie, Cape Breton, and Chisholm, Inverness, who expressed their approbation by pounding their desks in the most vigorous manner.

I am prepared to take the full responsibility for both my language and my conduct inside the House as well as outside of it; but it happened that on the 11th day of December, when the question was discussed by the hon. member for South Cape Breton I was not in the House, and I knew nothing whatever of what had taken place during my absence until I read the proceedings in 'Hansard' of the following day. I think it is of the greatest importance that the position of members on all questions should be properly represented by the press correspondents, and while I do not say whether I approve or disapprove of the attitude of hon. gentlemen in regard to this matter, I repudiate the intimation that I was present on that occasion.

Mr. SINCLAIR: As my name has been mentioned in the article just read by the hon. gentleman, I wish to say that the statement, as far as I am concerned, is not true. I have no personal acquaintance with the reverend gentleman mentioned by the member for South Cape Breton, nor do I know whether the reverend gentleman is an active politician or not, but I am quite certain that I did not join in any applause during that part of the hon. gentleman's speech. The reporters in the gallery are, of course, aware that they are enjoying a privilege in being permitted to be present during the discussions in this House, and it is only fair that they should accord gentlemanly treatment to hon. members, and not attribute to them any statements which they do not make. I am quite certain that I have been improperly represented in this item.

Mr. MACKENZIE: I also have read the article referred to by the hon. member for Richmond, and, in so far as any reference to myself is concerned, it is absolutely without any foundation in fact.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is reported in the Quebec papers that a party of engineers has left Ottawa to inspect the Quebec and Saguenay railway. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals if that party of engineers has been sent by his department, and if this action has been taken with a view to the probable guaranteeing of the bonds of the Quebec and Saguenay railway.

Mr. BORDEN: If the hon. gentleman will put his question on the Order Paper, it will be answered in due course.

THE SCHOONER ADVOCATE.

Mr. DEVLIN: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to direct the attention of the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the report of the Department of the Naval Service for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1912, in which I find that the schooner Advocate has been purchased, and is being fitted out for the practical instruction of cadets in seamanship. I would like to ask the hon. minister when this purchase was made, and what is the exact size and strength of the schooner Advocate.

Mr. HAZEN: I am quite sure my hon. friend would not expect me to answer such a question at a moment's notice, but I will be glad to obtain the information and give it to him at a future date.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think these questions are such as can only be properly answered after notice has been put on the Order Paper.

Mr. DEVLIN: I respect your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to point out that this is a matter relating to the defence of our territory.

Mr. SPEAKER: If this is a matter of urgent public importance it could be taken up by motion to adjourn the House.

Mr. DEVLIN: Might I be permitted to ask if the purchase of the schooner Advocate was made in connection with the urgent need for the defence of our territory?

Mr. HAZEN: If my hon. friend will put his question on the Order Paper, full information will be given.

THE CHRISTMAS ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MACDONALD: I wish to say a few words on behalf of hon. members who come from the extreme eastern and western provinces of the Dominion, in regard to the adjournment of the House over the Christmas holidays. By the adjournment as now proposed, these gentlemen will have their Christmas holidays at home narrowed down to about a week, and the hon. gentlemen will see that to them this arrangement is very unfair. In a great many instances the House is dependent upon the gentlemen from the eastern and western provinces for a quorum on Mondays and Fridays, and, were it not for their faithful attendance, a large amount of the public business of the country would remain undone. If, as is now proposed, the House adjourns on Thursday until the 8th of January, the time which hon. gentlemen from extreme eastern and western provinces will spend at home will be very short. I am sure I speak on behalf of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House when I ask the right hon. Prime Minister to take into consideration the proposition to adjourn on Wednesday of this week until January 13. I was speaking to an hon. gentleman from British Columbia in regard to the matter, and he pointed out that under the arrangement as originally proposed he would arrive home on the Monday before Christmas day, and would be obliged to leave the day after New Years. Hon. gentlemen from the East could not arrive home until the Sunday morning before Christmas, and would be compelled in some instances to leave on the Saturday previous to the 8th of January. If hon. gentlemen have any business engagements, as most of them have, it would necessitate their being absent at some period during the session, and, as a result of shortening the holiday period, subject them to a reduction in their indemnity. In making this request, I am sure that the business of the House will be transacted in just as satisfactory a manner as if the original proposition were carried out, and that there will be no disposition on the part of any hon. gentlemen to unnecessarily retard the business of the House if reasonable consideration is given to this suggestion.

Mr. BORDEN: I feel that special consideration should be given to hon. gentlemen from the Western, as well as those from the Eastern provinces, for the reasons which my hon. friend has suggested. I will assent at once to the adjournment on Wednesday, and will give my best consideration to the other suggestion.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Hazen.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. WHITE (Minister of Finance), moved that the House do to-morrow go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to revise the laws relating to banking, to continue until the first day of July, 1923, the charters of the several banks to which the provisions of the Bank Act apply, and to authorize the payment out of consolidated revenue fund of remuneration to auditors for special examination of the affairs or business of banks which the Minister of Finance may require to be made.

He said: I have been requested by members on both sides to give them copies of the new Bill, and it is in order to accommodate them that I have asked the assent of the House to this motion, which is necessary, under the rule, before I am permitted to introduce the proposed new Bank Act for its first reading.

Motion agreed to.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of and concurrence in the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon) : Mr. Speaker, in order to arrive at a proper decision as to what Canada should do toward the protection of the British Empire and of itself, we should eliminate from consideration all those things which would belittle the importaance of the subject or which are irrelevant or foreign to it, as they only becloud the issue.

The House will not derive much benefit from dictionary definitions of words, such as emergency or crisis or empire or British Empire or autonomy. These should be understood in their ordinary significance and as generally understood by the people of the country. In order that the hon. gentleman from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) might come to a proper conclusion as to the course which he should pursue he had recourse to Webster's dictionary to ascertain what an emergency meant.

Mr. LEMIEUX : I was rather taken with the interview given by my hon. friend (Mr. Aikins) when he came back from Europe and declared that war was actually declared between Germany and England, and I wanted to know——

Mr. AIKINS : If the hon. gentleman will have a little patience that subject will be considered. I wonder if the hon. member for Rouville was ever sick, and if, being sick, he consulted the dictionary for the words emergency or illness to find out whether he was really sick or not, or whether he should send for a doctor.

Mr. LEMIEUX: My friend is sea-sick now.

Mr. AIKINS: I wonder, too. if, after having consulted that dictionary he came to the conclusion that something was wrong, and the doctor diagnosed his case as incipient diphtheria, he would refuse to take an antitoxin because he was not in an emergent condition and would wait until he was hovering between life and death before applying preventive remedies. I wonder whether, if the hon. member lived out west near a settler who saw a little smoke on the prairies in the distance, if he would advise that settler to consult his dictionary to see whether a critical condition had arisen or whether he would expect that same settler to say: I do not know which way the wind is blowing, the wind may change, the rain may come, something may interfere with the progress of that fire; I shall sit down for the present in statu quo. Would he do that or would he expect that settler to do what any sensible man would; go out, perhaps with his neighbour, and put out that fire if possible, or go out with a team to plow a fire-guard, or burn one against the wind, so that his home and property might be saved from destruction. There are preventive remedies in respect of war as well as corrective force, and these preventive remedies should be applied where possible. We can also eliminate in trying to reach a proper conclusion what was said a year ago or two years ago or four years ago—under circumstances and conditions which were entirely different. What matters it what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said four years ago in respect of circumstances then but not now existing.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. AIKINS: Mr. Speaker, I observe that what those gentlemen are depending upon to decide their course is thoughts expressed in times past under very different circumstances. What matters it what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, what the right hon. the leader of the Government (Mr. Borden) said four years ago under particular circumstances then but not now existing, how the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Inland Revenue voted in days gone by. That is not important. The matter of importance is what are their opinions, their views now, and what action are they going to take? We may also eliminate from consideration details of past constitutional history. What matters it how the little provinces in the earlier Canada advanced from Crown colonies to greater strength? What matters it when those provinces were incorporated into the Dominion, how gradually they grew from boyhood into young manhood and were accorded by the Government of Great Britain the liberty which young men are given when they leave their home and assume family responsibilities. What cares he how he escaped from the cradle to the school, how educated at school. How fostered and cared for, and allowed a little freedom? What matters it to him the stages of adolescence, and young manhood and freedom from paternal government. And so with our country. What matters it on this important question how our country escaped from its swaddling clothes into the knickerbocker stage, and grew to its present strength. A young man leaving his home for one of his own can with mind alert and eye clear, understand the condition prevailing at his old home. If the family at home requires aid, it is not necessary for that family to tell him they need his assistance. He knows it. It is not necessary for the family to demand it; he gives it voluntarily, and he does not hesitate and say: 'I am a young man, and if I grant this aid, I am back in my swaddling clothes, back at the school, or back to the time when I was under parental con-

trol I felt restive under restraint.' What he gives to the family he gives unsolicited and out of the enthusiasm of his heart; and so it is in the present case with Canada. Canada is indebted to the British Empire for its existence. That Empire guarded its juvenescence, and brought it to present maturity; if the British Empire now requires some naval aid, shall we wait until that assistance is even suggested not to say demanded? Sir, Canada does what it now proposes of its own motion, and voluntarily says to Great Britain: 'Here is the aid we offer, we beg you to take it.' Canada is a self-governing nation, and, Sir, the action that is being taken at the present time by the Government in the resolution and Bill before the House, is not only consistent with, but confirmatory of its rights as a self-governing nation. The people of the British Isles, or the Government of the British Isles do not ask it. It springs from the people of self-governing Canada, through the members of Parliament assembled. The Canadian people and they alone can tax themselves to build the battleships now offered. We all know, and the right hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition knows, that practically all public property is held in the name of the Crown. It may be so held in the right of the Dominion; or in the right of the provinces; this aid is given to the Crown and these splendid battleships are held in the right of the Dominion of Canada. Owned if you like by Canada and subject to an arrangement between the Government of this country and the Government of the United Kingdom, under which they will be liable to be recalled at any time that Canada wishes to recall them. The action of the present Government is not a policy of permanency; it is a policy of present expediency.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. AIKINS: I presume that if a condition suddenly arose and confronted some of those hon. gentlemen and required immediate action, they would decide on what was expedient.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Look at Webster.

Mr. AIKINS: Again my hon. friend, with that flippancy which is characteristic of him, tries to reduce this debate to the level of dictionary definitions. The question for the consideration of this House is, what should Canada now do, under existing circumstances to give efficient aid as speedily as possible in the naval defence of the Empire? Not a slow policy of permanency, but an arrangement of the most temporary character.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. AIKINS: The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) nods his head, and that it is temporary is true. If instead of building ships for the navy which protects our country, Canada had made a money grant of thirty-five million dollars to the people of Great Britain, there would be an element of permanency about that, because, once paid it would be gone forever, and Canada would cease to have control over it. But under the present arrangement, what is proposed is to build three of the finest dreadnoughts, to let the British Admiralty have the use of them for the time being, and then, should the Dominion of Canada, through this Parliament, decide to have a Canadian navy, it will have in those three magnificent ships a splendid nucleus for such a navy.

It has been suggested by speakers on the other side of the House that Canada should maintain its status quo, and not move save to build a small navy for itself —should not Canada move strongly. When we consider what has been going on in the world among warlike nations, the wonder is that Canada did not move more quickly. When you consider that within the last fifty years Russia has attained power, has a navy, and a population of 150,000,000; when you consider that the United States has in that time practically grown to be the greatest manufacturing and agricultural producing nation in the world with a population of 100,000,000 and a navy; when you consider that within fifty years there has arisen the Empire of Japan, an empire which aspires to rival the British on the Pacific ocean; when you consider that other European nations are building large war vessels, that Germany within fifty years has become a consolidated country, a population of 69,000,000, which has increased in wealth by virtue of its application of scientific methods to industry, has become a workshop, has organized one of the greatest armies the world perhaps ever saw, an army that can within a few months mobilize 3,500,000 trained and equipped soldiers, that in its aggressiveness Germany desires to equal in naval power any other empire upon the sea; why then should Canada not act quickly and effectively; fifty years ago Great Britain was practically the workshop of the world, she was unchallengeable upon the sea, she could send her commerce almost without a rival to all parts of the world, and was without a peer in wealth. Let me ask, Mr. Speaker, has the United Kingdom increased proportionately in wealth, in power and in aggression? The population of the British Isles is only 45,000,000 and the wealth of her people has not increased proportionately to the wealth of the Germans.

Mr. DEVLIN: Yes, it has.

Mr. AIKINS: It has not increased proportionately to the wealth of Germany or some other countries during that 50 years. England does not possess in herself great natural unexploited resources. We must surely come to the conclusion that the United Kingdom has not increased proportionately with some of these other countries, in population, in riches, in industries, in commerce and power, yet the British Empire as a whole has increased in proportion, will maintain its importance, so long as that British Empire in all its parts is one and indivisible.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is it not a fact that the United Kingdom is to-day the only European power which is reducing its national debt?

Mr. AIKINS: That is not the pertinent question at all. The point is that the United Kingdom, which undoubtedly was the superior of all other nations fifty years ago, in the way I have mentioned, is not maintaining its proportional progress and strength as a lonely unit but the British Empire is so long as the British Empire remains, one and indivisible.

If we cannot depend on dictionary definitions, and if we cannot be guided in the course we should take by details of past Canadian constitutional history, by what can we be guided with certainty? Sir, these can guide us safely: the instinct of self-preservation; natural and national instincts, the impulses and inspirations of the heart; the belief of the people of Canada and of the Empire, that there is some great world purpose for this young country, namely, to hold higher and wave wider the torch of British civilization, which has been a benefit in past times to the whole word. There is above all the faith that the people of Canada have that there is before them one great destiny, not that Canada will be only a great, independent, self-governing nation, but a great and leading nation in the greatest Empire of the world. These instincts, these impulses and this faith will be 'the voice within the heart to melt the freezing reason's colder part;' these are the voices behind us saying: 'This is the way; walk ye in it.' The Empire is one and indivisible; any separation from it of any one part the untying of the bond which binds all parts together or some of the parts together, the adoption and pursuit of the policy of Canada now in and Canada now out, the Empire being at war, yet Canada not warring or in conflict, and reciprocally of Canada being at war and the United Kingdom not in conflict or warring, means the destruction of the British Empire and the construction of another and different empire, if empire it may be called. The Empire is one and indivisible, and the navy which is indisputably sufficient and necessary to protect Canada in all its rights, Canadians and their property at home and abroad; which is sufficient to safeguard, protect and enforce trade arrangements or foreign treaties with other countries, will be sufficient to safeguard and protect the United Kingdom and other parts of the Empire. And, conversely, the navy which is without a doubt sufficient to protect the United Kingdom, its people and its rights, is sufficient to protect all parts of the British Empire. Is it not absurd to suppose, because some battleships of the British navy have been withdrawn from outlying parts of the Empire, that these parts of the Empire are not protected. Where would you expect the navy of Great Britain to be if not in a position to face and meet and control that strongest naval power which at any time might destroy the power of the British Empire, or bring disaster to self-governing nations belonging to it? And the place at present for that British navy is in the North sea, confronting the German navy, four-fifths of which is kept ready and on a war footing.

The aid which is at present being given by this Parliament to the British navy, is a temporary aid, as I have said: three large battleships to assist that navy, concentrated in the North sea. What is to be the future policy of Empire naval defence? It may include a Canadian navy. That future policy may have to include in it, joint action with Australia, with New Zealand, with Canada, and the United Kingdom in respect to the protection of the Pacific ocean, as it most certainly will have to include the question of the protection of the Atlantic ocean and trade routes. It may be that that navy which is held now in the North sea may in time to come be stationed at the mouth of the St. Lawrence, or in the China sea, protecting the interests of that part of the Empire. Whatever the future naval policy of the Empire may be, I know not; but this present contribution of ships for the purpose of aiding the British Empire, if it spells anything, spells this: a British-Canadian fleet under British-Canadian control.

I wish to refer for a moment to the amendment moved by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. There are some things in it which I do not quite understand. It says:

This condition—

Referring to the earlier part of resolution.

—has compelled the United Kingdom to concentrate its naval forces in home waters, involving the withdrawal of ships from the outlying portions of the Empire. That such withdrawal renders it necessary that Canada

without further delay should enter actively upon a permanent policy of naval defence.

Naval defence of what? Does that mean defence of Canada or of the whole of the Empire? I think I am entitled to an answer from my right hon. friend; I am not putting the question captiously, but because I want to understand this amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Does my hon. friend want my answer?

Mr. AIKINS: Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I think the policy is stated in the amendment: That the new condition of things which has arisen in Europe has compelled Canada to take a part in the defence of the Empire as a whole, and the manner of doing it is by the creation of a Canadian navy.

Mr. AIKINS: Let us look at it in this way:

That such withdrawal renders it necessary that Canada without delay should enter actively upon a permanent policy of naval defence.

Does that mean of Canada or of the Empire?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I have just stated: of the Empire.

Mr. AIKINS: Then it says:

That such withdrawal renders it necessary that Canada without further delay should enter actively upon a permanent policy of naval defence,——

—of the Empire, and that without consulting the British Government.

Mr. TURRIFF: A lawyer's quibbling.

Mr. AIKINS: And an hon. gentleman's want of apprehension to see the point. We should enter without further delay actively upon a permanent policy of naval defence of the Empire, as if the responsibility were thrown upon Canada alone to defend the Empire? Now, let me read just a little further in connection with that:

This House is further of the opinion that to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy by the addition by Canada under the above Act of two fleet units, to be stationed on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts of Canada, respectively.

Might I ask the hon. gentleman one question? It seems to me there has been an omission when it says: 'to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial Navy by the addition to '—what?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on reading it.

Mr. AIKINS: It does not say to what. I want to know to what, simply because I want to understand that resolution.

Mr. TURRIFF: The people of the country understand it.

Mr. EMMERSON: To arrange for a night school.

Mr. AIKINS: My hon. friend who has just spoken, having in view some honour from the Government, might think a knighthood instead of a night school. I would really like to know for the information of this House what it means thereby, 'the addition to.'

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am very sorry that my imperfect knowledge of the English language is not adequate to convey the meaning to my hon. friend. I think if my hon. friend will read the whole sentence, he will have no hesitation as to its meaning:

This House is further of the opinion that to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy by the addition of two fleet units.

If that means anything, I think it means an addition to the Imperial Navy.

Mr. AIKINS: That is the explanation I desire.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I am glad you have it at last.

Mr. AIKINS: Let us read it again:

That this House is further of the opinion that to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy by the addition to the Imperial navy by Canada under the above Act of two fleet units.

Now we have something that interprets that, which we will see if we read a little further on. The first part is that this House is of the opinion that it is necessary to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy, and a little further on that it is necessary to restore greater freedom to the movements of the British squadrons in every sea. Does the amendment, then, mean that there is to be an addition by Canada of 2 fleet units to the British squadrons in every sea. If it does not then it draws a distinction between the British squadrons and the Imperial navy. As I understand it, the very purpose of this amendment is otherwise—that there should be established in Canada a navy of two fleet units, one to be stationed on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, under separate and independent Canadian control, and not under the same control as the Imperial navy or the British squadrons? Am I wrong about that?

Mr. GRAHAM: Read the resolution.

Mr. AIKINS: I have read the resolution. It seems to me that the purpose of this amendment is that there should be stationed on the Atlantic and on the Pa-

cific, under the control of the Canadian Government, two fleet units built by the Canadian Government, to act as the Canadian Government thinks proper they should act—sometimes perchance in conjunction with the Imperial navy, perhaps never in conjunction with the Imperial navy, and never under the same control. If that be the true construction, and I believe it to be, is it the purpose of this amendment that there should be an inpendent Canadian navy and an independent British navy? Let us look at some of the statements that have been made by the right hon. gentleman, and I think we will come to a conclusion upon that point. He says in one part of his speech upon this resolution :

The document discloses the fact that, on account of this increased naval armament, England, in order to maintain her security in her own waters, has been obliged to withdraw some of her naval forces from the distant seas.

This means, if it means anything, that in the belief of the right hon. gentleman, and I suppose also of his supporters, the British navy has been withdrawn from Canada to maintain the security of England in her own waters. Does not that suggest the idea that Canada is no longer protected, when the battleships are withdrawn to protect England only for her own security? A little further on he says :

What is the duty of the House of Commons, what is the duty of the people of Canada?

He answers a little further on:

England has been obliged to increase the margin of security which she relies on for her own defence, by reducing her naval forces in the outlying seas. Such is the condition; and, I ask once more, what is the remedy?

In order to protect herself, England has withdrawn her fleets from other seas, and the suggestion is that as Canada is left unprotected, the remedy suggested by the right hon. gentleman is that Canada should have a Canadian fleet in order to protect and look after Canada. Is that right? The suggestion is that in order to increase the mobility of the Imperial Navy Canada assumed the responsibility of looking after Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear.

Mr. AIKINS: Some hon. gentlemen says, hear. I presume that is his view of the case. Let me ask this question: To what do the people of Canada look now for their protection? To what have they looked in times past for their protection? What hopes have we for our future protection except one thing, the Imperial Navy? I have had the impression, which the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickel) had, that the tendency of the naval policy of the right hon. gentleman and his recent government was toward separation of Canada from the Empire.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh!

Mr. AIKINS: I have heard the statement made by the right hon. gentleman that he is a Britisher, and I believe it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Then how can you be ieve that he wants separation?

Mr. AIKINS: I will tell my hon. and impatient friend if he will wait just a moment. The right hon. gentleman appeals to his 71 years of life as a British Canadian—

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. AIKINS: And I say, Hear, hear, to that, yet it was not necessary to convince me of his loyalty. The right hon. gentleman is a Canadian. I am a Canadian, and as a Canadian I respect great Canadians, and the right hon. gentleman is a great Canadian. I have no more doubt of his loyalty as a British subject than I have of my own.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. AIKINS. I will go further. I have no doubt of the loyal hearts and loyal sentiments of the hon. gentlemen who support their right hon. leader.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why should you?

Mr. AIKINS: I should not. Sir, loyalty is a matter of affection, of sentiment, of the heart. But, while I believe their hearts are right their judgment is wrong. Hearts right, heads not so. I imagine their heads do not follow what their hearts dictate. Consider the statement that has been made by the hon. gentleman just now, and if that statement means anything, it means, that, ships have been withdrawn from Canada, Canada is left unprotected. And what is their remedy? The creation of two fleets, one on the Atlantic coast and the other on the Pacific coast. Controlled how—by the united control and power which guides the British navy? No, but by Canadian control. Look at the amendment, and you find that it refers to the Naval Service Act. And what does that say?

The Governor in Council may place the naval forces or any part thereof, on active service at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of an emergency.

And who is to decide the emergency? The Canadian Government. But that is not all:

In case of an emergency, the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service the Royal navy, the naval service or any part thereof.

'May' place. What does that mean? It means that the Governor in Council will have the right to decide whether there is an emergency or not—taking the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux's) definition as to 'emergency' though defined in Naval Service Act to which that hon. gentleman did not refer. What certainty has the British Admiralty or the British Government that the Canadian Government will decide there is an emergency or will place Canada's navy here given for general service. They will say: That may or may not happen; therefore we will have to strengthen the Imperial navy so that we may be independent of the naval units of Canada on the Atlantic and on the Pacific coasts. It means more than that. Even if the Government of Canada decided that there was an emergency, and that they should place the naval units at disposal for general service of the British Empire, one stationed on the Atlantic, and the other on the Pacific, would require much time to reach the place where they are required. And when they reached there, if anything adverse had happened, the enemy, as suggested by the right hon. gentleman, would grapple and sink our beautiful units of the Canadian navy. The naval protection of Canada and of the British Empire has been a united protection. The Imperial battleships have been taken away, are we therefore without protection in Canada, that we must prepare our fleet units to protect ourselves? Let us assume that there is a severance between the Canadian naval units, the Imperial Australian units, and what may happen? Any power, stronger power than any one of them—I do not care what it is—may attack each singly in an unequal contest and in disgraceful disaster. Why should that be? The only present naval protection which Canada has is the Imperial navy. I wonder if the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is really sincere in what he says, that this policy is necessary to protect Canada, British battleships being withdrawn. And has he just now awakened to the importance of the position? But when did that withdrawal take place? Did it take place only the other day? Did it take place in 1910? As I understand it, they were withdrawn in 1906 and 1907. If the right hon. gentleman and the members who support him were sincere about it, why did not they do something about it when these battleships were withdrawn? Why did not they then begin to make provision for the protection of Canada? Do they really believe that when the United Kingdom withdrew these vessels to their own waters Canada required protection? If so, what protection did they offer? They purchased, it is true, the weeping Niobe,—and all the more weeping when she was on the rocks. They also purchased a Rainbow. What a name! It suggests that Canada need fear no more, because the Rainbow is there. Has Canada been unprotected in times past? These certainly did not protect Canada against other navies. Assuming the British navy was not protecting Canada, was Canada still protected? Protected by isolation? Is Canada so isolated that other nations do not know anything about her? Is she like Iceland? Yet the Scandinavians found even Iceland. Why, Mr. Speaker, in these days, if Canada were located at the pole and unprotected, we should find some incautious Cook or some patriotic Peary starting out with the Stars and Stripes to nail them to the pole. If we cannot depend for protection upon isolation, is Canada so unattractive, so inhospitable, that we are protected without the benefit of any fleet? We have advertised to the world that Canada is one of the richest countries and have urged people to come. And they are coming in hundreds of thousands a year, at an average of nearly nine hundred every day, of whom from five hundred to eight hundred a day are going into the western part of Canada. This shows the attractiveness of our country. If we are not protected by our isolation or by our want of attractiveness, are we protected because we are so good? Is there so little 'of the earth, earthy' about us, are we so divine in our lives that hostile nations will look at us and say in sacred regard, 'Touch not Canada.' The time has not arrived when nations learn the art of war no more; the time has not arrived when nation does not rise up against nation, but the very reverse appears to be the case. Japan, having been asleep for many years, following her peaceful avocations, suddenly awakened, beat her ploughshares into swords and her pruning hooks into spears, and drove back the Russian bear to his northern fastnesses. The time has not come when for this country we can claim any special providential protection. It is said that a special Providence watches over drunken men and fools. Canada does not wish to classify yet if Canada does not see to her own protcetion, she may be classified among those—and yet be unprotected. What has protected Canada in times past? What is protecting Canada now? The British navy.

The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) referred to the Monroe Doctrine, and I am pleased to know that he is not satisfied with the results of that doctrine. He has referred to the complications that

have arisen in Cuba by virtue of the intervention of the United States and the domination of the latter over Cuba as a consequence. I am glad to know he is commencing to realize that dangerous results may come from entanglements with the United States. The right hon. gentleman has said that we want to have nothing to do with Monroe Doctrine. But is it possible to avoid it? Is it at the option of Canada to decide whether the Monroe Doctrine will or will not be enforced? Let us assume a condition of affairs, and suppose that a foreign fleet—from Germany or Japan, I care not which—appeared in the St. Lawrence river or on the Pacific coast, threatening Canada, under the Monroe Doctrine, the principle of which is that the United States has a paramount interest in American affairs—a doctrine which has rapidly developed since 1890—what might happen? The United States navy might appear, and without our option, in effect say to those hostile fleets on the Atlantic or Pacific 'Hands off'; and the United States might say: 'We saved Canada' and might they not, Mr. Speaker, claim for themselves the salvage? Is that a desirable condition of affairs?

What has protected Canada in the past? A Canadian fleet? No, there was no Canadian fleet; but we have been constantly under the protection of the naval forces of Great Britain. I can only refer, Mr. Speaker, to the time when Canada ceased to be a French possession; to the time when Montgomery appeared before Quebec and was beaten back by the patriotic French Canadians; to that time a little later on when the United States sent Benjamin Franklin, Charles Carroll and Samuel Chase to Canada to entice the people to unite with the United States. They failed, just as the army of Montgomery failed before Quebec. But I do wish to call attention to what has since happened between the United States and Canada, in order that we may understand the power which protected us. In an address at Washington before the International Conference held under the auspices of the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes. Mr. John W. Foster, who was a member of the Harrison Government in 1891 and 1892, made this statement:

> The war of 1812 was a partisan and sectional war. In this respect it was quite different from the Mexican and Spanish wars. Henry Clay, Speaker of the House, gathered around him a body of ardent young members, known in history as the 'War Hawks,' Calhoun, Grundy and others, and organized the committees with the view of bringing on the war. Slight disguise was made of the purpose to conquer Canada. As early as January, 1811, Clay, in discussing a retaliatory Bill against Great Britain declared: 'The conquest of Canada is in your power. I trust I may not be deemed presumptuous when I state that I verily believe that the militia of Kentucky are alone competent to place Montreal and Upper Canada at your feet.' His memorable speech on the Army Bill, as epitomized by his biographer, anticipated the results of the war. 'It was to be an agressive war, a war of glorious conquest. He saw the battalions of the Republic marching victoriously through Canada and laying siege to doomed Quebec. His dream was of a peace dictated at Halifax.' Grundy, in defending the report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs favouring the war, said, 'We shall drive the British from our continent. . . . I feel anxious not only to add the Floridas to the south, but the Canada to the north of this Empire.'
>
> The war of 1812 was declared before diplomatic recourse had been exhausted. This is manifest from the fact that on the day before war was declared Parliament voted the repeal of the Orders in Council, the announced cause of the war. Adams, who has discussed this phase of the question fully, states that 'the people of England never wanted war with the United States,' and this is confirmed by other historians. Parliament met in January, 1812, and the speech from the Throne was 'studiously moderate' in its references to our affairs, closing with the declaration 'that England could bear more from America for peace's sake than from any other power on earth.'

That was the action of the United States against Canada in 1812, to which I think the right hon. gentleman has referred. What was it that protected Canada in that conflict? Although there were successes and reverses; although Canadians did splendidly in the war, what really terminated the conflict was the fact that the British fleet was released from its European contest, was free to protect Canada and the Canadians to the British Empire, and did so. In the same speech, Mr. Foster further stated:

> The war with Mexico followed immediately after the annexation of Texas, and was caused by the forcible occupation by the army of the United States of territory which was in dispute at the time of the annexation. Before the annexation was consummated the republic of Texas had proposed to Mexico an adjustment of all differences between them, and the basis of settlement had been agreed to by Mexico, but was not carried out because of the annexation. One clause of this proposal was as follows: 'Texas will be willing to submit disputed points respecting territory and other matters to the arbitration of umpires.'
>
> In his memoirs 40 years after the event General U. S. Grant wrote:
>
> To-day I regard the war (which resulted from the annexation of Texas) as one of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation.

The United States then wished to have that territory; the fact of an agreement

for arbitration did not stand between her and her wishes and that territory was annexed.

I do not wish to attribute improper action or motives to the people of the United States. It is a magnificent country, a splendid nation, that has been created in a very short time, a nation of wonderful business enterprise, of intellectual advancement, a nation in which there are hosts of manly men and womanly women, but nevertheless they are just as acquisitive, they desire advancement just as much as Canadians and we who are living in a glass house should not throw stones. At this juncture, while I am expressing an admiration for the people of the United States, I cannot but voice the sympathy which I am sure is felt by all members of the House with the people of the United States because of the death of their late eminent ambassador to London, Mr. Whitelaw Reid. But, while I respect the United States and regard them as being a great nation, is there any reason why that nation should not act towards Canada just as it did towards Texas? Any reason? Yes, one reason is this, because of the supremacy of the British fleet and the power of the British Empire.

Let us go a little further. Mr. Foster in speaking about the Spanish war said:

President Taft has recently announced in a public address in my hearing that the Spanish war was an altruistic war; it must have been such for only on that ground can it be justified.

I wonder if that altruism of the people of the United States might not at some time be exercised towards Canada? Might not the United States, at some time, wish to give to the backwoods people of our country the benefit of the free and great institutions of the United States? What is to prevent it if altruism is upheld by war?

Let me go just a little further in respect of a matter which is now of very great importance to us in Canada, that is, the Panama canal, which was referred to recently by the hon member for Guysboro' (Mr. Sinclair). The provision in that treaty is that:

The canal shall be free and open to the vessels of commerce and war of all nations observing these rules, on terms of entire equality so that there shall be no discrimination against any such nation or its citizens or subjects in respect of the conditions or charges of traffic or otherwise. Such conditions and charges of traffic shall be just and equitable.

We know the legislation passed in the United States in making free from toll American vessels doing coastwise trade. The President of the United States in his message said:

After full examination of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty and of the treaty which preceded it, I feel confident that the exemption of the coastwise vessels of the United States from tolls and the imposition of tolls on vessels of all nations engaged in the foreign trade is not a violation of the Hay-Pauncefote treaty.

Then what does he add? He says:

I suggest therefore that before the time has elapsed for the disapproval of the Bill congress will consider the wisdom of passing a joint resolution as follows.

And among other things:

When any alien, whether natural person, partnership, company or corporation considers that the charging of tolls or the enforcement of any other regulation under and pursuant to the provisions of this Act violates in any way any such treaty, rights or privileges, such alien shall have the right to bring an action against the United States for redress of the injury which he considers himself to have suffered; and the district courts of the United States are hereby given jurisdiction to hear and determine such cases, to decree appropriate relief and from the decision of such district courts there shall be an appeal to either party to the Supreme Court of the United States.

If there is a dispute Canada's remedy then is only in the courts of the United States. Is that fair? There is no country more interested in the proper interpretation of that treaty than Canada. The last speaker in the Senate closed the debate on that very Bill with a remarkable outburst in which he attacked the British interpretation of the treaty, not because it was incorrect, unjust or inaccurate, but because it was an interpretation which the American people would not observe. Moreover he observed bluntly that this was not a question of arbitration, it was a question of power, and if diplomacy failed then war would be the final arbiter.

I wonder what in times past has protected Canada in all her rights. What protects it now? The navy that has been recently instituted under the Naval Service Act by my right hon. friend? The Rainbow with its pop-gun and the Niobe with its hand-grenade? As the right hon. gentleman suggests, would they pounce upon and grapple and sink all other battleships in Canadian waters?

What can we rely upon? If we cannot depend upon the British fleet we might purchase our safety. I refer my good British friend to what Kipling says on that subject.

It is always a temptation to a rich and lazy nation,
To puff and look important and to say
Though we know we should defeat you!

Think of the Niobe!

Though we know we should defeat you, we have not the time to meet you,

We will therefore pay you cash to go away.
And that is called paying the Dane-gelt;
But we've proved it again and again,
That if once you have paid him the Dane-gelt,
You'll never get rid of the Dane.

Canada, unless it be protected by the British navy, which we are told is now concentrated to protect the United Kingdom, is like a rich and very attractive looking young heiress, I will not say loved, but longed for by other covetous people who would like to take possession of her. The fleet units of a Canadian navy or a greater Canadian navy will not be sufficient to protect Canada for the next quarter of a century without the assistance of the British fleet. The richness of our country is a temptation to other aggressive nations, its lack of protection an incitement.

Again allow me to refer the right hon. gentleman to Kipling:

It is wrong to put temptation in the path of any nation,
For fear they should succumb and go astray,
So when you are requested to pay up or be molested,
You will find it better policy to say:—
We never pay any one Dane-gelt,
No matter how trifling the cost,
For the end of that game is oppression and shame,
And the nation that plays it is lost.'

What is there then to protect us against those who would like to occupy Canada? We are told that Germany is looking for colonies, that she wishes to get colonies under her control where she can sell her goods and place her surplus population. What is there to protect us in the interpretation of the Hay-Pauncefote Treaty? Nothing; we would be helpless unless beneath and above us and enfolding us were the prestige and power of the British Empire, and the unchallenged supremacy of the Imperial fleet.

Mr. Speaker, I have been from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I have been in the houses of well-to-do Canadians, I have seen their nice drawing rooms with perhaps the lady of the house or her daughter playing the piano, I have seen their dining rooms, on the tables of which were spread bountifully the necessaries of life. I have seen the children happily at play there, all the attractions and enjoyments and comforts of any home; and I have passed out to another part that might be called a shed or a lean-to. In that shed or lean-to is stored the wood, the coal, the water, perhaps, the fish in a refrigerator, and other things. Everything necessary in that shed to bring comfort to the home, and that place, with all its coal, and wood, and water, and raw products, is nothing less than an adjunct to that home. The persons working there are the hewers of wood and the drawers of water. What was it that caused young Canada in its knickerbockers, almost to shake its fist in the face of the great people of the United States and cooly to turn down their Reciprocity proposition, if it was not that they stood between the forepaws and under the strong jaws of the British lion, and found there strength and protection? And yet the power of Great Britain is questioned. The supremacy of that fleet is now being challenged. I shall not go into a long discussion of how, but I shall refer to what has been stated by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government in regard to the explanatory notes in the German Navy Act of 1900. That Act refers to the greatest sea power, to the mightiest naval power. What power could be meant other than Great Britain? Let me read from it:

Germany must have a fleet of such strength that even for the British Empire——

I am using the words 'British Empire' instead of 'the mightiest naval power.'

Germany must have a fleet of such strength that even for the British Empire, a war with her would involve such risks as to jeopardize its own supremacy. For this purpose it is not absolutely necessary that the German fleet should be as strong as that of the British Empire because, generally, a great sea-power will not be in a position to concentrate all its forces against us. But even if it should succeed in confronting us in superior force the enemy would be so considerably weakened in overcoming the resistance of a strong German fleet that, notwithstanding a victory gained, the enemy's supremacy would not at first be secured any longer by a sufficient fleet.

That is the declaration of the policy in 1900. How have they followed it up? From the Naval Pocket Book of 1898, it appears that of war-ships built, building or ordered on February 1, 1898: Britain had 88 armoured ships, 154 cruisers, 60 coast defence, 313 torpedo craft. Germany had 28 armoured ships, 24 cruisers, 13 coast defence and 127 torpedo craft. Since then there has been such a rapid increase that now the German programme is for 61 battleships. Now, naval sea power does not consist simply in the number of vessels, but in their preparedness for immediate action, and all those vessels that have been gradually increasing in number and power are now in the North sea or in the Baltic which are connected by the Kiel canal, like hounds in leash, prepared for any emergency, prepared to strike when the antagonist is at his weakest. In a pamphlet published recently in Germany which is mentioned in Hurd's 'Command of the Sea,' and

which is signed by one 'Lookout' who is supposed to be a well-informed Admiral, there is a comparison between the growth of the British navy and the growth of the German navy as follows:

In 1898 the German navy stood to the British navy in the proportion of one to 6.3; in 1900 one to 4.3; in 1903 one to 3.5; in 1911 1.2 to 2.2; in 1912 one to 2.1.

This shows how rapidly the Germans have increased their navy. Then it goes on to suggest that the two to one standard is doomed, and that when Germany has 60 dreadnoughts Britain will have to stop building, as she will not have enough men to man 120 dreadnoughts or enough money to pay for them. In another article which appears in one of the German magazines, this is stated:

The cause to which this naval expansion in Germany is attributed by leading German politicians is 'the widespread belief shared by many people of very advanced views and friendly feelings towards the British nation that Great Britain will one day try to get rid of German competition and the menace of the German navy by forcing war upon Germany and destroying as many German ships as possible.'

Britain has not given Germany cause for such a belief. Why circulate then such a spectral story? The empire ideals of Pan-Germans are high. Do we blame them? Driven by ambition they steadily pursue and work up to them. Why should we condemn it?

That is the talk that is circulated in Germany in order that the people may keep on increasing the navy. If the British purpose is to destroy the German navy, it may be asked why did not the British navy do it long ago, and why is it not doing it to-day? When Germany is not as strong as it hopes to be a suggestion in 1905 was made to the people of England that they should reduce their armaments, and from 1905 to 1909 they did reduce the building of warships to the extent of about £11,000,000 sterling per year. Then what happened? The people of Germany, so we are told, said, 'Oh, England has reached her limit; and can go no further; now is our opportunity to increase our navy,' and they did increase it, as was stated by the right hon. the Prime Minister. If England increases her armaments the people of Germany say they intend to destroy us; and the people of Germany are told so, and so they increase their armaments. If on the other hand Britain decides to reduce her armaments the German people say now is our opportunity, and so the contest goes on. Such is the challenge of the aggressor. What do English statesmen reply? The Hon. Mr. Asquith stated in 1908:

Every foreign power knows that if we have established, as we have, and if we mean to maintain, as we do, an indisputable superiority on the sea, it is not for the purpose of aggression or adventure, but it is that we may fulfil the elementary duty which we owe to the Empire, to uphold beyond reach, yes, and beyond risk of successful attack from outside, our commerce, our industry, our homes.

Lord Rosebery speaking in 1909 said—and I call the attention of the hon. member for St. John to this:

We live in the midst of what I think was called by Petrarch as tacens bellum, a silent warfare, in which not a drop of blood is shed in anger, but in which the very last drop is extracted from the body by the lancets of European statemen.

The Right Hon. Winston Churchill, speaking on February 9, 1912, said:

Whatever may happen abroad, there will be no whining here, no signals of distress will be hoisted, no cries for help or succour will go up. We will face that future as our ancestors would have faced it, without disquiet, without arrogance, but in stolid and inflexible determination. We should be the first power to welcome any retardation or slackening of naval rivalry. We should meet any such slackening, not by words, but by deeds.

Mr. Balfour, in the debate on the Naval Estimates, July, 1912, said:

The Germans were moving steadily and remorselessly, they were adding year by year to the number of men, to the number of ships, and to the readiness of those ships and those men for instantaneous action, and he (i.e. Mr. Churchill) said and he said rightly, in my opinion, there is one way and but one way to meet a menace of that kind, and that is to imitate the policy of our neighbour, and neither to lapse into panic nor, what is even more important, to relax for one instant your efforts for the augmentation of your strength, so that no possible revolution of fortune will ever put you at the mercy of some military or naval accident.

A prominent authority writing to the Tagblatt so recently as the 10th of December last, says:

There can be no doubt, that the increase in the British fleet is due, not to American or French armaments, but to Germany's action. Canada's is proof, of the unity and strength of the British Empire and a little reflection must have long since made it obvious to anybody that nothing was more calculated to weld together the British Empire than the hurried strengthening of the German fleet.

In the Taglische Rundschan published on the 10th of December last, referring to Canada's proposed naval contribution, we read:

This development is the result of the enormous increase in the British world power which brings Germany face to face with the ques-

tion whether they can any longer be satisfied with the slow progress established in the last naval estimates.

And so that tacens bellum goes on. There is between these two nations a state of war, but what words can describe it better than these: that Germany and England are in a state of war, though no overt blow has yet been struck. Sir, that was the statement which was made by me when I was in the old country, and which was sent by the Associated Press to Canada; misread, I submit, by some hon. gentlemen opposite. I never stated, as was said by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that England and Germany were actually at war. It is the tacens bellum I referred to and that conflict is to-day continuing between England and Germany. The people of Germany are as a result groaning beneath the burden of debt; it has added £39,000,000 to the debt since 1900 for building vessels. The people of England are burdened by the taxation they have to bear for naval armament; not for the benefit of the United Kingdom only as was suggested by the right hon. gentleman, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). No, the concentration of the fleet was for the protection of the whole British Empire, including Canada. Now, what should Canada do under the circumstances? Is it to commence to build a Canadian navy; to start where the right hon. gentleman had left off, and complete a great naval fleet unit on the Atlantic and another on the Pacific? No aid would go to the United Kingdom in that way short of ten or fifteen or twenty years.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. AIKINS: The right hon. gentleman said, referring to the members on this side of the House; 'O ye Tory jingoes,' in connection with the manning of the fleet—'O ye Tory jingoes.' I might just as well say to the right hon. gentleman and to his friends on the other side: 'O ye Grit jockeyers.'

Mr. LEMIEUX: We are riding only one horse anyway.

Mr. FOSTER: It's a poor looking horse.

Mr. AIKINS: I rather pity that poor one horse with all the hon. gentlemen on the other side with their diverse opinions, upon its back. These gentlemen opposite tell us that no provision is made for the manning of these offered dreadnoughts by Canadians, and let us consider that for a minute. The people of Canada, young men and others, are very much occupied in the development of our own country. There is a great demand for labour here, there is a great demand for labour in the United States, and does this House suppose that Canadians will leave their work, their industries, their farms, and go at low wages on board battleships to be trained—and, it would require four years to properly train them. Does the patriotism of my right hon. friend opposite, or any of those behind him move them so strongly that they are ready to relinquish their seats in this House to go on board these vessels from patriotic motives, and be trained in the science of naval warfare? Of course, they say no, and why should any class of Canadians make sacrifices, these gentlemen opposite are not prepared to do. Why, you would have to pass a law of conscription to oblige Canadian workers to leave their occupations to man the battleships.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why? Is there one in England?

Mr. AIKINS: What?

Mr. LEMIEUX: A law of conscription. Is there one in the United States?

Mr. AIKINS: There is not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why should we have one in Canada?

Mr. AIKINS: I will tell you. The people of Canada are occupied in the development of Canada. We have a young population. They are occupied in the development of Canada; they are receiving very high wages; and, assuming that the three dreadnoughts, which are to be for a time part of the Imperial navy, were to be manned by Canadians, the rate of pay would have to be twice as much or more in order to induce Canadians to go on board, than that paid to the seamen that are on board the dreadnoughts in the Old Country.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Can Canada afford to pay?

Mr. AIKINS: Canada can afford to pay; but can the people of the United Kingdom afford to double the wages of their ordinary seamen in order to man their own vessels? Put the two English and Canadian vessels side by side. The Canadian on one dreadnought is paid twice or three times as much as the Britisher on board another dreadnought, then what will happen?

Mr. OLIVER: Is that an objection?

Mr. AIKINS: That there should be a conflict between seamen from the United Kingdom and those from Canada in respect to their wages? Is it an objection that dissatisfaction should be raised among the people who are manning the British fleet and who are to fight for the protection of our Empire, because of discrimination.

Mr. OLIVER: It did not form an objection in South Africa.

Mr. AIKINS : Where were the dreadnoughts of Canada in South Africa ? There is a very great difference.

Mr. OLIVER : The soldiers of Canada were the dreadnoughts in South Africa.

Mr. AIKINS : What a great imagination the hon. gentleman has ! There is this difference between an army and a navy. An army is restricted to the land; it's ambit is narrow; it cannot go beyond that narrow ambit without a fleet. A fleet on the other hand is mobile; it can go anywhere. Any supreme fleet has its highway upon the oceans, and can protect every part of our Empire. A fleet must be united in order to achieve great things. In an army regiments may be paid different wages in different countries, that is quite true, and it might be an objection if they were long together, and one section knew what the other section was being paid; but on the field they soon separate as in the South African campaign. I say, unless there was a conscription law you could not get Canadians to go into long training and service at very small wages.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What about Canada and the United States?

Mr. AIKINS: What discrimination my hon. friend has that he does not know any difference between aiding by dreadnoughts the navy of the United States and aiding the Imperial navy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Speaking of conscription?

Mr. AIKINS: Does my hon. friend think so much of the United States, that the Canadian unit is going to be a part of the United States navy?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No.

Mr. AIKINS: The conditions are different.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With the hon. gentleman's permission, if he will allow me.

Mr. AIKINS: Certainly.

Mr. LEMIEUX: The hon. gentleman referred a moment ago to the possibility of Canada adopting the conscription law. Then I interjected, 'What about England? What about the United States?' My hon. friend has answered as regards England. Now I put the question, what about the United States? I am referring to conscription. My inference is that as there is no conscription in the United States, therefore there is no necessity to have conscription in Canada. I am in earnest as to this.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to draw hon. members' attention to rule 23, which says that when a member is speaking, no member shall interrupt him, except to raise a point of order. It seems to me that in the interests of the procedure of the House, it is desirable to follow that rule as closely as possible.

Mr. AIKINS: The hon. gentleman asked a question with respect to the United States. In that country they pay high wages. In Canada, if the fleet were stationed in Canada, and were not a part of the British fleet, Canada could afford to pay very high wages, but when the Canadian dreadnoughts were united to the British fleet and it became known, as it would, that Canadians were paid very high wages for their services, the same services as were given by men from the United Kingdom, there would at once be dissatisfaction. It must not be forgotten also that the British Isles are sea girt, that the people learn to live upon the seas, and it would be very much easier to get people to go from those islands, trained as they are upon the sea, to man the battleships from Canada, than it would be to get Canadians to leave their homes and go to England. Not every man is fit to do duty on a dreadnought. It requires a man of skill, a trained mechanic. Therefore one cannot be surprised at the difficulty we might experience in endeavouring to get Canadians to go upon these vessels, even at a high rate of wages.

Let me refer now to the question of the necessity of promptly taking efficient action. I have pointed out that men in England, who know a great deal more about it than we do, think the circumstances call for immediate action. I refer to the statement made by Lord Roberts only last October, in which he said:

> Germany has within the past ten years sprung up at a bound, from one of the weakest naval powers to the greatest naval power, save one upon the globe. But yesterday, so to speak, the British fleets did not feel the furrows of the German war keels on the high seas. To-day, every British warship and every British merchant vessel thrills in all its iron nerves to that mighty presence..... .....I point to the gradual displacement of the British fleets before the German menace. I point to the Mediterranean, bereft of British battleships and the gradual harrowing year by year of Britain's once far-flung battle line. . . .
>
> Germany always advances towards complete supremacy by land and sea. . . . How impressive in this magnificent unresting energy! It has the mark of true greatness. It challenges admiration even from those against whom it is directed. . . . . There is one way in which Britain can have peace with Germany and every other power, namely, to present such a battle front by sea and land that no power or probable combination of powers dare attack her without the certainty of disaster (loud cheers). That is the only reply worthy of our past or wise for our future. (Renewed cheers). But there

is a way in which Britain is certain to have wars, horrors and calamities, namely, by persisting in her present unpreparedness, apathy and unintelligent blind disregard of warnings of the most ordinary practical political insight. . . . . What is the lesson which history enforces? We must abandon the Empire and with it our commercial wealth or be prepared to defend it. We have a great fleet but that fleet is rapidly becoming unequal to the fleets by which we may be opposed. . . . . A paramount navy we must possess, whether of two keels to one or three keels to one. That is a self-evident truth. . . . . What then is my ultimate counsel to the nation in this solemn hour?

Gentlemen, it is a message burnt into my mind. . . . . That message is, arm, prepare, quit yourselves like men, for the time of your ordeal is at hand. . . . . Remember, war does not begin nor end on the day of battle. There is a kind of war, a war of preparation, which goes on silently and unperceived amid apparent peace. . . . . If once you permit any one state to be your undisputed superior by sea or land, that hour, even if not a shot be fired, you cease to be a free nation. . . . . I ask myself how can I, even at this late solemn hour, best help England. Again I say arm, be prepared to quit yourselves as men, for the day of your ordeal is at hand.

This is from one of the oldest and most patriotic warriors Great Britain ever grew. Surely, he knows as much of the interests of the British Empire, and more about British protection, than we do in this House—even than hon. gentlemen opposite do. Therefore, what should Canada do? Arm and prepare for protection. Protection of what? Solely of Canada? No. Disaster to England would mean disaster to Canada; the protection of the British Isles means the protection of Canada; the supremacy of the British fleet means the supremacy of a Canadian fleet, if forces are united. Therefore, we should now take those steps which will result in giving the most efficient aid in the shortest possible time. Canada has been delaying too long; it has been trifling with the so-called Canadian navy. If the late Government had been in earnest a Canadian navy would have been established long ago. Why was it not? The very reason assigned by the right hon. gentleman for the establishment of these navy units on the east and west coasts of Canada existed long ago. If the need existed, why then was not the remedy applied? There is however but one protection for the British Empire—the united British Empire.—and that is a united British Empire fleet. And so what was said to the people of England by Lord Roberts will equally apply to the people of Canada:—'Arm, quit yourselves like men; be strong.' Are we going to neglect the teachings that are indisputable? 'When the strong man armed keepeth his palace, his goods are at peace. But when a stronger than he cometh upon him and overcometh him he taketh away the armour wherein he trusted and divideth the spoils.' What is the armour in which Canada has trusted in the past? The British navy. Will we in Canada allow a stronger to come upon the Britisfi Empire and take away that armour in which we trusted? Or will we make stronger the strong and add to the armour. When these three splendid Canadian dreadnoughts float in grim silence and power with the other dreadnoughts of the British fleet and a Canadian minister advises on its control whatever complaint has been made—such as that mentioned by the right hon. gentleman as to people in England, in ignorance giving away portions of land which otherwise might be part of Canadian territory—these complaints will absolutely disappear and every foot of farm land, every mineral vein, every waving tree-top, every one of the lowing kine and every fish that cuts in joy the Canadian waters, every towering church-spire, every bowed worshipper, every humble home, and every happy fireside in Canada, will be of as much interest and as carefully guarded as the very beatings of the heart of the British Empire, the breathings of its own existence. Sir, never in the history of Canada, never in the history of the British Empire, was there such necessity for prompt and efficient measures as there is to-day. Now is the opportunity offered to Canada to assert her greatness and to come out into the limelight as an important world power. And Canada will do it. While these clouds and that darkness surround the British Empire, they separate for a moment, and through the rift comes a ray of light. It falls upon the tree of Empire whose branches and leaves are for the strengthening and healing of the nations, and that tree of Empire stands Canada, the young shepherd of the Empire, ruddy, because of his healthfulness, strong, because of his experience, full of courage, because Canada has been grappling with the wilds of prairie and of forest; in his sling and pouch are three smooth stones like unto battleships; and there stands before that tree of Empire an aggressor armed from top to toe in steel. And in his hand he holds a sharpened battleaxe ready to cut down that tree. But he stands, for he hears that young shepherd of the Empire, Canada, saying:

> Aggressor, spare that tree,
> Touch not a single bough;
> In youth it sheltered me,
> And I'll stand by it now.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, Lord Beaconsfield said of the policy of protection, that it was both dead

and damned. I think myself that the naval policy of the present Government was dead-born; it has certainly been damned effectively by the defence that has been set up behind it. My hon. friend (Mr. Aikins) who has just taken his seat, objected to irrelevancies in debates; and in gitting rid of irrelevancies, he took a wide sweep at the very start. He divested himself, as I understood him, of the dictionary, a work which is not only useful, but is quite a necessity in modern life. And then he divested himself of all knowledge of or responsibility for the constitutional history of the country. If I might borrow my hon. friend's method of describing the irrelevant, I am afraid I should turn to the dictionary and the constitutional history of Canada for a very great deal of the speech to which we have just listened. For a man who claimed to discard the irrelevant, I thought he was wonderfully bold in becoming irrelevant. I cannot for the life of me see what the past sicknesses of the hon. member for Rouville have to do with the question of a Canadian navy. From the past sicknesses of the hon. member for Rouville my hon. friend conducted us to what seemed to me to be another irrelevant question—the nature of prairie fires, and he asked me what I would do in regard to a prairie fire. During the eleven years I have been in western Canada I have fought prairie fires, but I always fought them myself: I never dreamed of anything so foolish as hiring a neighbour to assist me.

I am sure my hon. friend will excuse me if I do not refer at greater length to his speech. I am readily excusable, I think, upon the ground that the speech was, to a great extent, not addressed to this side of the House. My hon. friend, for more than half the time he was on his feet, pursued what to me seems to be a new and very reprehensible parliamentary practice. Hon. gentlemen never see the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) turn his back upon his rhetorical foes; he always pours his hot shot direct into the ranks of the enemy. However, the methods of my hon. friend are pardonable under the circumstances. It is an extraordinary fact that in the discussion of this question we have two broadsides—to use a nautical metaphor—of no mean strength, thrown into the policy of the Government; but my hon. friend had a method in his madness. He felt that probably he need not address his arguments to us on this side of the House, as we are persuaded that the arguments of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and of the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) are unanswerable. So he proceeded, very naturally—and without much success, so far as I could see—to work up some enthusiasm upon his own side of the House.

I am one of those who believe in the Imperial status quo. I want to enrol myself behind the opinion of the hon. member for South Renfrew, when he said that the real bonds of the Empire are the bonds of sentiment —the love and affection which we have for the Throne, the Monarch, and the flag that floats over the Empire. I believe that sentiment is so strong in Canada that I venture to repeat what I have said before in this House, that in the event of any attack upon that flag, there would be no fine legal quibbles as to our attitude when Britain was engaged in these wars to which my hon. friend refers. From what I have seen of Canada I have found the opinion prominent that ninety-nine Canadians out of one hundred—aye, a far larger proportion than that—in the event of any attack upon the flag being made, would at once say: 'We are behind that flag, which is as much ours as Britain's, with the whole of our material and moral resources.'

But the condition of affairs, does not deprive gentlemen on this side of the House of their right of free speech and open discussion of any proposition brought before the House by the Government. Any other contention would be absurd in the extreme. The idea, forsooth, that our loyalty is to be impugned because we do not endorse a particular scheme of a particular government, which is here to-day and gone to-morrow, is one which cannot for one moment be entertained. Consider what the result would be if we adopted such an attitude on any question concerning the defence of the Empire. I think it is perfectly clear to any one who has followed the proceedings of this House in regard to this matter that nearly four years ago we were unanimously in favour of defending our own shores. That sentiment was contained in the original resolution carefully thought out and drafted by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Very well; because this is a question of Imperial and foreign politics we at once accept that position, and we will defend our own shores. But the same statesmen say to-day that was all wrong; we must send a contribution to Britain because the real fight will be in the German ocean. Some hon. gentlemen are not political acrobats enough to make such changes so swiftly. But are we on that account to be told we are disloyal? I contend we have the absolute right, in matters of foreign as well as of national politics, to discuss with perfect freedom any scheme brought before us.

The Prime Minister, in bringing his Bill before the House, deprecated any spirit of controversy entering into the

consideration of this question. On general grounds, despite what I have just said, this would be most desirable, but I do think that a Prime Minister has a very sanguine temperament who, coming from a cabinet rent with controversy and on the point of disruption, expects a spirit of controversy to be absolutely avoided in this matter by the Parliament and the nation. On this side of the House we are but human, and when the document is heralded throughout certain parts of the country by supporters of the present Administration who seek to eliminate party from the discussion of this matter, two questions naturally arise: when and by whom was party introduced into this contest? These are questions, Mr. Speaker, which admit of the most specific answers. The time was the by-election in Drummond and Arthabaska, and the people who introduced this spirit of controversy, I regret to say, were those prominent men in the present Government who sent telegrams to the effect that everything should be done in Drummond and Arthabaska which would help to down Laurier. Yes, shoot imaginary holes in the British flag to down Laurier! I am sure that nothing so partisan will be done or said on this side of the House as was evidenced in that telegram. The fact is that the intrinsic qualities of the scheme make an acute and prolonged controversy upon the question an absolute certainty. For that, I repeat, members of the present Government are absolutely responsible. The action of the Tory party of this country in connection with that by-election, and in that alliance which is so unstable in its very nature that it is already beginning to break up, will go down on the pages of history as subject to the condemnation of all fair-minded men, because Quebec, of all provinces, was the one where such tactics should have been avoided. Every statesmanlike consideration for the unity of the Empire and the harmony of all classes of Canadians should have restrained public men from making Quebec the cockpit of our party battles. In this connection I want to say that the name of the right hon. leader of the Opposition will be perpetuated in history surrounded with this great glory that on the naval question he was able to carry the province of Quebec by a large majority in favour of a policy which ought to have been the policy of the whole of Canada.

The second ground upon which I regret that this party aspect has been introduced and that the question is in the realm of controversy, is because it makes it impossible for us to meet the first desire of the British Admiralty, expressed in their memorandum—I mean first in point of importance. Any one who reads that memorandum must be impressed with the fact that what the British Government wants is the moral support of Canada behind any scheme by which we are to help in the defence of the Empire and in the defence of Canada as well. I put it to my hon. friends opposite that with that spirit of controversy, which we did not introduce, with Canada actually divided as it is at the present moment, is it not a deplorable fact that the moral effect of Canada's attitude —unless there be some revision of policy on the part of the Government, which I am told is not an impossible contingency—the moral effect of Canada's attitude is absolutely destroyed and thrown away. I personally am rather in a position to plume myself on this naval question. I have to appear, Sir, in no white sheet on the subject. I was no scare-monger four years ago—I think my friends, of whom I have many opposite, will do me that credit —and I am no scare-monger now. I have not had to change my mental attitude, which is always a convenience—at least I find it so. The fact of the matter is that this German scare has become so attenuated a thing that it only finds a resting place in such comparatively disordered minds as we have had an example of this afternoon. At the time that the whole of Canada, almost, was in a state of hysteria on this question, I was learning political wisdom in regard to scares at the feet of no less a person than the present first Lord of the Admiralty, Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill. In the year 1909, when this question first arose in this country, Mr. Winston Churchill used this very remarkable and useful language—and I commend it especially to any of the younger generation of Canadians outside of this House who may hear my words so that they may have some guidance how to act when future scares arise. He said :

> In my judgment a Liberal is a man who ought to stand as a restraining force against an extravagant policy. He is a man who ought to keep cool in the presence of jingo-clamour. He is a man who believes that confidence between nations begets confidence, and that the spirit of peace and good will makes the safety it seeks, and above all I think a Liberal is a man who should keep a sour look for scare-mongers of every kind and every size, however distinguished, however ridiculous—and sometimes the most distinguished are the most ridiculous—a cold, chilling, sour look for all of them, whether that panic comes from the sea or from the air or from the earth or from the waters under the earth.

If the hon. member for Brandon had only come earlier under the teaching of a political philosopher such as Mr. Winston

Churchill is, what a mental perturbation he would have been saved in his course through this troubled vale.

It is interesting, with this scare drawing to a close, to look into the history of the scares that have troubled Anglo-Saxons during the lifetime of living men. The first one was the French scare about the middle of the last century, which had many resemblances in the way it was kept up to the German scare. The thing that was then afflicting the people was that the French were going to come over and attack them; and one strong resemblance to the present scare was that just as Lord Roberts, an ancient warrior of eighty, has been trying unsuccessfully to alarm the people of Britain at this time, at that time the Duke of Wellington wrote his famous letter to Lord Burgoyne in which he described exactly the military shortcomings of Great Britain as Lord Roberts did the other day, and in which he was rebuked by an eminent statesman of that day just as Lord Roberts has been rebuked by Sir Edward Grey and others to-day. Another comparison between the two scares—and these are very interesting historical studies—I apologize to the Minister of Marine for introducing history; but, after all, a little historical knowledge is not a drawback in a statesman. At that time the papers printed most authentic statements that the French nation was engaged in building warships secretly in the harbour of Cherbourg, just as the other day we had it printed that the Germans were engaged in a similar impossible occupation. I say impossible because your common sense will tell you that it is impossible to build a dreadnought secretly. If a man were living alone on a prairie, and had a rent in his pants, he could mend it secretly, and he would probably choose to do so; but a dreadnought is quite a large article, so that you need a harbour and you need thousands of men working around. There is no secret that is ever divided between two. The pants would not necessarily be divided between two at all, but the moment a dozen people knew about the dreadnought—the thing on the face of it is so silly that it condemns scares now and forever more and it is incredible that there should be people silly enough to print these things and a still larger number silly enough to believe them. After the French scare, in the late seventies, we had a scare of which I remember all the particulars—I was a keen young student of British politics at the time. That was the Russian scare. That agitation had one great similarity to the German scare which is now dying a natural death. At that time it was thought that Russia threatened Constantinople, and the British Government asked Parliament for a vote of credit. They asked for a gift from themselves of six millions pounds, thirty million dollars, five million dollars short of what this Government propose. I remember that the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, then approaching the height of his wonderful powers, told a story in a strong speech which he made against that vote of credit. I recall the story for several reasons. The first is that it is extremely apposite to the hesitation and the vacillation of the present Government, at last followed by some kind of decisive action, and the second is that it illustrates the freedom with which prominent men, and men who receive the respect of all Canadians, have attacked the foreign policy of England in England when they thought it was contrary to the true policy and principles of the Empire. He told a story of three men on a raft. I suppose one might think that it might be in the present day the Minister of Trade and Commerce, the Prime Minister and the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). They were struggling together in great trouble upon the raft trying to save themselves from shipwreck, when one of the three turned to the two others and appealed to them for goodness sake to engage in some form of devotion, to sing a hymn, to pray, or to repeat a portion of the Scriptures. But he found that neither man was any use for his purpose. 'Well, then,' he said, 'we will have to take up a collection.' On the raft, in the case of the present Government, they could not even come to an agreement about the collection, because, the moment a collection was mentioned by the Prime Minister, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) jumped overboard. Now if we remember these matters, I think they will help us very much to bring a calm mind to the consideration of the Government's proposals.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had pointed out that just as in the middle of the last century the French scare passed away without there having been the smell of gunpowder between the two great nations of France and Great Britain from that time, and as the Russian scare in the seventies passed away likewise without there having been a trigger pulled then or since; so happily for humanity and civilization the German scare of yesterday is vanishing. I think I shall be able to offer proof from the best possible sources that a generation from now we shall be looking back upon this scare as another of the human follies and upon the historical fact that following it

there was not the firing of a shot by the one or the other of these two great Christian nations.

That brings me to the position which I think was the position taken by the Prime Minister himself in laying down his policy: that there is no emergency—no emergency present and no emergency prospective. I base that statement in the first place upon the fact that the Prime Minister did not rest his case upon the claim that there was any emergency. The contention that there is such appears to me to be impossible in view of the simplest of our experiences at the present moment. What have we seen, Sir, in the recent history of Europe? We have seen in Eastern Europe a conflagration, and we have seen this remarkable spectacle: that the two great powers which were in the most active cooperation for the promotion of peace, were Great Britain and Germany, which we are told here by some people are at each other's throats. The evidence that there is no impending war between these two countries is carried to our very doors. Some one had the courtesy to send me a copy of the Montreal Gazette the other day, and it contained a most interesting interview. As it is a column long I do not intend to read it, but I might say, it was an interview given by a Canadian-born gentleman, but of German parentage, Mr. Munderloh, who has just returned from Germany. I will read two of the headlines of this interview only :

> Mr. Henry Munderloh saw no Anti-British Feeling in the Fatherland.—The Great Mass of the People are too much Concerned with Earning a Living to bother about War.

And about the latter headline; those of us who know something about the fiscal position of Germany have known for some time that this was a condition produced in her people by a too close sticking to the policy of protection—that by the way. The next evidence I would offer is the evidence which was referred to by my right hon. leader when he said that no one could claim there was an emergency in the face of the public utterances of the leading statesmen of Britain during the last twelve months. Then, the memorandum itself is the best proof that Great Britain is equal and far more than equal to any claims that are likely to be made upon her powers of defence, if such claims are made, and, as I have already said, there is no evidence that there will be any demand upon these powers for some time to come. I cannot understand why any gentleman on the other side of the House should want to believe there is an emergency, for so far as I am concerned it is a matter of gratitude with me to think to-day that the great masses of civilized mankind are convinced that a war between Britain and Germany would be a causeless and a purposeless war; that it would entail untold misery and loss and suffering upon both nations now, that it would hand down a heritage of hate to generations yet unborn, and that it would take its place in the front rank of the criminal follies of mankind.

There is no emergency. But the extraordinary political situation we are in in Canada is this: that although there is no emergency we have a government which comes coolly forward for its only naval policy with an emergency contribution. That is a most extraordinary position. I am inclined to think it is a position which the Ministry themselves are finding extremely difficult to sustain within the secret deliberations of their cabinet councils at the present time. And, Sir, I am perfectly certain and convinced in my own mind that it is a position which is absolutely hostile to the confirmed opinion of the great majority of the people of this country. An emergency contribution in the presence of no emergency is an absurdity in terms and it is an absurdity in fact. It is a contribution that is proposed, and a contribution pure and simple, for I set no store by the strings that are supposed to be put on it.

We are told that it is to be returnable to Canada, and we are told this by a Ministry to whom the First Lord of the Admiralty complains that the objection to the fleet of my right hon. friend is that the ships would become effete in six years. Do dreadnoughts not become effete? What is to be the condition of the dreadnoughts when they are returned to us? Why, clearly, they will be effete. We are to get the dreadnoughts back; they are to come to Canada and constitute the elements of permanent policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they will come to us when they have been reduced to scrap iron.

I set no store either by the string in the shape of a promise of a member of the Defence Committee from Canada. It may readily be conceded that the only logical departure from the Imperial status quo would be some form of Imperial federation; but the trouble about this Imperial federation is that people have been actively discussing it since the time of Edmund Burke and Adam Smith, who took diametrically opposite views of the question a century and a quarter ago, and I am skeptical whether my right hon. friend opposite, even with the assistance of his Postmaster General, could succeed where Edmund Burke failed. Why, the main criticism which was offered to the speeches of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in the old country upon this question was, that while he talked

about Imperial federation, he did not give the slightest hint as to how he was going to bring it about. If one thinks for a moment about the question, one will see what the difficulties are. I would ask in the first place, is Imperial federation feasible? and in the second place, is it desirable? This must be perfectly clear: that in any form of Imperial federation we in Canada would have a very small minority in the representation upon such a body. There is no doubt that the majority upon that body would rule, and it is perfectly obvious that a conclusion might be carried by the majority in any Imperial Council that you can conceive of, over the heads and against the ideas of the Government and the Parliament and the people of Canada on matters which were close to their rights, close to their interests, close to their habits. This is the difficulty that has met every statesman for a century and a quarter, who ever approached this subject, and we are no nearer the solution of it now than we were then. Does anybody who has considered the constitution of the Committee on Defence consider that in that Committee of Defence there are the germs of Imperial federation? Why, the very suggestion of our having any power in regard to the policy of Great Britain has set a large portion of the British public by the ears, to such an extent that the Times newspaper, which is in sympathy with the policy of my right hon. friend opposite, has hastened to assure the British people that it is not proposed to give any power to Canada, and that great newspaper has defined in the most exact terms the duties of the Committee on Defence. I quote from the London Times:

> The Committee on Defence is a body created solely to co-ordinate our naval and military preparations with the requirements of policy as defined by the Cabinet——

That is the British Cabinet:

> —and indorsed by Parliament and approved by the electorate.

That is, the Parliament and the electorate of Great Britain:

> The Committee on Defence can commit the country or the Empire to nothing. It has neither responsibility nor power except in so far as its councils are approved by the Prime Minister who presides over it and by the other ministers who attended it.

Is that the kind of thing that is to compensate us for any suspicion of an attack upon our selft-government? Does any one see in that the germ of a responsible government in London managing the affairs of the whole Empire? We have no power in it, no responsibility. We have a man sent to London whose privilege it is to help to co-ordinate the naval and military forces of the Empire and of our portion of these naval and military forces; to carry out a policy thought out by the British Government, endorsed by the British Parliament and by the British electorate. If that is not humiliating to Canada in the extreme, and taking away from us in a very real sense our self-government, then I do not know how to describe it. We are face to face with a policy of contribution pure and simple, which is not accompanied by any permanent naval policy, but which for all practical purposes means the abandonment of any permanent naval policy.

Take the point to which I have just referred. If in another century and a quarter we get as short a distance forward as we have done in the last century and a quarter on Imperial federation, on the construction of this representative council; and if we can only have a voice in the foreign policy of Britain when we have that representative council; then I submit to the intelligence of gentlemen opposite that we may say, for our purposes at any rate, that a permanent naval policy is abandoned, because I do not think we will be likely to live for another century and a quarter. The quarter of a century will do me, and there will still be a hundred years to wait. No permanent policy for Canada, but what follows is worse than that. If there be no permanent policy in Canada what we are really committed to is a permanent policy outside Canada. No minister, no member opposite, will stand up in his place and claim that that is the last time we will give a contribution, if we give it this time. I know that my hon. friend the Prime Minister said that this was not to be taken as a precedent; but the next time some fellow like Robert Blatchford comes along and writes some scare words, there will be more contributions; or some party will want to use this policy in some by-election, if not in Drummond and Arthabaska, then somewhere else, and you will have the party that needs it coming along with another contribution. Apart from these considerations, it is too humiliating to think that Canada is going to get off for all time with a contribution of $35,000,000. It is the beginning of a permanent policy outside of Canada. I do not need to go any further to condemn it in the minds of all thoughtful men in this country.

Now this is the sense in which the policy is understood by leading supporters of my hon. friends in the press. I do not know whether or not they all read this article in the Citizen. It is an extremely significant article. It says that the people, who supported the Laurier

navy and opposed the contribution forgot that the main role of Canada in this world is a peaceful role. If that means anything at all, it means that we are not going to have a navy, but that a policy of contributions is to be our permanent policy. It is a peculiar article. According to the Bible, the battle of Armageddon preceded the milennium, but the Citizen is going to run the two concurrently; it is going to have Armageddon in Europe and the millennium in Canada.

I should like to appeal to members of the Government to reconsider this policy. It is true, they have had fourteen months to consider it in, but that is not enough for men who are newly in harness. When they have reconsidered it, they will run away from it in shame. I have said that if the Prime Minister did not base his policy on the claim that there was an emergency, what did he base it upon? He based it upon two points, the first being that there is need of closer co-operation between the various portions of the Empire in matters of trade and defence. That was his only reference to trade in the whole speech, but it was full of significance. I wish the Prime Minister had been in his place, but I can trust the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) to tell him what I say. I should like to advise him not to worry too much about trade. I see that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster) is not in his place. That is too bad. Trade depends on causes far beyond the control of hon. gentlemen opposite. They may win elections by a cry about trade, but I see the light is dawning upon my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. White). In his budget statement last year he would not see the light. He pursued the policy of the political ostrich. While he was reading the details of the trade of this country, when he came to the statement in reference to our expanding trade with the United States, he stuck his head abruptly into the sand. My hon. friend, the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), took his head out, and he had to cough up the truth about the matter. This year he admits that we must trade with the United States. Of course we must, and yet my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce goes on worrying about the scheme of trade within the Empire. For a man of his intellect, it is the most pitiable sight I know. The facts of the situation are these. Last year our total trade with the United States was roughly $406,000,000. There is the obvious fact, which as I say, is now playing its full part upon the brain matter of my hon friend the Minister of Finance; but my hon friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce still thinks he can ring trade up within certain limits. He talked some time ago about two estimable gentlemen going to Washington; he himself was visited in the spring of the year by fourteen or sixteen gentlemen, and they had a pow-wow about trade with the West Indies. I think he is going to Australia to talk with his relatives in the southern seas about the possibilities of trade within the Empire. He did not formerly believe in foreign commerce at all; he was the great advocate of the home market. He reminds me of a story of two Scotchmen who were walking in Perthshire one day, and they came across a man whom they had never seen before except in kilts, and he was wearing an extraordinarily wide pair of trousers. One of the gentlemen called the other's attention to it, and the reply came, 'Converts are always enthusiastic.' Now that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has gone in for foreign commerce, he has gone in for it with a vengeance. Now $406,000,000 was our total trade with the United States last year, and during the same year we did $16,000,000 total trade with the West Indies, Australia and New Zealand put together. I give these figures in reference to the phrase, which I have just quoted from the Prime Minister's speech, as to the matter of closer co-operation within the Empire on questions of trade and defence. I should like to give my right hon. friend the Prime Minister the piece of advice I gave in his absence, do not worry too much about the trade aspect of this thing. Whatever antics you perform in the field of defence, trade will pursue its own course in accordance with laws far above human influence, in the future as in the past. Britain and Germany will be knit closer by that commerce, which is one of the sights of the world today, and that commerce we have been doing with the United States will knit closer together in many ways, without in the least interfering with our political allegiance or our national defence. The great fault of my hon. friends opposite is that they are guilty in these great questions of what I would call inverted thinking. They exaggerate the influence of sentiment, where it has no influence at all, because trade is the most prosaic thing in the universe; and they minimize the influence of sentiment where sentiment is all powerful. That is all that is wrong with them, but it is a good deal when you come to think of it. It means that their thinking is apt to be upside down. People do not trade with their relatives. I heard my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce talk the other day about dealing with Newfoundland or somewhere else on the principle of sentiment. Who ever heard of a storekeeper doing his principal business with his own relations? The thing is absurd. We trade according

to the laws of trade. People trade for a profit; and, as a profit is their object, they look for numbers, they look for proximity, they look for exchangeable products in their customers. That is the only way you can do business. And we will do that business with the States, and we will do it freely yet; I don't care which side brings it in.

The other ground upon which my right hon. friend based his policy was the ground of the projected change which it is found necessary to make in the disposition of the British fleet. Approaching that with my own common-sense—such of it as Providence has given me—I should say, that that was the strongest argument, on the face of it, for the supplying of the deciency that is left in the outside portions of the Empire. And I am reinforced when I find that such a man as Lord Charles Beresford, takes the same view. But I am going to offer now one of the very few quotations with which I shall trouble the House, the strongest that I know along this line, in the shape of an extract from a speech made by the Right Hon. Winston Churchill in April of this year. I also think that if my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, for whose mind I have a great regard, and his ministers, will give an open-minded and frank consideration to this quotation, they will see that they are embarked upon an impossible course, a wrong course, one that does not make for the greatest usefulness and strength of Canada nor the greatest strength and harmony of the Empire:

> The British fleets are now practically concentrated. The recent great review before the King is only one proof of the quality of concentration with the Admiralty has lately brought to its final act, a policy of naval concentration which has given a real measure of security to the centre and heart of the British Empire.
>
> But there is one aspect of naval concentration which requires the attention of thinking men here and elsewhere throughout the British Empire. The fact that our fleet is not only concentrated in the decisive theatre of European war, but must be kept concentrated, and in a certain sense, tied to that theatre, has been for some years creating a new want, a new need, a new opportunity for the great self-governing dominions of the Crown.
>
> Naval supremacy consists in our being in possession of naval forces sufficient to overcome in war the strongest effort or efforts which any reasonably probable combination of powers may bring against us. That we should be always in a position to do—that we believe ourselves to be now and in the immediate future in a position to do. But a war may go on for a long time before a decision is obtained or gained; and this is the more likely of the two contingencies. If we act, as we shall do, with discretion, with sobriety, with simplicity, with good will to all nations and rancour and prejudices against none, it is much more likely—I say it with sincere conviction—that war will never come in our time, and perhaps will have passed from the world; at any rate for periods which our most adventurous imagination enables us to forsee. Meanwhile, and pending a decision in the critical theatre, there is no doubt that the general mobility of our fleet is reduced. It cannot move safely and freely to every part of the world to the same extent as in former years. At present, of course, and for some years to come we are not only able to maintain a sufficient margin in home waters at the decisive points, but we could—by making special arrangements, by effecting partial mobilization we could if need arose—fit out and despatch strong squadrons to the aid of any of our colonies or dominions across the sea, whose vital interests were menaced or attacked.
>
> That is the duty which we are able to discharge, and which we are proud to discharge—a duty which we should not hesitate to run the risk of discharging—which we should not hesitate to make sacrifices for—the protection of our great self-governing dominions. And when I speak of this, I mean not only by a general supremacy which operates simultaneously and universally at every portion of the globe, but by the despatch, if necessary, of particular squadrons to any point or any part of the British Empire where special danger might menace our fellow-countrymen. That we can do now, next year,, and in the years which are immediately before us.
>
> Still, here we are—gathered together a company of practical shipwrights, and accustomed to deal with real and great facts. We must face them and we must recognize them, for with every new development in continental navies, with every fresh squadron which takes water abroad, with every step in the ceaseless accumulation of naval strength with which we are confronted, the world-wide mobility of the British navy becomes restricted.
>
> And here is a great opportunity—the great chance of the self-governing dominions—these strong young nations which have grown up all over the world under the shelter of the British flag and by the stimulus and protection of British institutions, and they have already begun to seize it; already we have seen the development in Australia of a strong modern fleet unit. New Zealand has contributed a noble ship to the general service of the British navy
>
> And in Canada men of all parties and of both races are deeply stirred upon the problem and of the share which the great dominions should take in the means by which it and all the other parts of the British Empire are kept from harm. And we are soon to receive, I understand, representatives of the new Canadian Administration, who will come over here to consult with the Government and the Admiralty upon the course of policy which should be adopted in the future.

Says Winston Churchill, the head of the British Admiralty at the present moment:

If the main development of the past ten years has been the concentration of the British fleet in decisive theatres——

The ground upon which my right hon. friend founds his case—

—it seems to me—and I dare say to you—not unlikely that the main naval development of the next ten years will be the growth of the effective naval forces in the great dominions overseas. Then we shall be able to make what I think will be found to be the true division of labour between the Mother Country and her daughter states—that we should maintain the sea supremacy against all comers at the decisive point, and that they should guard and and patrol all the rest of the British Empire.

I am perfectly serious when I ask the Government and its supporters to consider that as decisive of the whole case. And I am more serious still when I ask them not to tell us, as my hon. friend the Postmaster General has told us, that he is undertaking this to please the British Government or the British people. He is taking the course precisely opposite to the course which Mr. Churchill recommends.

These are the two grounds upon which the right hon. Prime Minister based his case. We have had a defence of that policy—and presumably a reply to the argument of my right hon. leader and the hon. member for South Renfrew—from two Ministers, I think I shall be supported by the judgment of the House when I state that these two Ministers both laboured very hard to prove an emergency; and it certainly needed hard labour, for it is hard to prove an emergency where one does not exist. And they laboured very hard to prove that the British Government had asked for their policy. I do not think, in the face of the quotation from Mr. Churchill such ground can possibly be taken with any decent self-respect in the future. But my two hon. friends, the Postmaster General and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, based their case upon the memorandum, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries especially based his case upon the last two paragraphs of that memorandum.

Evidently we are differently constituted for these two paragraphs taught me exactly the opposite of what they taught my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. They taught me, in the most comprehensive and unmistakable language, that the British Government say there is no emergency, and they taught me also that the British Government did not ask for this contribution, or anything else. Now, the last paragraph but one of the memorandum states in the most emphatic terms the fitness of Great Britain for all duties of defence that may devolve upon her.

She has before now successfully made head alone and unaided against the most formidable combinations, and she has not lost her capacity by a wise policy and strenuous exertions to watch over and preserve the vital interests of the Empire.

It cannot, in the face of that language, be successfully claimed that there is any emergency, and, if there were, still less can it be claimed that Great Britain is not able to face that emergency. But it is in the last paragraph we are told the British Government asks for this policy. It reads as follows:

The Prime Minister of the Dominion having inquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective, we have no hesitation in answering after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friends say hear, hear; I will read to them again the first two lines of that paragraph:

The Prime Minister of the Dominion having inquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective.

What is the only conclusion that even my hon. friends who say hear, hear, can draw from that language? It is, that the Prime Minister of Canada went with his colleagues to the Government of Great Britain with a cut-and-dried policy of contribution. They did not go to seek a policy; they went with the only policy which the Nationalists of Quebec would allow them to propose—no other possible meaning can be attached to that statement. I do not now hear any of my hon. friends opposite say hear, hear. Having gone to the British Government with that cut-and-dried policy of contribution, what could the Admiralty say? They are but human. I venture to say that if any department of any government anywhere is offered the sum of $35,000,000, they will jump at it. I am not a fighting man, but I could put it to some use if I had it. What could the Government do but tell them the form in which that immediate aid should be given?

My hon. friends a moment ago said hear, hear, as if this paragraph did not carry its own interpretation. Most hon. members, have, no doubt, read the very simple and explicit statement of Mr. Asquith in the British Parliament last

Thursday upon this very subject. Mr. Asquith is a master of terse expression. In reply to a question as to whether any request had been made of the Canadian Government by the Imperial authorities, he said:

> The memorandum speaks for itself. It contains no request, but leaves the facts set out to the unfettered consideration of the Canadian Parliament.

I believe that is another thing we shall not hear very much about in this debate. I take it that the people of Canada who carefully follow the interpretation of these two paragraphs, as understood, having my own judgment confirmed by the unmistakable language of Mr. Asquith, will not accept the statement that the British Government asked for anything. If hon. gentlemen are going to stand by this policy, they should stand by it in their own strength, and not try to father it on the British Government.

I now wish in terms as brief as possible, to offer the objections which occur to my mind as being insuperable against the policy of a contribution. I do not know that my initial objection will commend itself very largely to either side of the House. I wish it would, but I am afraid it is too idealistic for a somewhat materialistic country. My initial objection to this policy of a contribution to what is going on in Europe in the way of armaments is that it fails to carry out what I conceive to be Canada's highest duty in world politics. The most significant fact in the international history of civilized nations, is, in my judgment, the fact that on this North American continent we have two great nations, destined, I have not the least doubt, to be the two greatest nations of the world, between whom no act of war has taken place for one hundred years. As I say, this is a most significant fact in the international history of civilized nations, and certainly it is a most significant fact in the national history of Canada, for in that fact lies the high-water mark of the world's civilization in international politics up to the present time. But, turning to Europe, a very different scene is disclosed to our view. We see what Sir Edward Grey, in direct and simple language, described a few years ago as the nations of Europe marching to the ruin of civilization through armaments. At the present moment it seems to me that to send $35,000,000 out of Canada into the maelstrom of European politics is inevitably to embark Canada upon the march to the ruin of civilization through armaments. I did not expect on its first presentation any great acceptance of that view in this House, but I am perfectly certain that this view will commend itself to a large number of the most thoughtful and benevolent of our fellow citizens.

Mr. BURNHAM: How does that affect the Laurier naval policy?

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend is always getting his thoughts disjointed, he will hear about that when I come to it. But if it is a point upon which my hon. friend would like some information, he may see the distinction between sending money into the maelstrom of European armaments, and engaging to a modest degree—and gradually—in what is a primitive——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CLARK: I have authority for saying that it shall be done gradually, because your great leader in rhetoric told us in March, 1909, that beginnings must be small. How partisanship blinds men! Hon. gentlemen opposite cheered my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce to the echo in 1909 for a statement which they laugh at when I make it now. We see that this thought which I am trying to impress upon the better nature of every man within my hearing is attracting attention in Europe itself, for there was a despatch the other day from Great Britain which said:

> The entrance of the Dominion into the European race of armaments and the fresh fuel furnished the already powerful armour industries are facts of serious importance. The contractor's profits on Canada's gift will be $3,500,000.

And in trying to estimate whether the country of which I have the honour of being an adopted son, is following her highest destiny, I claim the right to bring this thought before this Parliament and to point out what has already resulted from our entering into this race of European armaments, or threatening to enter on that race. Why, within two days of my right hon. friend's statement, language of the most provocative kind was used by members of the German ruling classes towards Mr. Winston Churchill as a direct result of this policy having been proposed in Canada. They referred to him as lying, and well they might, if he had guaranteed that the armaments of Great Britain were not to exceed a certain point, and Canada's gift was at once to increase those armaments by three dreadnoughts. There is an immediate result along those lines, and a result of a deplorable nature, which only indicates what will happen to us, and what will be the dire results if we pursue that as a permanent policy, outside of Canada.

I object to this policy of contribution because it stultifies this Parliament—absolutely stultifies the resolution unanimously arrived at by this Parliament. I do not think I need to prove this case. Is there any one on the other

side of the House who will try to prove that this policy of a $35,000,000 contribution to the British Admiralty in any way realizes our conception of a speedy construction of a Canadian naval force? Is there any connection between the two? No one can claim that for one moment. I claim that the Government, if they had had the courage of their convictions in this matter, before they brought in this proposal should have repealed the resolution of March 1909 and should have repealed the Navy Act. I know that my hon. friend the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) has failed to notice the difference between my right hon. friend's position now and in 1909; but that must have been because he has not had time to read up carefully what has happened in this House. Indeed, he had a peculiar way of proving his case. He described my right hon. friend as the epitome, the boiled-down essence, of consistency—if I may adopt a dictionary definition of the word. Because my right hon. friend had pointed out that what the Prime Minister was doing now was not consistent with what he said in 1909, the Minister of Marine at once proceeded to prove that the consistency was all there by reading something the Prime Minister said in 1910. That is a method of logic that I have not been accustomed to and that does not carry me with it at first sight. The fact of the matter is that my right hon. friend may claim to be consistent only in the sense in which the acrobat may be said to be consistent who makes his living entirely by turning somersaults. Does anybody see the speedy construction of a Canadian naval service in the bald statement made with very great courage that we cannot have an organization worth speaking of in Canada for 25 or 50 years? Is there any agreement between these positions? Without the rescinding of that resolution and the repeal of the Navy Act, this proposal of the Government is almost ultra vires, to use a legal expression; it reduces parliamentary procedure to the greatest farce imaginable. The claim as to the inability of Canada to do things in 25 or 50 years is one that I would look for from hon. gentlemen opposite. One of the first things I heard on coming to this country was a statement from a prominent Conservative in a schoolhouse in Alberta that he expected to see the grass growing on the bed of the Grand Trunk Pacific, so little did he think, even in 1904, that it was possible to compete sucessfully with the one great creation of the Tory party, the Canadian Pacific railway. I heard that with my own ears. People who in 1904 had so little faith in their country as that might well doubt the ability of Canada to enter upon the field of a reasonable defence of her own shores. Nobody else would, I am sure.

My next objection to the policy of contribution is that it absolutely declines the elementary duties of a nation. I shall not read extensive quotations, but I wish to read one not from any malignant desire to score a point off the Prime Minister, but because it states the proper policy for Canada in terms that cannot be improved on, certainly cannot be improved on by me. Speaking in Halifax, on October 14, 1909, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister gave an admirable condensed definition of the duties of the Canadian people as I conceive them to be in this case. He said;

> The House of Commons last session laid down a certain policy touching naval defence in which both political parties united. It may not have satisfied the aspirations of all Conservatives, but it seemed our bounden duty to place, if possible, above the limits of partisan strife a question so vital and far-reaching, and to attain the standard which has for many years governed both political parties in Great Britain with respect to foreign nations.
>
> How the present Administration will work out the policy which was outlined by a resolution to which I have alluded, remains to be seen.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CLARK: You keep your, Hear, hear, for the next sentence.

> One governing principle at least should control, namely, that out of our own materials, by our own labour and by the instructed skill of our own people any necessary provision for our naval defences shoulde be made so far as may be reasonably possible. In this connection may we not hope that there shall be given a stimulus and encouragement to the shipbuilding industry of Canada which has long been lacking.
>
> To-day should be Nova Scotia's opportunity in that regard. Providence has endowed this province with the material, with the men, and with the maritime situation which are essential not only for developing a scheme of naval defence and protection, but also for the resuscitation of this shipbuilding industry which once made Nova Scotia famous throughout the world.

I put on one side a number of quotations from the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in the same sense exactly, but I have one which has not been read, and which is too great a beauty to miss:

> The imagination can scarcely grasp the commerce that waits for Canadian vessels, manned by Canadian crews, and a mighty instrument of expansion and wealth to be held almost completely in our own hands. But to accomplish that purpose we must build steel vessels.

Unfortunately in this matter of defence my hon. friend does what he does with regard to trade; he relies upon his imagination. He does not get down to actual facts, and the consequence is that both

trade and defence will disappear in the direction from which they come unless he changes his ways. I did not read that extract from my hon. friend's speech to make an argumentative point at all. It is sound policy, and it was sound policy when it was uttered. Let me put it to my hon. friends opposite in this way: I came here from Britain eleven years ago, and took a western homestead; and, with a number of other fellows out there, I have been doing my best to dig the wealth out of the soil of Western Canada. Before I came here, I used to see the great shipyards upon the Tyne where I resided, and upon the Clyde which I visited; I saw the men clambering over the sides of boats there, and I saw the serried hordes of Britain's labour going out of the shipyards and the steel works. As a Canadian, I want to see those activities in Canada. As a western farmer especially, I claim the right to speak strongly on this question. In almost the last utterance, if not the last, of Sir Richard Cartwright in the Senate, he proved to my satisfaction at any rate that western Canada is overtaxed today. We shall contribute our full share of the money to pay for those dreadnoughts which are to be sent out of the country; because it is the workers and the farmers of Canada who will have to raise that $35,000,000, and it is to those workers and to those farmers that you will have to answer for this policy, not to the millionaires of Toronto.

There is a pestilent type of Imperialist who comes across the Atlantic from the old land that one meets in this country from time to time. I meet him in the railway trains and in the hotels. He has been driven abroad by the Lloyd George budget. After I have let him blow off a good deal of steam on Lloyd George's budget, I touch him gently on the subject of dreadnoughts, and he says: 'oh, yes, we have got to have dreadnoughts.' His appetite for dreadnoughts is in inverse proportion to his appetite for taxes, and I am afraid he has his representative in Toronto. These millionaires are very good at talking Imperialism, but they come to Western Canada, to the men who are digging the wealth out of the homesteads, to get the money to pay the piper. That is a kind of Imperialism I have very little use for. Now, it seems to be an aspect of the case that we cannot forget. It is Canadian labour that it is the duty of this Parliament to build up, it is Canadian industry that it is the duty of this Parliament to develop, and in doing so we will have the blessing and the good wishes of Mr. Winston Churchill, according to the passage I have just read from the speech he delivered last April.

Another objection to this policy is that it sets out a new constitutional relationship between Canada and the old country. One may concede that technically it does not give away autonomy. I do not wish to make a single unfair argument on this subject. If we give the money, we are not having the money torn from us; I admit the contention of the Postmaster General in that connection. But we do give away what is very close to self-government, and that is the power of spending the money. We give away the power of the purse, and I would press this point upon the thoughtful men in the House on whatever side they sit. My right hon. friend referred to the permanent and constitutional relations between Canada and the Mother Country. In that connection, I read the other day a most interesting address which the Prime Minister gave ten years ago in the town of Lindsay, a most interesting and instructive address. He reviewed in a manner very similar to that followed by my hon. friend the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) the history and progressive development of self-government in Canada and he went on to show how each step in the way of widening Canada's liberties had been accompanied by greater loyalty to the old land because of greater freedom. Can any one contend that in giving a contribution which is to be spent by the British Admiralty, we are extending our self-government? Can any one contend that that marks progress in our constitutional relations? Mr. Speaker it marks retrogression in our constitutional relations; it is a move backward. As I have said, it will not be the last contribution. We give up control of our expenditure. Self-government not only here, but in Great Britain, is largely associated with the control of the purse. Why was it that they cut off a king's head? Because he wanted to take money from the people without the consent of Parliament. What was it that lost the thirteen colonies? The fact that Lord North wanted to take money from them without their consent. The third step seems to me not much better when it is proposed that the Government and the Parliament of Canada should take money from the people and send it over to Great Britain without their consent. There is an argument here for a plebiscite anyway.

Mr. BORDEN: To prevent misapprehension, would my hon. friend explain what words in the Bill he is relying on for his argument?

Mr. CLARK: I was not referring to the verbiage of the Bill; I was dealing with the proposition.

Mr. BORDEN: The money must be spent under the terms of the Bill. That will be

the law, but I am not aware of any words in the Bill that support the hon. gentleman's argument.

Mr. CLARK: Well, I am not a great constitutional lawyer, and I do not know that I need meet my hon. friend's point, because the hon. gentleman who preceded me in the debate said this was not a case of constitutional law, that it was not a question of words, that is was a question of $35,000,000.

Mr. BORDEN: I would like to point out to my hon. friend that by the terms of the Bill the money is to be spent under the direction of the Governor in Council, and not under the direction of the Admiralty.

Mr. CLARK: My right hon. friend helps himself extremely little, because, after all, the ships that are to be bought with our money are to be run by the Admiralty. I would like to put this to my right hon. friend, is it in any sense a step in the direction of the extension of self-government, which he elaborated in the address to which I have referred? I think he will have difficulty in persuading the people of this country on that point. Further, I want to express the opinion that the step of running any portion of Canada's public works, or works of defence, from Downing Street, is a hazardous and rash step. It has never been done, and it has never been attempted without serious consequences in the United States, and in the past Canadians have carried arms for this principle of self-government, and have shed one another's blood for it. We are entering, in my judgment, upon a vista the end of which no man can see.

I am opposed to this contribution because it is wholly and absolutely unnecessary from a financial point of view. In fact, from this point of view, it approaches the grotesque and the absurd, and I think a couple of simple figures will justify my position. I believe I am correct in saying that the United Kingdom has invested in Canada, publicly and privately, at the present moment, nearly four hundred million pounds—two billion dollars. Now, Great Britain—I know on the authority of Sir Edgar Speyer of London, in an address of his which I read—draws an average interest of 5·2 per cent on her foreign investments. But if you allow only 4 per cent on her investment in Canada it follows that this country is paying annually to Great Britain $80,000,000 every year in interest. I have had occasionally to carry my land out West—thank Heaven I am free of that business now—but for a number of years I had to pay 5 per cent interest, and I know they were always prompt about collecting the payments. We are sending eighty million dollars a year to Great Britain at the present moment in the shape of interest on her investments, and there is another fact that is of some importance. Since the Asquith Government came to power several years ago they have paid seventy million pounds or $350,000,000 off the national debt of Great Britain. We are needing to borrow money every year from Great Britain for the absolutely necessary development of our own country. Here is Great Britain which has two billion dollars invested in Canada, which is drawing from us eighty million dollars in interest every year annually, and we are to be told, forsooth, that to keep the flag flying and to keep the British Empire intact we have to send a miserable toll of thirty-five million dollars across—miserable compared with the money we are now sending annually to Britain. That situation approaches a little to the grotesque and absurd.

Sir, this contribution places on Canada a badge of inferiority which I for one believe her people will not carry, and this brings me for a moment to the argument of the Postmaster General. I wonder sometimes why the Prime Minister took the Postmaster General across the Atlantic with him last summer. I had thought that perhaps he took him over as an interesting specimen of an almost extinct species; but, when the Postmaster General comes back here and makes a speech such as he made the other day, I see that the Prime Minister had a deeper purpose in view: it was to make a thorough-paced jingo of the Postmaster General. But there is nothing very thorough-paced about the jingoism of the Postmaster General; he is only a calculating and frugal jingo, after all. And I must say that the calculations he enters upon seem to be particularly ill-suited for the furtherance of the policy which his speech was made in support of. There was something noble about the real original jingo. If the Postmaster General should come to me in private, I can help along his education a little; I would like to teach him some of the ditties in the days that St. Jingo first arose:

> We don't want to fight but by jingo if we do,

The old original jingo said:

> We've got the men, we've got the ships, we've got the money, too.

There's something whole hearted about that. It is more like my hon. friend from Brandon (Mr. Aikins); there are varieties of the jingo. The Postmaster General says we have not got the ships, and we have not got the men, but we will send a belated

donation, and we will send it on the cheapest possible scale; we will get the most for our money, he says. Just think of it. If we were to spend the money here, according to the Postmaster General, we would have to bring men from Britain and we would have to pay them more than they are paid in Britain; we can get Britain's men-of-war's men on the cheap in Britain. What a noble type of jingo he is! There was another ditty they used to sing when the name jingo first arose:

There's money in the country,

They are aways ready with the money in Britain for fighting purposes——

And there's thunder in the air,

The Prime Minister spoke of the thunder in his peroration——

And little Turkey's threatened by the great big Russian bear,
The British lion is looking on and waiting for a row,
That's what the people say in England.

There was something whole hearted about that, but somehow or other this lion's cub that talked the other day has not got the right roar; he may have borrowed a skin somewhere. Then, at a later period, we had a song about Tommy Atkins, being an absent-minded beggar. There is nothing absent-minded about the Postmaster General when it comes to counting up the cents he is prepared to pay his seamen. No, Mr. Speaker, this combination won't work. The Government has only been founded 15 months and it was founded on an alliance which was unstable in its very nature. It is beginning to break up now—one of them has gone and the sooner the other two go the better for the Cabinet. I can tell the Prime Minister that if he wants to have a cabinet of real jingoes he cannot make them out of such stuff.

This policy puts the badge of inferiority upon Canadians. I listened to the figures which my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) gave us: he told us that Britain contributed $220,000,000 every year to the upkeep of the navy. Divide that by the 45,000,000 people who are in the British Isles and you will find that if I were in Britain I would be worth $5 annually as a good seafaring-fighting man. But, in Canada if you divide $35,000,000 among 8,000,000 which is our population, you will find that here I am worth $4.50 for an indefinite and indeterminate period. Does the Prime Minister think so meanly of his fellow-citizens as to believe that they will put up with that calculation; not for one moment. If he went to the country on that policy that fact alone would damn him, if I understand the spirit of the Canadian. And these are the people who talk to us about our tin-pot navy. All I have to say is that if we lowered the dignity of the nation by entering upon the construction of a tin-pot navy, I do not think you will elevate that dignity by passing around the hat. But, the financial indignity put upon the Canadian nation is as nothing to the moral indignity, because, in addition to my being worth only four and a half dollars in Canada, at intervals of, I do not know how long, as compared with the Britisher at home who is worth five dollars every year of his life, there is this moral indignity put upon the Canadian, that if that bolt from the blue, which my hon. friend says might fly, ever does fly, not one drop of Canadian blood would be risked or spilt. That is what I call the moral inferiority which Canadians will not put up with. I have tried, Sir, as briefly as I could, to place before this House and the country the main objections which I have to this policy of contribution. I shall vote for the amendment because it sets out the distinct principle that what we do in this matter we should do as Canadians. The Prime Minister referred to the splendid organization of the British navy and I might point out to him that it has taken a thousand years to organize that navy. They began with boats with men rowing in them, and what I say about this thing is: If we can only have a canoe to start with, let us have a Canadian canoe. We, on this side of the House stand united as one man, and we stand where we did, and we stand where you did, and where you should be standing to-day. We stand for Canada as a nation; a nation beneath a common flag; a nation within the Empire but a nation still; with a nation's rights, a nation's aspirations, a nation's responsibilities, yes, and a nation's courage and spirit to discharge these responsibilities. We stand for Canada a nation, not less in herself than Great Britain or any other nation composing this great Empire. Great Britain trades where she will and she defends herself. We stand for Canada with the right to trade where she will, without any man daring to tell us that we are disloyal. We stand for Canada with the power and the ability to begin now the naval defence of her own coasts, in co-operation with the various portions of the most glorious Empire the world has ever seen. We stand on that policy, and we believe we have the majority of the people of Canada with us, because it is the only policy that makes for the dignity of this nation, for the harmony and progress of the Empire, and for the peace of the civilized world.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, in addressing the House upon this most important question, I feel particularly pleased that it is totally unnecessary for

members on this side of the House to offer to the country apologies for not having done something which, according to statements made in years gone by, they might have done. When the right hon. the Prime Minister brought down his proposition a week or ten days ago, in introducing this most important question for the consideration of the House, he struck a note which has claimed and dominated the attention of the people of Canada, the people of the Empire, and a great many nations outside of the Empire. When the note was sounded, I believe that I am safe in saying that the people of Canada and the people of the Empire felt that a statesman had given expression to a sentiment and to principles which were bound to appeal to the good sense of the people throughout the land. It fell, however, to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, and his able lieutenant the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) to introduce into the discussion of this question sentiments that I believe are unworthy of gentlemen who hold and who have held such a high place in the estimation of many of the people of Canada. They lowered the debate immediately to the plane of party and petty politics; and much as we should have liked to keep clear of that form of debate, we are by that very circumstance forced to reply to some of the arguments advanced by hon. gentlemen opposite.

Before proceeding to do so, I would like to make a few references to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Michael Clark). He has indulged as usual in a series of witticisms, sallies and jokes for the entertainment of the House. The House is usually pleased to listen to the hon. member for Red Deer, as a sort of relaxation from serious contemplation of matters of importance. It was said of my hon. friend about a year ago, after he had made one of his historic speeches on free trade in the city of Montreal, that he used the old fashioned blunderbuss with black powder, which made a great deal of noise and a great deal of smoke, but scattered very badly. The exhibition we have had this afternoon and evening I think bears out very well this description of my hon. friend. His arguments were very scattered; he could not refrain from going off into fields of trade and commerce, and he read the House a homily on the way that trade will carry itself along and so forth. I shall not, however, digress to that extent, but shall try to confine myself as much as I can to the question at issue. The hon. member complained that the previous speaker on this side of the House, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), had not directed his remarks to the members on the opposite benches. I trust before I complete my speech to-night to address some remarks to the hon. members opposite which they will probably wish had not been spoken. As a matter of fact, as to the burlesque the House was treated to the other evening by the hon. member for South Renfrew, his whole argument was summed up in the few words he read at the end of his speech. The rest of his speech was a diatribe on the right hon. leader of the Government, and his fellow members in the Cabinet, with extracts from certain speeches, which he detached from their context and put meanings into that were never there, and never intended to be there. It is perfectly clear that it is the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite, in their dismay, at this particular time, to try and mislead the people of this country by misrepresenting the remarks of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House.

We have been told time and again by the hon. member for Red Deer and other speakers on the opposite side of the House that the bonds of Empire are bonds of sentiment. In truth, according to the policy of the late Liberal Government, the bonds of Empire have been bonds of sentiment pure and simple. In a moment or two, I shall show that from 1902 to 1911 the hon. gentlemen opposite were aware of certain conditions, but they did absolutely nothing, and so I say that as far as they are concerned, they are bonds of sentiment. But as far as the people of this country and the speakers on this side of the House are concerned, we demand that these bonds of Empire be substantiated by something more concrete, more lasting and of a more material character.

The hon. member for Red Deer has also said that our part in Imperial Defence will be that we defend our shore—that our part in Imperial defence is complete if we do that. Apparently it is the intention of hon. gentlemen opposite to base their arguments upon this ground, which I shall examine in detail a little further on.

We have been very severely criticised because it has been stated that there is an emergency, that there is a demand at the present time for some immediate action in connection with this great question, and my hon. friend from Red Deer quotes from Hon. Winston Churchill in 1909. He described him as a great philisopher. I shall not quote the remarks, as the House will remember them. At that particular time he said also that Lord Roberts had indulged in certain statements for which he had been later on taken to task. I should like to point to the hon. members of this House that Hon. Winston Churchill within the past two months supported Lord Roberts in the statements he made; and while in 1909 he deprecated the tendency to increase

armaments, in 1912 he admitted the necessity of it; and he is one of the most active men in this regard in Great Britain to-day. In 1909, as is ably pointed out in the memorandum that has been submitted to this House, the British authorities made a serious attempt to lessen the progress of armaments, they reduced their own expenditure, but it was noticed that other powers were increasing theirs until, I believe about a year ago, the British authorities saw the utter uselessness of that method and increased their armaments during this year. Imperial federation, we are told, presents difficulties to the people of Canada; and my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, has been twitted by hon. members opposite, especially by the right hon. leader of the Opposition, with having attempted to present to this House any suggestion that it was possible to solve this great problem. I take it that it is the mark of a statesman to face and to deal with a difficult question rather than to turn his back upon it because it presents certain difficulties; and, so far as I am concerned, I hail with delight the attempt that has been made, the steps that have been taken, to lay the foundation upon which, I believe in years to come, Imperial federation will be built. It is stated that it would attack our autonomy and be a retrograde movement. I absolutely repudiate such an inference. The federation of the Overseas Dominions which have now assumed the rank and place of nations in this Empire, their federation with some common control, so far as international affairs are concerned, and so far as defence is concerned, has become an absolute necessity; and that problem must be solved—or there must be the alternative and that is the disintegration of the Empire.

Now, I wish to direct attention for a few moments to the famous resolution which has been so constantly kept to the front by hon. members opposite and by reference to which it has been attempted to misrepresent the attitude of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I have no doubt that when the Minister of Trade and Commerce makes his statement to the House, gives his conception of this policy, he will take care of himself, as hon. members opposite well know he is able to do. But let us examine this famous resolution briefly and compare it with some of the statements made by the hon. leader of the Government at this time and with the attitude taken by the Government. There is one clause which states:

> This House fully recognizes the duty of the people of Canada. . . . to assume in larger measure the responsibilities of national defence.

We are charged at the present time with doing something that is anti-Canadian because we presume to carry out the introductory clause of that resolution which asserts it to be our duty to assume our proper position, our proper responsibilities, in connection with national defence. The resolution goes on:

> The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

We quite agree to that. It has been agreed on all occasions that it is not intended to set a precedent of cash contributions. This is not a cash contribution; it is simply the most effectual way of giving expression to the will of the people in this regard. Let me quote the leader of Government in his speech here the other day:

> In presenting our proposals, it will be borne in mind that we are not undertaking or beginning a system of regular and periodical contributions.

I wish to refute absolutely the attempts made and persisted in up to the present moment, to give the country the impression that we are acting contrary to the statement of the right hon. the Prime Minister when introducing this Bill.

Now, let me examine the resolution offered in amendment by the right hon. gentleman. I shall not read it all, but only a clause or two:

> That any measure of Canadian aid to Imperial naval defence which does not employ a permanent policy of participation by ships owned, manned and maintained by Canada, is not an adequate or satisfactory expression of the aspirations of the Canadian people in regard to naval defence, and is not an assumption by Canada of her fair share in the maintenance of the naval strength of the Empire.

Let us try to interpret that clause by the words of the right hon. gentleman himself at various times. In the first place, I will read a quotation from the right hon. gentleman in 1909:

> We have done a great deal for defence, though not, perhaps, as much as we might have done. At the conference in London in 1902, we stated that we undertook to develop our own defences by land and by sea. With respect to our land defences, we have done more than our duty.

He goes on:

> In the development of naval defences, I admit we are altogether behind the times. Engaged as we have been in works of peace, we have delayed and put off the development of our navy, and I agree with my hon. friend that we shall undertake this work, and undertake it immediately.

In 1902, the right hon. gentleman attended a conference of the Overseas Dominions in London. He states that they discussed the question of Imperial defence. Certain proposals were made to that conference by the Admiralty. But, up to 1909, absolutely nothing was done, and from 1909 to 1911, nothing was done. The Admiralty, in 1909, suggested that Canada, Australia and New Zealand should each form a unit composed of one battle cruiser and three small cruisers. This was to be the basis of the overseas protection of their own dominions. It was suggested that these units should be on the Pacific ocean and that they might co-operate in case of necessity. Now, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition absolutely rejected that suggestion. Hon. members opposite are charging us at the present time with not accepting the proper suggestion of the Admiralty; they are charging us with dictating to the Admiralty as to what our policy should be. But in 1909, the leader of the Opposition, supported by all his colleagues, absolutely rejected the advice of the Admiralty. They went back and asked Great Britain what could be built for £600,000 or £400,000. When they found that out they ordered four small cruisers, of a light type, quite unsuitable for the purposes for which they were supposed to be used, that is the defence of of our shores,—mere scouting ships. They refused to accept the main vessel in the unit, the battle cruiser. This force they divided between the Atlantic and the Pacific. It resulted in this—that the suggestion of the Admiralty was entirely rejected, and that the policy adopted was useless so far as the assistance to Imperial defence was concerned. The resolution was passed in August 1909, the tenders were called for in February 1910, opened in May following, and still nothing has been done.

A few moments ago, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) drew forth cheers and hilarity on the part of his colleagues by referring to the Australian navy. The intention was to impress upon members on this side of the House that, so far as they were concerned, they had proposed a policy similar to the Australian policy, which is absolutely without foundation in fact—they proposed nothing of the kind; they rejected that policy. What did the Australians do? In 1909, the conference was held. They accepted the advice of the Admiralty, and in the same year laid down three destroyers of which two were completed in 1910. In the same year, they laid down an 18,800-ton battle cruiser which has just been completed. And in 1911, they laid down three other cruisers which are all completed. So that, as far as Australia is concerned, they have their unit complete, whereas Canada has what? Absolutely nothing. The policy that the hon. gentleman proposed was not in the slightest degree carried out.

I now wish to examine for a moment the sincerity of hon. gentlemen opposite, and especially of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, in regard to Imperial defence. We have heard a great deal about loyalty, and I do not know why hon. members opposite continually assure us of the fact that they are loyal. It seems to be incumbent upon them to be continually reminding us of their loyalty to the British Empire. However, we will take their loyalty for granted for the time being, and we will now analyse for a moment some of the statements they have made recently in this debate, and compare them with statements made by them during the last ten years.

A statement has been made that no emergency exists at the present time. What is understood by emergency? The hon. member for Rouville had frequent access to the dictionary to ascertain the proper definition of the word emergency, and I would like to quote him a definition that is official on his side of the House so far as the Naval Act of 1910 is concerned. It says that emergency means 'war, invasion or insurrection.' In other words, as far as Canada is concerned, she should do absolutely nothing until war, invasion or insurrection actually breaks out. There is another definition of emergency which I think applies very aptly to hon. members opposite, and it is this: the process of issuing forth from concealment or confinement. It is about time that Canada did come forth from her position of concealment or confinement on this naval question. I wish to quote very briefly from the Naval Act of 1910 as follows:

In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty for general service in the Royal Navy the Naval Service, etc.

In every part of that Act, as passed in this House by hon. gentlemen opposite, there is a string on the Canadian navy. I wish to show, by quoting from the speeches of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, that his idea of a Canadian navy, and the idea of his followers, in so far as they endorse his opinions, is a Canadian navy controlled by the Canadian Government, and which, goes to war only when ordered to do so by the Government of Canada. The statement has been made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition that 'when England is at war, we are at war, but it does not follow that because we are at war, we are actually in the conflict.' As far as Great Britain is concerned; as far as Australia, New Zealand, South Africa

or Canada are concerned; they are not at war unless invaded, or unless insurrection actually takes place.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition made this statement in the debate of 1909:

Now, it may be said that defence, which is the duty of all nations, is a matter as to which there should be a common aspiration. Yes, I agree to that, but at the same time the young daughters of nations of England have insisted that even in the matters of defence they should preserve in its entirety local autonomy.

In other words, as far as Canada is concerned, we are going to preserve in its entirety our local autonomy. I do not think that such a position is possible when we speak of Imperial defence. Then he proceeds:

I have no hesitation in saying that the supremacy of the British Empire is absolutely essential, not only to the maintenance of that Empire, but to the civilization of the world. I have no hesitancy in saying that the supremacy of the British Empire on the high seas must be maintained in the highest degree.

What a contradiction ! In one paragraph of the speech he tells us we must preserve in its entirety our autonomy, while in another paragraph he says the safety of the British Empire depends entirely upon the supremacy of the British fleet!

In the year 1899, the Boer war broke out. All the different parts of the British Empire immediately offered to send troops to the aid of the Mother Country. In Canada the question was debated pro and con in the public press and on the floor of this House, and the Hon. Sir Charles Tupper, then leader of the Opposition, strongly urged upon the then premier that something should be done. And what followed? On July 31, a resolution of sympathy was passed for the Mother Country in connection with the Boer war. The Globe on October 4, 1899, in an interview, gives very clearly the attitude of the right hon. leader of the Opposition at that time in connection with Canada being at war when the Empire was at war. He was reported as having said:

Canadian troops are to be used to fight for Canada's defence.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, to consider that statement in comparison with those made by hon. gentlemen opposite in trying to persuade the people of this country that as far as war is concerned we are at one with the Empire in this matter. Then he goes on, still speaking of the Boer war:

There is no menace to Canada, and although we may be willing to contribute troops, I do not see how we can do so without Parliament granting us the money. So it is we have not offered a Canadian contingent to the home authorities.

There you have again, in clear and terse language, the attitude of the right hon. gentleman at that time regarding the matter of Imperial defence. The Globe, which I think is a good Liberal organ, said editorially:

Summed up, the Government's situation is this: the Government has done nothing and has nothing to say one way or the other.

So that the ideas of the right hon. gentleman at that time on the question of Imperial defence were that Canadian troops and Canadian money should be retained for the defence of Canada, in spite of the fact that we had been receiving from the Mother Country for over 100 years the benefit of the protection of her navy.

In quoting from the remarks of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, I shall not now go back as far as 1899, but I shall quote the remarks of the right hon. gentleman in Ottawa in August, 1912. At a banquet held in the Chateau Laurier in honour of Sir Arthur Lawley and Arthur Grenfel, at which the right hon. leader of the Opposition was present, as well as other prominent gentlemen interested in matters of Imperial welfare, he said:

Canada has only one neighbour and with that neighbour she has had no war for 100 years.

Implying that it was none of her business what other parts of the Empire might do or what the relations of Great Britain or say of Australia to her neighbours might be. As far as Canada was concerned, as long as she was at peace with her neighbours, that was all that was necessary.

Then speaking of European armaments, the right hon. leader of the Opposition said:

Thank God we have been free on this continent from that. Shall we go into that mad race or shall we continue to settle our difficulties by arbitration? That is a question we want to solve here.

He said: Shall we continue to settle our difficulties by arbitration? I want to ask any hon. member on what grounds did we ever settle any difficulty by arbitration? There has been only one power back of the arbitration of Canadian matters and that is the power or might of the British Empire. Yet the right hon. gentleman has the temerity to stand up, quoted as he was throughout the length and breadth of the land, to ask the people of Canada whether or not we should take part in assisting the mother country in the defence of the Empire or continue, forsooth, to settle our difficulties by arbitration. He went on:

You think (speaking to the hon. gentlemen who represented the Mother Country)—you think all the time of armaments and spend half your revenue upon them. We think of railways and canals.

In other words, we have no part or lot with you in your defence of the Empire.

The best way for the British Empire was to live according to the principles of autonomy.

I shall examine briefly what the right hon. gentleman means by that. We have heard it from every member on the other side of the House who has spoken on this question, representing from time to time that we must maintain in its entirety the principle of autonomy. What do they understand by autonomy? As far as I can learn they mean not only self-government on internal matters, but self-government and self-responsibility as far as Imperial matters are concerned. That is, if the Empire is in any sense involved in a controversy with any nation that is no business of ours so long as it does not affect immediate and local conditions within the bounds of our own country.

At another time the right hon. gentleman said:

We can be in the conflict only through two things, namely actual invasion of our soil or the action of the Parliament of Canada.

That statement was made by the right hon. gentleman the other day: 'We can only be in the conflict in this way, by actual invasion of our soil or by action of Parliament.'

Another thing, speaking of the Canadian navy in 1909, as reported in 'Hansard,' page 7626, the right hon. gentleman replied to a question from the present leader of the Government. The question was this:

Suppose a Canadian ship should meet a ship belonging to an enemy on the high seas what is she to do?

The answer of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition was:

I do not know that she would fight.

We heard the other day a lot of diatribes from the hon. member from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) against the Government and members on this side of the House regarding fighting. You would think that the hon. member for South Renfrew was the only member who invited a fight, politically or otherwise. As far as I can remember his record, he is anxious to avoid political fights, yet he delivered a series of diatribes against members on this side, claiming that we were trying to avoid fights simply from the proposed manner of manning the vessels to be furnished by Canada with British sailors. The right hon. gentleman continued in his answer:

I do not know that she would fight. She should not fight until the Government by which she was commissioned had determined whether she would go into the war or not.

What would be the use of a naval force in Canada, as far as the Empire is concerned, if it were not permitted to participate in the battles of the Empire, in the defence of the Empire, until you were able to call Parliament and thrash the question out on the floor of the House? I think we would be here a long time with the present Opposition before we would be able to get a Bill through this House to permit vessels to fight.

A question has been raised about the manning of the navy. We have been charged with trying to evade our duty in connection with the manning of the Canadian navy, and this amendment which has been proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite was proposed to catch the vote of the innocent people on the Pacific coast. They know perfectly well that under their own policy at the present time we are absolutely unprotected on the British Columbia coast. They know that the British Government has been forced to transfer her battleships to the home waters because of pressure in that locality, and so they have offered this, hoping to pull the wool over the eyes of the people on the coast. In the first place we must judge men by their actions, and judging the hon. gentlemen opposite by their actions and policy when in power, their policy in connection with fisheries on the Pacific coast, I think you will see immediately how hopeless a task it would be to man anything on the Pacific coast. Ten years ago we had 10,000 white men engaged in the fishing trade. It is well known that the fishing population is that from which you must draw the men to man navies. The other day we heard some eulogy of the fishermen on the Atlantic coast and I agree that they are worthy men whom we could draw on, but on the Pacific coast in place of the 10,000 white men engaged in fishing what have we to-day? Except for 300 or 400 men they have been entirely supplanted by Japanese. Where do they intend to draw men from for the navy? I suggested at one time that they intended to bring over Admiral Togo and his men, and from the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite that apparently was the course they intended to pursue. I should like to explain the effect that this policy has had on our coast. In the first place, the Japanese who are doing the fishing on the Pacific at the present time have charted every foot of our coast. They have more complete charts of the Pacific coast of British Columbia than have the Admiralty. They have charted every harbour, every inlet and every foot

of the coast. They have some of their leading naval reservists, officers and men constantly doing this work, all under the protection of the policy introduced by hon. gentlemen opposite in connection with the Japanese. From Alaska to Cape Horn every strategic point of value along the Pacific coast is now occupied by Japanese. This is true in the Queen Charlotte islands, the Aleutian islands, the Hawaiian islands, Mexico, Chili and Peru, wherever there is a strategic point of value it is held by Japanese, largely aided and abetted by the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. Our coast on the Pacific is exposed. The intention of this amendment is to suggest to the people of British Columbia that the Opposition are offering greater protection.

I wish to say that, as far as we are concerned, we hail with delight and pleasure and confidence the policy of the right hon. leader of the Government. That policy as presented to the House is a policy which ensures the supremacy of the Imperial navy, and that is a most essential feature in connection with the world's peace. If the supremacy of the Imperial navy were threatened or impaired in the slightest degree our danger would be increased three-fold. The other day the right hon. the leader of the Opposition stated that if the Empire were attacked, under the Opposition policy, Canada would have a powerful fleet scouting the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. I ask members of this House to consider what terror it would strike into the hearts of the Japanese to see the Rainbow shooting out from the harbour of Esquimalt to meet them on the high seas. Their policy could not have been completed until 1917, but, if it had been completed at the present time, what a laughing stock it would have been to the nations of the world as a protection for our coasts, particularly in view of the fact that that navy would have been a neutral navy—no one can gainsay it. It would have been the laughing stock of the world, whereas the policy which has been offered to the country by the present Government is one that gives to the world the idea that, so far as Canada is concerned, she intends to cement her interest with those of the Empire, while, so far as the Imperial navy is concerned, it is strengthened by three of the finest fighting machines that can be placed on the face of the waters.

We heard quite a little lecture from the hon. member for Red Deer on the moral side of this question. Britain, he said, wants moral support. Now the moral support proposed by hon. gentlemen opposite is that we build a puny navy costing $11,000,000 for our two coasts. That is the moral support they offer. The moral support we propose to give is that at once we contribute three dreadnoughts costing $35,000,000 to be under the guidance and orders of the Governor in Council for active participation in any war, an offer unqualified and unconditional. My hon. friend made the statement that there was no emergency, that conditions had changed from what they were in 1909. He said that then there was a considerable jingoism, but he thanked God that the clouds were passing away, and so on. But let me ask, why is his party trebling the contribution which they proposed in 1909 if the conditions are less dangerous than they were then? In 1909 the right hon. leader of the Opposition and his able lieutenant from Red Deer proposed a contribution to the defence of Canada of only $11,500,000. Now, they say, you are not doing enough, we will give $35,000,000 too, and yet in the same breath they tell us that the conditions are less inimical at the present time, a contradiction that cannot be justified or harmonized in the slightest degree.

Now, there is the question of manning the navy. The policy proposed in 1909, which, I would remind you Mr. Speaker, was never carried out—and no attempt was made to carry it out beyond buying two obsolete ships—if it had been carried out, would have demanded 2,000 men to man the boats. But what were they able to do? There are, I think, 365 men on the Niobe and about 125 or 130 on the Rainbow. That was the full quota of trained sailors that could be secured to man the boats which would have required 2,000 men if the scheme had been carried out. I submit that the policy of the Opposition bears every evidence of insincerity from start to finish.

Another matter which I desire to point out is that during the Imperial conference of 1902, when this question was brought up, it was proposed by the British Admiralty to the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, then Prime Minister, that Canada should do certain things. I have already pointed out how he repudiated and rejected that advice and suggestion. At that particular time the contributions to Imperial navy defence per capita were as follows: Great Britain, 15s.; Cape Colony, 1s. 10d.; Australia, 1s. 0¾d.; Canada, nothing; Natal, 10s. 9d.; Newfoundland, 3s. 0½d.; New Zealand, 1¼d. So that every part of the Empire at that time was participating in naval defence. That condition was presented to the then Prime Minister of Canada, and he rejected absolutely the proposal, although Canada had sent him there with a mandate to close up some form of assistance. And from that day to 1909 the Government never stirred a finger. In 1909, however, they were forced to take certain action, though up to that period they had

not done a particle to bring out the practical side of the question; and their policy, as I have said, is represented by two obsolete vessels, and is the laughing stock of the world. In view of that record and of that attitude, I ask Mr. Speaker, can you credit the sincerity of the right hon. the leader of the opposition and his followers?

Now, I wish to say a word or two as to the need of the policy now proposed, and in doing so I shall quote a few figures. We were told very glibly by the hon. member for Red Deer that trade was going to take its own course. He advised the right hon. the leader of the Government not to worry about trade, and, in the supercilious tone which is characteristic of the hon. gentleman, and with that profound wisdom born of his Cobden training 25 years ago and never revised to date, he presented this House a homily on the question of trade. I am not very old, but my hon. friend seems to have stopped in his evolution, in his knowledge of trade 25 years ago, for every speech I have heard him make, and I have heard him make a good many, is absolutely the same from beginning to end. If he knows anything about political economy,

and he presumes to be the authority for this House on that question, he ought to know that the development of British commerce has gone hand in hand, concurrently, with the development of the British navy, and that the development of trade in Germany has gone on concurrently with the development of the German navy. He knows perfectly well that as the trade and power of a nation develop, there must be a development of protection for that trade. It is all very well to have fine theories and to state in this House that he wants to see the day come, and it will come shortly, he says, when armaments will be a matter of foolishness, and that 20 years hence we will look back and think of the folly we indulged in. But we are dealing with conditions and men and nations, and not with theories, at the present time. I submit to the House the following statement which shows each country's naval strength, its army strength, and its commerce in tonnage, and the comparison between the standing of the British army and navy and that of other countries will be interesting:

Country.	Naval.					Merchant.		Army		
	Armoured Battle-ships.	Cruisers.	Others.	Officers.	Men.	Over 10,000 tons.		Peace.	War.	Peace Cost.
						Ships.	Tonnage.			
*Austria	19	12	105	835	18,500	2	28,567	386,800	3,560,000	£14,370,000–1910
France	52	12	344	2,426	60,000	15	203,170	606,294	3,630,000	34,872,198–1910
Germany	54	48	224	.....	66,000	45	838,720	1,056,000	4,360,000	
Japan	36	21	145	2,072	46,000	4	72,351	800,000	1,500,000	
United States	57	16	116	.....	60,217	9	115,398	100,000	.....	
	218	109	934	5,333	250,717	75	1,258,206	.....	.....	
British	110	104	441	.....	137,500	145	2,024,490	323,826	500,000-700,000	
Other Countries.										
Turkey	8	5	22	.....	.....	.....	.....	390,000	.....	
Italy	28	9	187	.....	33,500	.....	.....	270,000	3,380,203	
Russia	28	8	126	.....	50,000	.....	.....	1,424,000	4,547,000	
China	.....	11	14	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
Brazil	6	10	39	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
Argentine	9	9	65	763	18,558	.....	.....	.....	.....	

*With only 140 miles of coast line

It will be seen from this statement that the tonnage over 10,000 tons of the British Empire is something over two million tons, and that the tonnage of all these other countries put together is very little over one-half of that, and yet, these other countries have armies exceeding ours ten to one, and their combined navies largely exceed our navy. The deduction I draw is that while, so far as our navy is concerned, it is large, yet it is not too large to protect our trade in comparison with the protection afforded the trade of other nations. The redeeming feature is that we maintain very little of a military force; and Great Britain has reduced her army 86,000 men in the last five years.

Now, I want to draw attention to some interesting facts in connection with the Niobe and the Rainbow. The full complement of the Niobe was 701 men and the average was about 400 men on board during the last eighteen months; the full complement of the Rainbow was 253 men and the lowest number she had was 125, the average running at about 175 men on board each month. It will therefore be seen that for the two or three years the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier has been in force, as far as it was in force, he and his Government were unable to man the two little toy ships we have on our coasts.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): How many deserters were there?

Mr. STEVENS: The desertions numbered 193. The manning of these ships is an economic question: every one knows that the demand for labour in Canada at the present time is very great, and that it is exceedingly difficult to get men to serve in the army and in the navy. The experience of the leader of the Opposition and his Government in this matter ought to be sufficient to demonstrate beyond all question that so far as manning the navy is concerned it is a serious problem at the present time and one that it will take many years to solve. But, we are told by the hon. member for South Renfrew that we are belittling the manhood of Canada in saying that they would not fight for the Empire. As a matter of fact, that sentiment expressed by the hon. member is not the sentiment of the people of Canada; it is a sentiment which generates in his own imagination, and so far as I can see he is the only man in the country who holds it.

I wish for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the memorandum from the Admiralty about which we have heard so much This memorandum is official, it is given to this House with the full authority of the Imperial Government, and I deprecate the light manner in which the leader of the Opposition and his colleagues have treated this document. In their amendment there is a veiled insult almost, thrown upon the British Government for giving us this memorandum. I read from the memorandum:

> The Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty are prepared to comply and to supplement in a form which may be made public the confidential communications and conversations which have passed between the Admiralty and ministers of the Canadian Parliament during the recent visit to the United Kingdom.

No man in the Dominion of Canada knows better than Sir Wilfrid Laurier that in the carrying on of the Government there are confidential communications which cannot possibly be published, and no man knows better than he that there must have been given to the Prime Minister of Canada information that he dare not expose. And yet that situation is taken advantage of by the leader of the Opposition and his followers. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition talks of retreating into the lines of Torres Vedras, but he knows that the Prime Minister is absolutely helpless in the face of that statement, and that he cannot reveal in any detail the confidential information that has been imparted to him. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition knows also that while this memorandum gives in part that confidential information, it does not give it all by any means, and he knows well that there must have passed between the statesmen of Canada and the statesmen of England communications which cannot be made public. Now, I ask hon. members opposite to treat this thing seriously. So far they have treated it from start to finish absolutely as a joke. In this connection I wish to call attention to the attitude taken by the hon. member from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) when this question was submitted to the House the other day. In the presence of members of the Royal Family, when the grand old national anthem was sung, that hon. gentleman retained his seat, and that very incident will give you an idea of the attitude which hon. gentlemen opposite take on this question. I am glad to observe however, that during the past week or ten days, through the instrumentality of these Liberal caucuses which have been held back in the corner room here, his fellow Liberals have succeeded in teaching the hon. member for Edmonton to know the air when he hears it, and consequently the other day he rose in his place when God Save the King was sung. This memorandum also says:

> The power of the British Empire to maintain the superiority on the sea, which is essential to its security, must obviously be measured from time to time by reference to the other naval forces of the world.

I believe with the hon. member for Red Deer that it would be a crime to have a war with Germany, but there are conditions prevailing which cause us who are anxious for the maintenance of the British Empire, to take heed. Incidentally, I wish to say that I believe the Monroe Doctrine of the United States has had more to do with the armament of Germany than has had the policy of Great Britain. If the United States were to throw overboard that absurd Monroe Doctrine and give an opportunity to the European nations to expand in South America and settle it up with a race who would be like ourselves in temperament, it would be a happy day for this North American continent. The effect of the Monroe Doctrine is that while keeping European races out of South America it is allowing it to be settled with Asiatics, and the time is not far distant when we will have an Asiatic question in South America. We have it stated in this memorandum that the maintenance of the British navy is essential to the security of the British Empire and coming from the Admiralty that is enough for me to be certain of one thing, and that is, that there is a possibility of a prospective emergency. I say the statement contained in this memorandum is enough to satisfy any sane man that there is a prospective emergency and that being so it is our solemn duty to the Empire to be prepared for that emergency if it should come. The memorandum also gives a comparison of the development of ship-building and it shows distinctly that Great Britain endeavoured to stop the increase of armament in 1909, and that the Hon. Winston Churchill then deprecated increased armament, but this year he has gone into it heart and soul, seeing that the life of the Empire depends upon it. Here is the paragraph in the memorandum which is set out by hon. gentlemen opposite as an excuse for doing nothing:

> Further, at the present time and in the immediate future Great Britain still has the power, by making special arrangements and mobilizing a portion of the reserves, to send, without courting disaster at home, an effective fleet of battleships and cruisers to unite with the Royal Australian navy and the British squadrons in China and the Pacific for the defence of British Columbia, Australia, and New Zealand.

That has been seized on by every speaker on the other side of the House as an excuse for lethargy, as an excuse for doing nothing in connection with this question. Just mark those words, that by making special arrangements, calling out reserves, the British Empire is still in a position to look after all its colonies; but forsooth, Canada is to stand back, fold her arms, and do absolutely nothing. In connection with that clause, I wish to say that, when the right hon. the leader of the Government brings down his permanent policy, as I have no doubt he will do at some future date, and in plenty of time, from the experience we have had of how ably the right hon. gentleman handled this part of it, he is not going to bring it down until he brings down something that will be well worthy of consideration. When he does bring it down, it will be something we can say is a finished product, and not a raw tin-pot navy. In another clause is says:

> Any action on the part of Canada to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy, and thus widen the margin of our common safety; would be recognized everywhere as a most significant witness to the united strength of the Empire, and to the renewed resolve of the Overseas Dominions to take their part in maintaining its integrity.

In other words, Canada has never up to the present time given any evidence of participating in Imperial defence; but if she does so at this time, it is conclusive evidence of her attitude on this question. I shall not quote the last clause which has been quoted so often, but this particular clause is our warrant for our action. When the hon. gentlemen opposite twit us with having suggested to the Imperial authorities a certain clause, I want to call their attention to their own attitude in 1902, and again in 1909, where they absolutely rejected the suggestion of the Imperial authorities, and went back and said to them: What will you give us for £600,000? —a ten cent policy instead of a policy that any self-respecting citizen might adopt— What will you give us for £600,000, or better still: We want to hit a bargain, what will you give us for £400,000? That is what the right hon. gentleman the leader of the Opposition asked the Admiralty when he was in power.

To conclude, I just want to say this. So far as our opponent's policy is concerned, they say: Let us have a Canadian navy, and by that they mean a Canadian navy which will not participate in Imperial wars, if there are any, until directed by the Government to do so. Those are the words of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. We say an Imperial navy, an entirely distinct proposition. They say we should not fight until Parliament determines whether we should take part in a war or not. I am quoting their exact words. We say: 'Our ships shall be a part of the Royal navy ready at all times to fight in every battle, and for Britain to demand its assistance at any time and in any place.' They say to Britain, 'You think of armaments; we have railways and canals.'. We say to Britain, 'You have borne the burden of Imperial defence alone long enough. We

want to help you. Here are our dreadnoughts at your disposal, until we can definitely adjust our policy upon a permanent basis.' They say: 'Shall we enter this mad race, or shall we continue to settle our differences by arbitration?' We say: 'Britain has for a hundred years supported and protected Canadian trade without one cent of charge; now we wish to enter into and partake of our responsibilities with Great Britain in this matter.' They say: 'The British Empire can best be maintained by increasing Canadian independence or autonomy.' We say: 'Imperial unity is essential to Imperial existence.' And I want to lay that down particularly, that Imperial unity is essential to Imperial existence, and we will do our part in cementing the various overseas dominions into one whole. They say: 'A separable Canadian navy.' We say: 'One king, one flag and one navy.'

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, I will not follow my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) through the whole of his argument, or I would rather say his apology to the people of British Columbia for the position he is taking in regard to this matter. I am told that the people of British Columbia are ambitious to build steamships; that they are looking forward to starting a great shipbuilding industry on the Pacific coast, and that they are urging their representatives in this Parliament to do everything they can to promote that great industry. British Columbia has some thousands of miles of exposed coast line, and I am told that a fleet unit is a very popular idea in that province. What is the attitude of my hon. friend from Vancouver on that question? He tells us that there are no fighting men in the province of British Columbia, no white fighting men in that great province. That is practically his answer. If the Dominon of Canada should at some future time or if it should at the present time, decide to spend fifteen or twenty million dollars in order to equip a fleet unit on the Pacific coast, my hon. friend informs us that that fleet unit would necessarily be manned by Japanese, and not by white men at all. Does my hon. friend mean that the white men of British Columbia show their whole loyalty by singing God Save the King, but that they won't fight? That is not the opinion we hold on this side of the House in regard to people of that great province.

I do not accept his interpretation of the difference between the two policies. He has informed us that the Canadian Navy is not to fight unless the Parliament of Canada gives the word. The Parliament of Canada must provide the cash. You cannot run a navy on a war basis for the same money that you can run a navy on a peace basis. It is necessary that the Parliament of Canada should have something to say in regard to the navy, if we are to have a Canadian Navy. The Parliament of Canada would have to be called together on proclamation of war and provide the money as quickly as possible in order to prosecute that war. I have listened to this naval wordy battle for the last three or four days from my seat in this House, and as a party man I may say that I have no fears as to the final outcome. On this side of the House, we have signed on under a captain who has weathered a good many storms, and we have confidence in him that he will steer the ship clear of rocks and bring her safely into port. We are not asking any quarter from the enemy, and we are not hanging out any signals of distress. We have a policy that we think appeals to the patriotism and to the courage of the Canadian people, and to their aspirations; we feel that if we can have an opportunity of submitting that policy to the Canadian people that it will be found to be a winning policy. Our policy indicates that we have grown to manhood, that we are strong enough to begin to do something for ourselves. It ensures the revival of the ship-building industry in this country. It cannot fail also to stimulate our great steel industries. Why, Sir, I am told that we are in a position to-day to roll armour-plate at Sydney. It means that we shall take our proper place on the high seas as the oldest, and strongest daughter of the Empire. It guarantees the protection of our own coasts, east and west, and puts Canada in a position to aid the Empire in time of need, to aid not only with ships but with men, and not only this year but in all the years to come. It is the only sane Imperial policy that is consistent with Canadian pride and Canadian honour.

What is the policy on the other side? The policy of the Government is to build—or to pay for the building of—three dreadnoughts and turn them over empty to the Admiralty. The chief of the Naval Department of Canada, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) has informed us it is not a policy at all—that he cannot dignify it with the name of policy. It leaves Canada's coasts unprotected; it leaves this country without a sailor or an officer in the firing line; it ignores the principle of self-government; and it implies that we are a mean-spirited lot of hucksters in this country who would rather pay than fight.

The situation that exists in Canada to-day has never existed before since Confederation. We have one gentleman after another on the other side rising in his place and informing us that he does not know

what is the permanent policy of the Government on the naval issue. I venture to say that we never had such a situation in this country, and I trust that we never shall again, when the dominant party of this country have no permanent policy to offer the people of this country in regard to the naval issue. They say that some day they will evolve a policy. But is it not a helpless condition to be in, when they must confess that they are not able to-day to state what they would like the country to do on this question, the most important question now before the people. Such a condition could not have existed under the leadership of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John Thompson or any other of the great men who, in past years, led the forces of the Conservative party. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries was somewhat disappointing to us on this side of the House. He seemed to take a rather hopeless and helpless view of the situation. My hon. friend is a maritime man, and we supposed that he would take a broader view of this great question, and regard it as a Canadian question. We expected some expression of opinion from him in regard to the great subject of steamship building in this country. He stated over and over again, that before we should be able to launch one of these armoured ships, they would be so old and useless that they would be considered obsolete and fit only for the scrap-heap. When making that statement he was referring to what he called the slow manner in which the late Government conducted their business. He is now in power, yet he has not indicated that he is able to go any faster than the late Government did. Is he able to formulate a policy by which ships can be built in his own city or in any other port, and have them launched before they become obsolete? He has not shown that he has any naval policy any more progressive than that of his leader. He refers to a naval authority, Commander Roper, who criticised the late Government because they had not been able to go faster in the construction of these ships. Now, as my hon. friend has appealed to Commander Roper he must go to Commander Roper. I have been looking up the record of that gentleman, and I find that he has been dealing with the naval situation on various occasions. A good deal of criticism was heard throughout Canada in 1910 in regard to what was called by hon. gentlemen opposite the 'tin-pot navy' of the Laurier Government. Commander Roper considered it his duty to come out in the public press and make statements which I wish to read to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. He told some very plain truths in the interview. I quote from the Ottawa Citizen, of Wednesday, 14th of September, 1910:

The Ottawa 'Citizen,' Wednesday, September 14, 1910, page 1, second column.

'Tin Pot Navy' is often, much too often used, and I have been to some trouble to find out the origin of the term, and have come to the conclusion that it is used by some of those people who are in disagreement with the present programme regarding the navy, and I firmly believe, that this arises chiefly through ignorance or want of thought.

A little hard on the Minister of Marine, because, I understand that he was one of the offenders, one of the gentlemen who used the term 'Tin-pot navy' with regard to——

Mr. HAZEN: What authority has the hon. member for that statement?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the hon. minister mean by that he did not——

Mr. HAZEN: I ask, what authority has the hon. member for making that statement?

Mr. SINCLAIR: If the hon. minister denies——

Mr. HAZEN: I repeat, that I ask my hon. friend for his authority.

Mr. SINCLAIR: The speeches I have read from my hon. friend (Mr. Hazen), as I recollect them. If he denies, I will take his word for it.

Mr. HAZEN: Up to 1910, I had not made a speech on the naval question, and the hon. gentleman will find, if he investigates the matter, that he is probably referring to a speech made by his friend from the county of Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson).

Mr. SINCLAIR: The hon. minister says that up to 1910 he did not use the term 'Tin-pot navy.' Are we to infer that he used it after——

Mr. HAZEN: The hon. member is convicted of making a statement without any authority to back him up.

Mr. SINCLAIR: At all events, it was used frequently in this House by the supporters of my hon. friend. And his chosen naval authority, Commander Roper, says that it was used through ignorance or want of thought.

To a large number of people, the beginning and end of a navy is to be reckoned in dreadnoughts, and also as regards obtaining a fleet, all that has to be done is to say, 'We'll have a navy,' and they expect to find a fleet of dreadnoughts floating on the St. Lawrence next day. That, of course, is a slight exaggeration, but it is the principle on which they work.

With regard to Canada's share in Imperial defence, a large faction only had one aim in view, namely, the presentation of a couple of dreadnoughts to the Mother Country. There

arose other ideas, but whatever they were, a dreadnought was invariably included, and so when these people——

that is, the friends of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

—found that the Government proposal did not include a dreadnought, they immediately designated it 'Tin Pot' which, I think you will agree with me is rather a contemptuous term to apply to a service which I sincerely trust and hope will, in the near future, be looked upon with gratification and pride by every soul who has the honour of calling himself or herself a Canadian citizen, and who is consequently a member of this great Empire of ours, the greatest the world has ever seen.

Just one more point to show you how much some of these people understand about what they are talking. A gentleman came up to me the other day and said: 'What I cannot make out is, what Canada wants half a dozen river destroyers for, when the St. Lawrence is the only river they can possibly be required to work on.' I then had to explain to him that these river destroyers are ocean-going destroyers of the very latest type, but are technically known as the river class, as they are named after various rivers in Great Britain to distinguish them from other classes. That, I think, is a very good illustration of the amount of knowledge possessed by some of these people, and I would advise them to go and study Brassey and other standard books, before venturing to talk or write on that which they know so little about.

That rebuke was intended for the jingoes of the Conservative party who were calling this navy a tin-pot navy, but who did not know what they are talking about. (Reading continued):

Now, a fleet is composed of various classes of ships, namely, battleships, cruisers, torpedo craft, fleet auxiliaries. I have no time to fully explain the working of these classes of vessels in connection with one another. Briefly, let me say that battleships are the vessels which should bear the brunt of the fighting, and it is an Admiral's duty to so place his battleships that they will in due course meet those of the enemy. Now he cannot do this without information, and it is the cruiser's duty to obtain and transmit this intelligence. In other words, battleships without cruisers are like blind men without a guide. During my service in the navy, it has been my lot to take part in six of the annual manœuvres when I was serving on the staff of the Admiral in command of one side. From beginning to end it was always one cry 'information.'

The Admiral can never be too well informed. Study the life of the greatest of all naval leaders, Nelson, and you will find there that his one cry of the whole time was for cruisers. Why? Because he wanted means of obtaining information. Now I have no hesitation in saying that at the present moment Britain has plenty of dreadnoughts, but has she plenty of cruisers? For an expression of opinion I refer you to that distinguished sailor, Admiral Lord Charles Beresford, who emphatically says she has not. When, therefore, the question arises as to what share Canada is to take in Imperial defence, every detail and item must be considered. It is not that Britain requires actual assistance from Canada so much as she requires that, in the event of trouble, Canada will to a certain extent be able to look after herself. The present naval programme, namely, four cruisers and six destroyers, is framed to meet the existing situation, keeping in view the amount of money available to the Government. These cruisers and destroyers will also be a useful addition to the Imperial navy in the case of necessity. Dreadnoughts cost a lot of money, they also take a larger number of men to man them, and docks of the largest capacity to hold them. If therefore, a policy including dreadnoughts was embarked on, a very large sum of money would be involved, and probably considerably more than Canada at present can afford.

If I were asked as to the relative importance of the various items composing a navy, I should place them as follows: Men, ships, and docks. Personally, I do not believe that we take sufficient count of the personnel. The wear and tear of a future naval war on the human being will be terrific and in my humble opinion, cases will arise where the personnel will be beaten whilst the material is still available. If the future struggle arises before the Canadian vessels are ready, the men can always be placed at the disposal of the Mother Country. There are many distinguished and clever men who say that the next trouble will arise in 1912. On that point I express no opinion, but what I do say is that apart from building ships, Canada by training and supplying men to the Mother Country will be rendering her the greatest assistance possible.

I am referring to Commander Roper's statements because my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries appealed to him as an authority in naval matters. The conclusions to be drawn from his statements may be summarized, as follows:

(1) That the parties who used the expression 'tin pot' did so through ignorance;

(2) That the clamour for dreadnoughts and dreadnoughts alone arises from a misconception of the requirements of the service;

(3) That dreadnoughts, unless accompanied by cruisers, are a weakness rather than a strength to the navy;

(4) That a dreadnought without swift cruisers to collect information as to the enemy's position, is like a blind man without a guide;

(5) That in naval warfare men are of more vital importance than ships or docks;

(6) That training and supplying men would be the greatest service Canada could perform for England.

A good deal of reference has been made in this debate to the attitude of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce in 1909. I have had the pleasure of sitting

in this House with the hon. gentleman for several years, and have listened on a great many occasions to his eloquent and persuasive voice. But I remember only one occasion when he was able to carry the whole House with him by the force of his eloquence and clear reasoning. That was a triumph for my hon. friend, and on that occasion he stood for a Canadian navy, owned by the Canadian people, manned by the Canadians and rooted in Canadian soil. Could any one believe that within the short period of four years he would become a member of a government that would go back on the principles he so strongly advocated on that occasion, and of the truth of which he so fully convinced hon. gentlemen on both sides of the house? It is said that misery brings strange bedfellows, but political emergencies also make us acquainted with strange bedfellows.

On that occasion objection was made to the humiliating course of hiring our defence, and hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House object very strongly now to the use of that expression. But I want to point out that that expression did not originate on this side of the House, but with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I shall not quote his speech but will read only two or three paragraphs:

The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do.

Then he goes on:

It goes still further than that. Suppose you contribute this year your sum, and next year your equal sum, and thereafter year after year. After ten or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years, you will have paid out an immense amount of money. You will have been protected in the meantime; but in Canada itself there will be no roots struck; there will be no residue left, there will be no preparation of the soil, or beginning of the growth of the product of defence.

Further on in the same speech he made these statements:

The interest that we take in a contribution spent by another is not the interest that I desire for Canada. . . . . I think this method ignores the necessities and the aspirations and the prospects of a great people such as the Canadian people are destined to become.

These words of the Minister of Trade and Commerce carried conviction in this House, and the principles then laid down by my hon. friend are the same now as they were then; the situation on that occasion is very much the same as it is to-day. But, Sir, the poison must have been instilled into the veins of the Government on some occasion or other, and I do not think it was at the time of the by-election at South Renfrew. I am of the opinion that it was earlier than that; that it took place in the by-election of Drummond and Arthabaska, and the result, so pertinently described by the leader of the Opposition, is a policy that is a cross between jingoism and Nationalism.

The Prime Minister used so many forcible arguments to back up the policy we are now placing before this country that the House will have to excuse me if I quote very shortly from him. On the occasion of that debate in March, 1909, the Prime Minister said:

In so far as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to-day outlined the lines of naval defence of this country, I am entirely at one with him. I am entirely of opinion in the first place, that the proper line upon which we should proceed in that regard, is the line of having a Canadian naval force of our own. I entirely believe in that.

I venture to say that my right hon. friend still believes in that if he could only shake himself free from the Nationalist trammels that surround him. That was on March 29, 1909. My right hon. friend during that summer went over to England and he attended the Dominion Day banquet in London and there spoke as follows:

Some feeling was created in the British Islands owing to the fact that Canada did not by resolution or by speech from the Prime Minister vouchsafe the offer of one, two or three dreadnoughts. The resolution in the form in which it was passed, while its terms might not, upon the surface, seem as significant as the offer of one of two dreadnoughts would have been, laid down a permanent policy for the Dominion of Canada which would serve a more practical purpose than any such offer of dreadnoughts.

That was the statement made by my right hon. friend after he had had two or three months to think over it, and a little later on, when he came back to Halifax, he addressed a meeting there in October of the same year in which he repeated that statement as follows:

That, out of our own materials, by our own labour, and by the instructed skill of our own people, any necessary provision for our naval defence should be made.

How does he stand to-day? He has abandoned the Canadian navy altogether. He proposes a gift of three empty dreadnoughts to the Admiralty, the very thing he condemned in 1909, and he states emphatically that these dreadnoughts are to be built in England. He does not give us a look-in in Canada as to whether we can do it or not, but he lays it down that they are to be built in England; and yet the Minister of Marine says the Prime Minister is the epitome of consistency. Some question arose this afternoon as to what control the

Dominion Government would have over the building of these dreadnoughts. My right hon. friend stated that they were to be built on the other side of the ocean, and further, that they were to be built under the supervision of the Admiralty. It strikes me that the Dominion of Canada will have very little more to do than to pay the bill of $35,000,000.

Reference was made here to-night to the opinion of the First Lord of the Admiralty, Right Hon. Winston Churchill. Speaking at the banquet of shipwrights in London on May 16, 1912, he said:

If the main naval developments of the last ten years have been a concentration of British fleets in decisive theatres, it is not unlikely that the main naval developments of the next ten years will be the growth of effective naval forces in the great dominions overseas.

That was the occasion on which the first Lord of the Admiralty made the proposal, that:

We in England will guard the centre and they, the colonies, will guard and patrol the rest of the Empire; the gaps should be filled by our comrades across the seas.

This was the opinion of Mr. Churchill in May, 1912, just two or three weeks before my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and the Prime Minister and the other ministers went to England. I have given the opinion of the First Lord of the Admiralty. I shall quote one or two Conservative opinions from British quarters. First, I shall quote from the London Spectator, a well known Unionist journal, which is out-spoken against any contribution policy. It says:

We felt—that is, the English people felt—however, that the essential thing was to interest and so to instruct the Britons oversea in the truths and realties of sea power. Next we realized that they could not attain to that interest unless they had navies which they could call their own, and feel were their own, because they had provided them. The notion of hiring sea power and of paying our Admiralty so much a year to protect them was, we knew, a barren idea from which no real help could ever come.

That was the opinion of one of the greatest London newspapers on the Unionist side. Let me quote also the opinion of the Right Hon. Arthur Balfour, the real leader of the Conservative party in Great Britain. This was delivered a few weeks ago at St. Andrew's dinner on November 30:

He referred to the great part his countrymen had played in reconciling the principle of nationality with that of ardent patriotism in various parts of the world. It was only by emulating that example that the future of the Empire as a whole could be secured. The people of Canada and other Overseas Dominions must have, and will have, their own feeling of nationality. Every Canadian ought to want to feel that Canada has got its own principles of development, and in future do not let us discourage that local patriotism, he said: Let them cultivate their own feeling of nationality. Canada for the Canadians, Australia for the Australians, but the whole for the Empire. It was the misconception of this principle which led to the great disruption between the American colonies and the Mother Country a century and a half ago, and perhaps, after all, it required that lesson to teach us what we know.

I agree with the leader of the Conservative party in that regard. We do not hear very much from our hon. friends on the other side of the House about that old slogan, 'Canada for the Canadians.' They used to use it quite often. I do not think I have heard it at all in the present discussion from hon. gentlemen opposite. I would like to know if they have abandoned it altogether. I agree with Mr. Balfour that it is a good policy: Canada for the Canadians, Australia for the Australians, and all for the Empire.

I was referring to the attitude of the Prime Minister in regard to the question where the ships would be built. In that part of his speech he does not give us very much hope that he sees any time ahead when we would be able to build battleships in Canada. What does he say about this?

That the Admiralty are prepared in the near future to give orders for the construction in Canada of small cruisers, oil-tank vessels and auxiliary craft of various kinds.

That seems to be the best that the Prime Minister expects for the people of Canada. I submit that this is a pretty small programme, that it is a small programme for my friend the Minister of Marine to go to St. John with and tell the people: You are not big enough to build a battleship, not even big enough to build a Bristol cruiser in St. John or Halifax, but we will allow you to tackle an oil-tank, that is the best we are able to do for you. That is not very ambitious, and I do not think it will be a taking policy with the people of this country. It has not created much enthusiasm with hon. gentlemen opposite, and you will note that the Government does not provide a dollar to build even the oil-tanks, they say that the whole $35,000,000 is to be passed over to the British Admiralty in order to build the three dreadnoughts. Where is the money to come from to help the building of those oil tanks that are to be constructed at Halifax, St. John and other places? We cannot be expected to become very enthusiastic over a policy like that. Hon. friends opposite called the policy of the late Government, which was approved by the British Admiralty, and which was a good Canadian policy, a tin-pot pol-

icy. I do not know whether we can get a good name for this policy, unless we call it an oil-tank policy. It will not be a taking policy in the province of Nova Scotia, I feel satisfied of that. There is nothing that will rouse the people of that province so much as the prospect of returning to the old and prosperous days of ship-building. They have never forgotten those old days when the flag of Nova Scotia was seen in all ports of the world. Perhaps there are some hon. gentlemen who do not know that the province of Nova Scotia had a flag of its own. I think it was the only province of Canada that had a distinctive flag of its own, and that flag was a common sight in all the ports of the world. The people of that province are very ambitious to take the place that they lost on the sea when the change took place from the wooden vessels to the iron ships. And why should they not? Why cannot they get a chance on this occasion to start the steel shipbuilding industry in this country? At the last election, the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) was aware that this was a very important issue in the province of Nova Scotia. He was accused on the hustings in the city of Halifax, and at other places in the province of Nova Scotia, of having voted against the Laurier Naval Bill. The people took the ground that he should not have done so because the Laurier policy meant the establishment of a ship-building industry in that province. In the city of Halifax, my right hon. friend found it necessary to issue a manifesto to clear up the question. I have a copy of it here and I want to put a small part of it on record. It is headed:

Mr. R. L. Borden's splendid Steel Shipbuilding Policy for Halifax.

Addressing a public gathering in Halifax, on the evening of the 14th October, 1909, the Liberal-Conservative leader, Mr. R. L. Borden, made an important declaration on the subject of steel shipbuilding at this port, which must have given much satisfaction to our people who, for many years previously, had been seeking aid for such an industry from the Laurier Government, but who had been receiving only very cold, and empty and, as the event proved, very worthless promises from the ministers. On that occasion the Liberal-Conservative leader said: The House of Commons last session laid down a certain policy touching naval defence in which both political parties united. It may not have satisfied the aspirations of all Conservatives, but it seemed our bounden duty to place, if possible, above the limits of partisan strife a question so vital and far-reaching, and to attain the standard which has for many years governed both political parties in Great Britain with respect to foreign relations. How the present Administration will work out the policy which was outlined by the resolution to which I have alluded, remains to be seen. One governing principle, at least, should control, namely, that out of our own labour and by the instructed skill of our own people, any necessary provision for our naval defence should be made so far as may be reasonably possible.

This was intended for the electors of Halifax at the time my right hon. friend was seeking their suffrages.

It may be noted, however, that in a Laurierite resolution published in the Halifax 'Chronicle,' it is asserted that Mr. Borden has 'deliberately repudiated that pledged policy. This Laurierite assertion is simply false. Mr. Borden has never 'repudiated' that policy, nor has he ever said or done anything inconsistent with it.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that this was in September, 1911, at the time of the election. My right hon. friend was seeking the suffrages of the people of the county of Halifax, and the statement was made by manifesto on behalf of his party that Mr. Borden had never repudiated that policy, and had never said or done anything inconsistent with it.

The Laurierite pretence is that it was a repudiation of this shipbuilding policy for Messrs. Borden and Crosby to vote against the Laurier Naval Bill. Such a pretence is simply nonsense. The Laurier Naval Bill made no provision for shipbuilding at Halifax. That Bill was passed, but what has Halifax gained by it in the way of shipbuilding? A few other facts should be noted: First, the Government's power to build ships did not and does not depend upon the passage of the Naval Bill. Second, the Naval Bill, in itself, did not authorize the building of any ships at Halifax or anywhere else. A vote against the Naval Bill was, therefore, no vote against shipbuilding at Halifax.

That was the manifesto on which my right hon. friend sought election in the city of Halifax. Mr. Speaker, seeing it is eleven o'clock, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Carried.

Mr. AMES: I think it was understood that my hon. friend would finish to-night.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It is 11 o'clock.

Mr. ROGERS: I understood from the whips that there was an understanding that Mr. Sinclair would finish.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The motion is carried. It is after 11 o'clock, and it is surely not unreasonable for my hon. friend to ask the adjournment.

Mr. ROGERS: I think 11 o'clock is quite early. We have been listening to a good deal of argument, and we can go on for another hour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At the last session of the House, an hon. member on the other

side moved the adjournment and it was agreed to, and it was a little after ten o'clock.

Mr. ROGERS: That was on Friday night when we wanted to get home.

Mr. AMES: Since then it has been decided to adjourn on Wednesday instead of on Thursday, and a number of speakers who are expecting to come on will have to be crowded into the next two days, if my hon. friend does not go on.

Mr. PELLETIER: We will adjourn the debate as soon as my hon. friend is finished.

Mr. SPEAKER: I did not make any announcement regarding the question.

Mr. ROGERS: I think our friends opposite are rather unreasonable. It is very early in the week and early in the evening, and the hon. member is apparently satisfied to go on and finish his speech. I do not see why he should not do so.

Mr. TURRIFF: I think that when the hon. gentleman asked for an adjournment, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries nodded his head, and I do not think it is fair now for other ministers to make him take back water, especially when it is after 11 o'clock.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Go on.

Mr. TURRIFF: You will not be ahead on it.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I was pointing out that my right hon. friend had issued a manifesto to the people of Halifax on the question of ship-building, and that in that manifesto he had advocated the building of naval ships at Halifax. That is what the people of Halifax voted for on the 21st of September, 1911, and I feel certain that that is what my right hon. friend would like to do to-day if he were not tied hand and foot by the jingoes of Toronto and the Nationalists of Quebec. I feel certain my right hon. friend would like to keep this promise, although the announcement he made in the House was not encouraging: that in his judgment about 25 or 50 years would elapse before we would be in a position to do anything ourselves in the way of naval defence. Is it true that Canadians are so phlegmatic that they can neither build these ships nor fight? Is it true that we are not fit to take rank with such countries as the Argentine Republic, or Chili or Denmark, or Belgium, or even China, all of which are building navies of their own? Is the breed in Canada inferior to the breed in Australia where our cousins are establishing a naval service of their own and carrying out the agreement entered into between the Imperial authorities and the colonies some years ago? In reading over these various memoranda I have come to the conclusion that there was virtually an understanding between the Imperial authorities and the Dominions of Australia and Canada that Australia would undertake to provide a local navy to guard the coasts of that country and the adjoining islands, and that Canada was to undertake the task of policing her Pacific and Atlantic coasts. That was the understanding, and Australia is going on in good faith carrying it out and I submit it is not a creditable course for the people of Canada to take to repudiate the understanding entered into on that occasion.

The argument of my hon. friends opposite is that we are not capable of building ships in this country and that we have not enough white men to man them when they are built. I refer hon. gentlemen opposite to the progress Canada has made during the last forty years. We have changed a string of scattered provinces into a nation; we have opened up the great West; we have established a great manufacturing industry in this country; we have developed a trade of one billion dollars with the outside world; we have constructed the greatest railway and canal system in the world, and are we to be told that with our present population and enormous wealth and overflowing treasury we are too puny to build our own naval ships and to protect our own coasts. It is an insult to the people of Canada to make such a statement.

But how did all this confusion arise in regard to this naval question and who is responsible for the difficulties we are in at the present time. I wish to call testimony which will have to be admitted by the hon. gentlemen opposite. If there is any newspaper in this country that is supporting vigorously the present administration, it is the Ottawa Journal; and I quote from it to show the reason for the confusion that exists among the people of Canada and especially among hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to this naval question. In September, 1911, two or three days after the election, the Ottawa Journal published the following:

> The situation is a very curious one. A number of newspaper comments on the election are to the effect that one good feature of it is that Mr. Borden is independent of Nationalist support, but those who comment so lose sight of the fact that not merely Mr. Bourassa's direct followers, but Mr. Monk, Mr. Forget, Mr. Nantel, Mr. Blondin, Mr. Paquet, all in fact of the old guard of Quebec Conservatives have been just as flatly opposed as Bourassa to any Canadian naval expenditure, and that all of them voted steadily against Mr. Borden in Parliament on this point. This renders it very difficult for any of them to enter a Cabinet which must make

naval expenditure a plank in its platform. When a committee was appointed to arrange for a great Conservative convention last year, the French-Canadian members delivered an ultimatum that unless it was agreed that no resolution should be offered on the naval question no French Conservatives would attend the convention, and on that account the convention was abandoned. This indicates the vital nature of the naval issue.

Now, Sir, does any one think that this shifty policy that is now before the country would have been resorted to were it not designed to appease the Nationalist followers of the Government? The Postmaster General in his address told us that we were doing this in order to please England, that the Admiralty preferred a contribution. But it has been clearly pointed out in this debate that the Admiralty did not have any choice, because prior to the visit of the Prime Minister and his colleagues to England they had made up their minds to abandon the Canadian navy. Why Sir, at the last session of Parliament a question was asked the Minister of Marine as to what he was to do in regard to repeal of the Navy Act, and the question and answer are worth reading:

Mr. MONDOU: 1. Does the Government intend to propose the repeal of the Naval Act?

2. If so, does the Government intend, in case of such repeal to propose another Act containing the policy of the Government on this matter?

3. If such other Act is proposed, is it the intention of the Government to submit the same for the approval of the people before being put into force?

Mr. HAZEN: The answer to these three questions is, yes. After such consideration and inquiry as may be necessary the Government will present its naval policy in Parliament and to the people. That policy will undoubtedly require legislation which will involve the repeal of the present Naval Service Act. In the meantime, that Act will remain on the statute book for purposes in connection with the Fisheries Protection Service and otherwise. Before any permanent naval policy is put into force, the people will be given an opportunity to pronounce upon it.

The Prime Minister on his visit to England, had this before him; he had agreed to repeal the Naval Service Act; he had agreed to abandon the former policy of the construction of a Canadian navy, and he approached the Admiralty in this way: Assuming that we will not have a Canadian navy, assuming that we will not undertake the construction of a navy and the protection of our coasts, what is the next best thing we can do in order to do something for the defence of the Empire? And, to that question, we have the answer as it appears in the memorandum from the Admiralty. On the question as to an emergency quotations have been read to the House from various sources, and may I be permitted to add another. In the discussion in the Imperial Parliament on the 20th of March last, the First Lord of the Admiralty said:

The hon. member for Chester and the hon. member for North Kensington have both recognized the strength which the Government possesses at the present time, and I do not think it would be possible to find two members in this House who have more right to give an authoritative opinion on that subject, for both of them have brought to the consideration of naval matters the study of a great many years, and both of them are gifted with knowledge which far exceeds any I have been able to acquire during the short term I have been in the Admiralty. I recognize very gladly the statement they have made that our position at the present time is a thoroughly satisfactory one, and I do not think there is any danger or chance of it becoming unsatisfactory in the future. If it is satisfactory now, and that position is maintained in the next few years, let it be remembered that we owe that position to my right hon. friend the Home Secretary, the fruits of whose administration the present First Lord of the Admiralty is reaping.

It would be most unjust and ungenerous if the satisfactory position which we now occupy, were to come by the public to be attributed to any efforts of mine, whereas they are entirely the result of what was done two or three years ago.

Permit me again to give you a remark made by the Prime Minister of England in July of this year in the House of Commons. It must have been about the time that my right hon. friend with his colleagues was over in England. The Prime Minister says:

There never has been a moment, and there is not one now, when we have not been overwhelmingly superior in naval force against any combination which could reasonably be anticipated.

Not Germany alone, but any combination that could reasonably be anticipated. I now give a remark made by the Prime Minister, (Mr. Asquith), on this question of an emergency only a few days ago:

The great powers are working together with a closeness of touch and a frankness and freedom of communication and discussion which are remarkable, and which may seem almost unintelligible to those who believe that because of certain purposes the powers have been and are arranged in different groups. Nothing is further from the fact.

That statement was made by the Prime Minister in England not one month ago. He said that there never was a time when the nations of Europe were in better agreement than they are at the present time. I want to quote another extract from the First Lord of Admiralty, because I think it is very pertinent to this discussion. It condemns making a splurge in naval affairs, and advocates a continuous and

steady policy such as is advocated by the Opposition in this House. This is an extract from a speech delivered in the House of Commons in England on the 22nd of July 1912:

Cool, steady, methodical preparation, prolonged over a succession of years, can alone raise the margin of naval power. It is no use flinging millions of money about on the impulse of the moment, by a gesture of impatience, or in a mood of panic. Such a course only reveals your weakness and impotence. Those who clamour for sensational expenditure, who think that the kind of danger with which we are faced needs to be warded off or can be warded off in that way, are either ignorant themselves of naval conditions or take advantage of the ignorance of others. The strain we have to bear will be long and slow, no relief will be obtained by impulsive or erratic action. We ought to learn from our German neighbours whose policy marches unswervingly towards its goal across the lifetime of a whole generation.

On that occasion the First Lord of the Admiralty condemns what my hon. friends opposite are doing to-day; he condemns making a rapid splurge in naval affairs; he advocates a steady and continuous policy. Of course, the Government of England will accept the gift. What else could they do? But what do they really think about the policy of the present administration? I should like to know what Lord Churchill in his heart really does think of the policy of my right hon. friend and his ministers in regard to this question. What does he think of those gentlemen dumping three empty dreadnoughts upon the door step of the Admiralty and then singing, 'God Save the King,' and thinking they have done their duty? He does not stop there. In that same passage he makes the following remark:

It indicates that the plans for naval construction shall be made years ahead, and that they shall be frankly communicated to the European power.

He indicates that if we break up the proposals we have made covering a period of years, it casts suspicion among the European powers, and does a great deal of harm. The First Lord of the Admiralty was referring to that phase of the question when he made these remarks.

What we want to avoid if possible is suggestions that vessels are being constructed, apart from those which are published and shown in the regular returns. The House knows that a lot of suspicion and ill-feeling was caused on that subject in former years, and it would be a great benefit if at any rate that element of suspicion could be altogether eliminated from the naval relations of two great powers. We would go a very long way on that road provided that reciprocal facilities are afforded to us. These are two things that we can do: we can remove uncertainty by letting it be known quite clearly what we propose to do and what are the limits within which the Goverenment increase or decrease from our prescribed course.

Now the announcement was made by the British Admiralty as to what they would do, and it covered a period up to 1920, quite a number of years ahead, and the Canadian Government came in with their three dreadnoughts, disturbing the arrangements that were made by the other European powers, after this announcement. That is the reason why these angry things are said in the German press to-day, and why the first Lord of the Admiralty is charged with falsehood by that press. The action of my hon. friends opposite in so far as an emergency is concerned has not done much to help the peace of Europe, but has rather created suspicion among the great powers. There is a witty gentleman in London by the name of Bernard Shaw, a very witty Irishman and a well known writer. This is what he says in regard to the situation:

Bernard Shaw gave the Canadian Associated Press the following opinion of Borden's scheme for building up a navy for Canada by putting out her ships to nurse with the British fleet at the expense of British taxpayers until the time comes for recalling them to form an independent navy for the Dominion:

'It seems to be a clever and altogether good bargain for Canada, but for obvious reasons Borden should stipulate that after sufficient delay to allow for the necessary training, the Canadian ships shall have exclusively Canadian crews.

'I notice some English papers regard the scheme as a method of strengthening the British fleet at the expense of Canada. If I thought Borden meant that I should recommend his immediate removal to a lunatic asylum. Canada must be able to defend itself before it can be a source of real strength to Britain, or any other power.

'It need not cut the painter, but it assuredly must cut its apron strings if it is to take its proper place in the world as a grown-up state.'

It has been asserted and it has not been denied, that the Admiralty does not need our money, that they have an overflowing treasury. As pointed out by my hon. friend from Red Deer, the present administration have met the expenses of the Insurance Bill, they have met the expenses connected with the Old Age Pensions, and all the other vast schemes of the government, and they have been able to pay $70,000,000 of the public debt during the time of the administration. Why should we send $35,000,000 of Canadian money across the ocean when the Treasury of Great Britain is overflowing, and when the British statesmen tell us they have provided for the defence of the country for a number of years ahead? It seems to me that our proper task, the task we undertook in 1909 is to spend that money in the

building up of the Canadian navy, developing our own country, developing a shipbuilding industry, and preparing ourselves to take a part in the defence of the Empire, if it should ever need our help. An interesting account was given the press some weeks ago of a meeting held at a place called Fort Francis, in the province of Ontario. My hon. friend the member for Rainy River (Mr. Carrick) was at that time addressing the public. I quote from a newspaper report which I assume to be correct; if it is not correct my hon. friend will inform me:

> Mr. Carrick gave an interesting account of his visit to Great Britain at the time Premier Borden was there and said he was gratified at the way the people of Great Britain received the Canadians, recognizing the Dominion as a coming part of the Empire.

We were all gratified at that.

> In conclusion he referred to the naval question and said his opinion was that Canada should have a navy and that the dreadnoughts should be built in Canada. The money should be spent in Canada and in this way Canada would receive the benefit. In the time of war the Imperial Admiralty should be in control and thus Canada could assist the Mother Country in time of peril. Loud applause greeted these remarks, the speaker evidently striking a popular chord.

Now, Sir, Fort Francis is not the only place where that popular chord could be struck. I venture to say that you cannot get a hundred Canadians together anywhere in the Dominion but they will cheer the same sentiment when it is presented to them.

A good many hon. members opposite have referred to the difficulty of finding men to man the ships. I wish to remind the House, and particularly the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen), that we are a maritime country in Canada. If he will refer to his own report, I think he will find that something like 70,000 or 80,000 men and boys are engaged in the great fishing industry of this country. From these men we shall be able to draw the sailors, and, I hope, the officers, to man the coming Canadian navy. It should not be an impossible task to find these men on the coast of the maritime provinces, if none can be found on the coast of British Columbia. There are many men in the Island of Newfoundland—

Mr. EDWARDS: May I ask the hon. member what proportion of the Niobe's crew are Canadians?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Since September 21, 1911, There has been no expectation among the men in the maritime provinces where I live, that the navy was going to continue under this Government. The idea got abroad, when the present Administration came into power, that the Canadian navy for the present, was doomed, that it was no use to enter upon it. I am not surprised that the young men on the coast of Nova Scotia and the other maritime provinces would not enter upon a scheme of that kind.

Mr. EDWARDS: What proportion of the crew of the Niobe before the Laurier Government went out of power, and when that Government had in full control, were Canadians?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I have not the figures before me at present. But I am informed that the report of last year states that the recruiting was very satisfactory indeed. But it remains true that we have a very large maritime population on the coasts of the maritime provinces, and that we should not have very much difficulty in finding men for a naval career, provided we make up our minds that we will build up a Canadian navy. Young men do not care about starting a career of that kind unless there is some settled policy, and there has been no really settled policy on this question since hon. gentlemen opposite dragged it into politics at the time of the by-election in the province of Quebec. I was going to suggest to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is always willing to take a suggestion, that, if it should be his lot—and I hope it will—to reverse the decision of the present Government and restore the policy of the Canadian navy, it would be advisable to start training schools along the coasts of the maritime provinces where the young men who are engaged in the fishing industry, who are at home in the winter and have not very much to do, could qualify themselves for positions in the Canadian navy. The British tar, as everybody knows, has a great history. But I submit, he is not made of any better stuff than the men who hunt the seals on the ice floes of Newfoundland, or who man the fishing vessels and schooners on the coast of the maritime provinces.

The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Aikins), referred to the war of 1812. I do not just recollect the point he made; but it occurred to me, that it would not be out of place to remind hon. gentlemen opposite, who think we have no fighting blood in this country, that in Nova Scotia, in the war of 1812, they fitted out troop ships and sent them along to the United States to help the British warships in the conduct of that campaign. They did not send a contribution, but they did some good work. We sent no contribution, I say, to the Im-

perial treasury, but we sent men who helped the Admiralty in the task they had in hand, and these men brought back a very comfortable little contribution of Yankee money, with which we started Dalhousie College, one of the great institutions of learning in this country. It is of no use for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to tell us about those brave fellows on the coast of the maritime provinces who have the salt sea in their nostrils. If they have to travel three thousand miles to get a look at the dreadnoughts he is going to build.

Great stress has been laid by hon. gentlemen opposite on the statement that they were dong something that could be done quickly. But should we adopt the amendment that is before the House, those dreadnoughts can be built in England, for the amendment does not say they must be built in Canada. They are to be manned by Canadians and owned by the Canadian people. Their first duty will be to protect the coasts of Canada and to assist in the defence of the Empire. That is the proposal made in the amendment. By the amendment the dreadnoughts could be built in a British shipyard, but you will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in addition to the dreadnoughts we have to have a number of other ships to compose these fleet units. We require 6 cruisers, 12 destroyers and 6 submarines. We could keep the Canadian shipyards busy building these cruisers, destroyers and submarines, and we could have the construction of the ships going on on both sides of the ocean at once, carrying on the work with far greater speed than is proposed by the present Administration. If hon. gentlemen opposite want to vote for a policy that will do something quick, and do something that is worth doing, they ought to vote for this amendment.

It is common knowledge that it takes a considerable time to construct a dreadnought. In the discussions in the British House of Commons it was brought out that it takes at least two years to construct one of these large ships in the British shipyards. Some of my hon. friends seem to run away with the idea that everything goes like clockwork in the British shipyards; that there are no delays on the other side of the water, and that when a ship is bargained for, its construction is completed with the greatest degree of promptness. Such is not the case. They have labour troubles in the Old Country to an even greater extent than in Canada. In the discussion in the British House of Commons regarding the delays in the British shipyards, one of the greatest authorities of the Conservative or Unionist party, Mr. Allan Burgoyne, M.P., editor of the 'Naval Review,' and a man who has studied this question for many years, made the following statement.

Similar criticisms can be brought forward in relation to the delay of other four vessels of the class. But in the case of the Australian and New Zealand vessels there is something like a scandal attaching to their play. The armour of a specific type was tendered for by a very well known firm. They were unable, however, to secure a patent for this particular armour, and attempted the manufacture of it for themselves, with the result that the Admiralty were forced to condemn the whole of it, and the ships are now laid up on the Clyde practicly built, with the exception of their armour. The Financial Secretary to the Admiralty might well reply to that. First, I put it at a charge of incompetence and as a lack of care in seeing that the tenders that were accepted were carried into effect by those who put them forward.

That is the condition existing in the shipyards of Great Britain, and therefore it cannot be expected that the work will be done with any greater degree of promptness than in Canada.

We on this side of the House have faith in the ability of the Canadian people. We feel certain that if the Government decided to build these ships in Canada, the Canadian people would be found equal to the task. I have not the slightest doubt that would be the case, and that we could build ships or do anything else in that line as well on this side of the water as on the other. The Prime Minister in his eloquent address the other day referred to the proud position that the people of Canada occupy as citizens of the British Empire. It is quite true Mr. Speaker, that this is the most precious of our possessions. There is no British subject anywhere in our far-flung Empire who does not enjoy the protection of the British flag. There is not a fishing skiff tossed on the white-caps off Cape Race or a settler's hut on the western prairie but is a matter of Imperial concern. We boast of our wonderful heritage in this country, but, if we are true to our traditions we must take steps to see that the flag is kept floating over those regions now under our control. Planting the Canadian flag here and there on the northern headland and marking vast regions on the map with red is only an idle pastime unless we have the courage to maintain that flag and to defend those headlands by land and by sea. For over 150 years we have accepted the protection of the British fleet, and we are now asked not only to protect ourselves, but to assume some share in the burden of protecting the Empire. And what answer does our Government give to that request? An offer of three empty dreadnoughts and at the same time refuses to accept any permanent responsibility in regard to the

defence of the Empire. I assert most positively that this does not express Canadian sentiment. It is not the answer of the Canadian people; it is the answer simply of a group of jingoes and millionaires who for the moment occupy prominent positions in the control of the affairs of this country. If I supposed for a moment that the gift of three dreadnoughts expressed the sentiment of the people of Canada, I would come to the conclusion that a naval battle or something of the kind was necessary to save us from national stagnation. Sir, it were better that our shores should be in danger; better that our blood should be stirred for a time by a hostile invasion, than that we should settle down to be a nation of pedlars and hucksters, without national sentiment, courage or aspirations. If I do not mistake the temper of the Canadian people, I feel sure they are prepared for the adoption of a permanent naval policy, and that they are prepared to assume not only the task of defending their own shores, but of accepting a fair share of the burden of defending the great Empire to which we belong.

I am opposed to the proposal of the Government, for the following, among other reasons:

1. Because there is no emergency to justify it.
2. Because it is the outcome of a political compromise with the Nationalist party of Quebec.
3. Because it abandons the opportunity which should now be embraced to establish and foster a steel ship-building industry in Canada.
4. Because it postpones indefinitely the commencement of a Canadian navy.
5. Because the proposal of the Government is no relief to Great Britain, as it is in addition to the stated programme, and imposes upon the home authorities the expense of manning and maintaining the ships.
6. Because the policy of the Government implies that the people of Canada are a parcel of mean spirited hucksters, who would rather pay money than fight.
7. Because it is the introduction of a system which is subversive of the principle of local self-government.

These, Sir, are the reasons why I am opposed to the policy of the present administration, and why I intend, when this question comes up, to vote for the amendment.

Mr. AMES moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, December 17, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 37, respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Clark (Red Deer).

Bill No. 38, respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Buchanan.

Bill No. 39, respecting the Algoma Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

Bill No. 40, respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 41, respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 42, respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 43 respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 44 respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill No. 45 respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. White (Renfrew).

Bill No. 46 to incorporate the North West Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 47 respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 48 respecting the Ottawa Gas Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 49 respecting the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

THE CHRISTMAS ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That, when this House adjourns on Thursday, the 19th instant, it stands adjourned until Monday, the 13th day of January next.

He said: In reply to the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I said the other day that I was willing to have the adjournment take place to-morrow instead of Thursday, and I move this motion, by permission, with that change. It seems to meet the views of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON: It seems to be agreed that Monday is a very inconvenient day. I suppose we can all travel on Sunday to get here. I wonder that the hon. member for Pictou did not suggest some other day than Monday.

Mr. BENNETT (East Simcoe). A great many of the members from the province of Ontario would be very much inconvenienced by the arrangement proposed. We who do not live on the main line of either the Grand Trunk railway or the Canadian Pacific railway cannot possibly leave home until Monday afternoon. I did not understand what the arrangement was, and thought that the adjournment would be until one of the days in the middle of the week. I would ask that that be considered.

Mr. BORDEN: I am afraid that we are going to put it so far forward toward the spring that very little time will be left for the session. But, if there is a strong feeling on the part of hon. members that Tuesday would be a more convenient day, I would be willing to accede to that, provided there is a guarantee that no hon. gentleman will rise and object to that. I would like it to be final. It is understood that this is final, I beg to change my motion so as to replace 'Monday the 13th' with 'Tuesday the 14th.'

Motion, amended accordingly, agreed to.

THE BANK ACT.

On motion of Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance), House went into Committee (Mr. Bennett, East Simcoe, in the Chair) to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to revise the laws relating to banking, to continue until the first day of July, 1923, the charters of the several banks to which the provisions of the Bank Act apply, and to authorize the payment out of the consolidated revenue fund of remuneration to auditors for special examinations of the affairs or business of banks which the Minister of Finance may require to be made.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance): My apology for interrupting the progress of the debate which has arisen on the special order of the day is the request of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House for a copy of the new Bank Act, which I shall introduce immediately upon the adoption of this resolution.

The resolution itself refers to one of the provisions of the new Act under which an external audit by auditors appointed by the shareholders of the bank at its annual general meeting, is provided for. At present there is no system of inspection of audit of the chartered banks of Canada except the inspection carried on by the various banks themselves, which serves the very useful purpose of informing the directors as to the conduct of the business of the banks at their several branches. Under the present Act, authority is granted to the Minister of Finance to ask for a return or statement from the banks pertaining to anything regarding their affairs in connection with which it may be desired to make an inquiry, but there is no machinery provided whereby he may verify the information obtained, in other words, he must rely solely upon the statements made by the banks. It occurred to me that in the revision of the new Bank Act it would be wise to insert a provision enabling the minister, in the event of his having any reason to suspect the correctness of a return made by a bank, to have that return verified by an independent officer. The officer I have fixed upon for this duty is the auditor appointed by the shareholders, who are the proprietors of the bank. The auditor, of course, occupies an independent position, and I therefore think that such an officer is the proper one to make to the minister any report, under the system of external audit which I propose, upon any matter concerning the affairs of the bank in regard to which any information is desired

Let us take a concrete case, and suppose the monthly return of a bank discloses something that does not appear to be satisfactory to the minister, or requires further explanation He would in the first instance, call upon the bank for such further explanation. He would in the first being unsatisfactory he could call upon the auditor, who is independent of the bank or its officials, and ask him to make a report in the matter. I have considered it desirable that any special services rendered by the auditor should be paid for by the government, so that the auditor would feel a direct responsibility to the government for any report made by him upon the direction of the minister. As that, therefore, would constitute a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue fund of the Dominion, it is necessary for me to proceed, with respect to this comparatively minor revision of the Bank Act, by way of resolution. As I stated, after the Committee approves, if they do approve of this resolution, I shall present a brief statement as to the leading changes which I propose in the new Act.

Mr. GERMAN: Will there be a separate auditor for each and every bank, appointed by the shareholders, so that if the hon. Minister wants a special report from any particular bank, he will obtain it from the auditor appointed by the shareholders of that bank?

Mr. WHITE: My hon. friend has correctly understood me. The provision in the new Act is to the effect that the shareholders of each bank, at its annual general meeting, shall appoint an auditor or auditors.

Mr. GERMAN : They do that now, do they not ?

Mr. WHITE : No; two or three of the banks do, but all of the banks do not. My predecessor, Hon. Mr. Fielding, when presenting his revision of the Bank Act in 1911, made permissible the external audit which I have in view. His Act provided that the shareholders may appoint auditors for the purpose of auditing the books, vouchers, accounts and securities of the bank, and certifying to the shareholders at the annual general meeting that the balance sheet presented for their consideration exhibited a true and correct statement of the affairs of the bank. I have gone a step further, and while I cannot, of course, speak for my predecessor, I am inclined to think that if he were introducing the Bill at this time he would take the same course. I believe the plan outlined follows the English system—a system applied to the great banks of England—and it is the same system, in substance, adopted in the several provinces with regard to the audit of financial and other companies.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Is this inspection imperative or optional under the English Act ?

Mr. WHITE : I think it is imperative; at any rate we are making it imperative in this case. With further reference to the question of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), there will be an auditor or auditors for each of the banks, and the Government, in the event of its desiring an inquiry as to any particular matter relating to the affairs of any bank, may ask the auditor to make a special report to the minister in regard to the matter.

Mr. PARDEE : The auditor appointed by the bank makes the report to the minister ?

Mr. WHITE : The auditor appointed by the shareholders of the bank will make the report to the minister. I thought this was a more desirable plan than that of calling in a special outside auditor or accountant to look into a matter which probably would not require any extensive explanation—which, while on the face of it might appear to be a proper subject for inquiry, yet upon investigation might turn out to be of trifling importance. It is desirable that the auditor appointed by the shareholders, who would be familiar with the affairs of the bank, and who, as I have said, occupies an entirely independent position, should make this special report to the Government.

Mr. CARVELL : Would this auditor have the right to enter into an investigation of the affairs of any particular account or any particular asset, or would it simply be an audit of the bank's books ?

Mr. WHITE : Does my hon. friend mean in so far as the minister may direct him to make inquiry ?

Mr. CARVELL : Yes.

Mr. WHITE: It would not be necessary to look into an account, and I did not have that in mind. But if on return of the bank being made, or if, for example, notice is given to the Government, as it has been in the past, in the case of the failure of banks, that a certain state of facts exists, I think it very advisable and necessary that the minister should be able to refer the matter to the auditor, and ask him for a special report. I do not understand that it would at all relate to or give the minister or the Government information with regard to particular accounts. I think that would be highly undesirable, and that the Government, in these circumstances, would not require such information; nor do I believe that the provisions would go quite as far as that.

Mr. CARVELL: I am afraid that unless the minister goes to that extent it will not amount to very much, because, unfortunately, a number of banks have gone to pieces in the eastern part of Canada within my recollection, and I have found that they have gone to pieces because of the existence of a few accounts that ought not to have existed. Therefore, unless you can go into particular accounts or assets, if you choose to call them so, I do not see what advantage there would be in an audit.

Mr. WHITE: I am afraid we are speaking at cross purposes. What I had in mind was that of course the banks have the accounts of thousands of individuals and commercial houses and I thought probably my friend feared that in the course of the administration of this Act, and especially having regard to the provision now under consideration, that matters relating to ordinary accounts might be asked for. Without question, if any suspicion of fraud were thrown upon accounts it would be open to the Government to ask the auditor to make a special report, for this reason, that the auditor, before he can certify that the balance sheet represents a true and correct statement of the affairs of the bank, would have to check over the accounts and conduct a running audit, and if there was anything in the course of his duties that would suggest that any fraud was being practised on the bank or assets carried in such a way as to constitute a fraud, so far as the statement is concerned, I think unquestionably, apart from the inquiry of the minister, it would be his duty to call the attention of the directors, and if necessary of the shareholders to that. What I

had in mind was in regard to ordinary accounts, about which no question of fraud is involved, that my hon. friend desired to know whether the Government would ask the auditor to investigate any accounts of that kind. I would say that if the question of the bank's solvency or of any impropriety is involved, then it should be done without question, because then his investigation would be absolutely pertinent and in that case the minister would be justified in asking the auditor to make a report in regard to whatever had been brought to his attention.

Mr. EMMERSON: Has the minister considered this feature, that while, nominally, the auditor appointed would be the appointee of the shareholders, yet in reality and practically he would be the appointee of the directors because of the fact that the directors have the controlling interest usually; they control the stock in the election of officers.

Mr. WHITE: That feature has been brought to my attention and I have given it consideration. I do not regard that as at all universally true, and so far as my own observation has gone, the moral effect upon a staff, upon the officers of an institution, of the appointment of outside auditors is very great. I do not doubt its extreme value to all institutions.

I would say that the shareholders of all industrial institutions in Canada, railways and banks, and others, should take a greater interest in the affairs of their several institutions than they do. My own view is that the shareholders of a bank should particularly take an interest in the affairs of their institution, and should at their shareholders' meetings be careful to appoint a proper auditor, because in the case of banks there is not only the value of shares held by the shareholders but there is also the question of the double liability, and I am therefore of the opinion that the shareholders of a bank will be careful to see that a firm of reputable outside external auditors is appointed for the purpose of the audit I have in mind, and, in addition to that, I am inclined to the view that public opinion will be very weighty in bringing about the appointment of firms of high standing in connection with the audits of our chartered banks under the Act which I am about to bring in.

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

Mr. WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 36, respecting Banks and Banking. He said: As I have said, my apology for introducing the Act is the request of members who desire copies of it. The copies will be available this afternoon or at latest tomorrow. As to the Bill itself, the discussion should, of course, properly take place upon the second reading, but with the consent of the House and as concisely as possible I desire to indicate the chief changes which have been made in the existing Act. As the House is aware, under chapter 29 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, the charters of the existing banks would have expired on July 1, 1911. By two Acts of 1911 and 1912 respectively, those charters and the corporate powers of the banks were extended for one year in each case, thus preserving the existence of the banks until July 1 of next year. It is usual in connection with these revisions of the existing Bank Acts to extend the term for ten years and following that practice the present Act extends the charters of the several banks and their corporate powers until July 1, 1923. I shall indicate very briefly some of the leading changes which have been introduced into the new Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Have the changes in the Bill been reprinted in type other than the ordinary type?

Mr. WHITE: The changes in the Bill have been printed in italics, so that, upon perusal, they may be clearly seen. Additional safeguards have been thrown about the organization of banks with a view to the protection of the subscribers between the period of the incorporation of the bank and the issue of the certificate of the Treasury Board. No expenditure may be made by the provisional directors, or by the board of directors, unless of a very trifling and necessary character, until the application is made to the Treasury Board; and the certificate of the Treasury Board may not issue until the Treasury Board is satisfied that all the expenses, in connection with commissions and other expenditures of a similar kind, are reasonable. In the event of the certificate of the Treasury Board not being obtained; in other words, if the bank is not successfully launched, then any of the moneys in the hands of the directors or provisional directors, as the case may be, cannot be paid out of commission or for other heavy expenses, unless with the consent of the subscribers obtained at a meeting specially called for the purpose, or upon the order of the court.

Now, I have explained to the House, and I will refer to it again very briefly, the principle which I have adopted with regard to an external audit. Let me repeat that in this we have followed the provisions of the English law with regard to the audit of the great joint stock banks. I believe that the system has been found very

satisfactory in Great Britain, and I incline to the view that it will provide a very effectual safeguard against occurrences such as we have had unhappily in the recent banking history of Canada. I refer more particularly to the Ontario Bank, to the Sovereign Bank and to the Farmers Bank. I believe that a proper system of external audit, such as we have in view under this Act, would have prevented the failure of those institutions, or would, in the case of one of them, have detected the frauds by which that bank was wrecked. It will not be necessary for me at this stage to say anything more as to that feature.

Then, in connection with the annual statement which is to be presented by directors to the shareholders of banks, I may say that the present form, the form which appears in the present Bank Act, has really been part of our legislation for some sixty years, and has been greatly outgrown, in fact so much outgrown, that many banks have themselves elaborated it in their annual reports to the shareholders. We have still further elaborated it, and provided for giving the shareholders information, in some respects, which the present Act has not provided for. I may make the same remark with regard to the monthly return which is made to the Department of Finance. That has been elaborated, and further particulars are called for, the idea in both cases being, to present to the shareholders and to the Government, respectively, a particularized, detailed statement of the assets and liabilities of the bank, properly grouped, and showing, as fairly as can be, the position of the bank. As I have said, in the case of the annual statement presented to the shareholders, that will have attached the certificate of the auditor or auditors, who will certify that they have examined the books, accounts, vouchers, securities, and cash of the institution in question, and that the balance sheet presented to the shareholders exhibits a correct view of the affairs of the bank at the date at which it is given.

There is another matter which the Bill introduced by my predecessor dealt with. That matter is the question of the penalty attaching to directors, officers, and auditors for false and deceptive statements made either to shareholders or to the Government or, in fact, to any person. Under the existing law it is practically necessary to prove intent. There is no criminal liability for negligence on the part of the officers or directors of a bank. I have given a good deal of thought and attention to that and it appears to me that there should be a provision in the Bank Act whereby a director, or officer, who is guilty of negligence, should be subject to indictment. Under the present state of the law, it has practically to be shown that a director, or a president, no matter how negligent he may have been, had had guilty knowledge before he can be indicted. I think that is the effect of the decision. I have introduced a provision into the new Act whereby, in addition to the penalties imposed by the existing Act for wilful misrepresentation or deception, or falsification, directors and officers and auditors will be liable to indictment and punishment for negligently preparing or making false and deceptive statements.

There is another provision in the new Act to which I desire briefly to call attention. It relates to the circulation of the banks. As the House is aware, under the present Act, the banks of Canada are permitted to issue their notes to the amount of their unimpaired paid-up capital. There is also a provision in the existing Act whereby, during what is called the crop moving period, from the first of September until the end of February, the banks are permitted, upon payment of 5 per cent for the privilege, to issue additional circulation to the amount of 15 per cent of their unimpaired paid up capital in reserve. These powers I am preserving to the banks; but in addition, we propose to give the banks the right to issue note circulation against gold. At the present time the banks may deposit gold with the offices of the Receiver General and receive Dominion notes, five dollar notes, or notes of a larger denomination in exchange for it. The gold is, of course, deposited as security, and as a guarantee for the redemption of the Dominion notes so issued. The banks, therefore, in addition to their authorized circulation, circulate large amounts of Dominion notes secured in the manner I have indicated. During last fall the Dominion issued, I think, over $10,000,000 of the new five dollar notes. The banks obtain those, and circulate them in addition to their own note circulation. The expense of printing those notes, is, of course, on the Dominion, and the expense of holding the gold, which is deposited before those notes are issued, also falls upon the Dominion.

I may say for the information of the House that the Bank of England has an issue department from which its notes are issued against gold. The Bank of Scotland, similarly, in addition to its ordinary powers of note circulation, is permitted to issue notes against gold in its own possession. We desire to give the banks here the power of issuing bank note circulation against gold, and in order to bring that about I have provided in the new Bank Act for the establishment of what we call a central gold reserve. In that central gold reserve may be held such amounts of gold as each of the banks may care to deposit. A bank may deposit, let us say,

$5,000,000 of gold, and it may issue notes against $1,000,000, $2,000,000, $3,000,000, $4,000,000, or $5,000,000. It may issue notes against the whole of the gold reserve, but it must not issue its notes in excess of the amount of gold held for it in the central gold reserve. If at any time the amount of gold held for it in the central gold reserve exceeds the amount of its note circulation issued in respect of that gold, then the surplus in the central gold reserve would belong to the bank and may be returned in its report to the Government. That gold reserve is to be held by four trustees. They are to be appointed, three of them by the Canadian Bankers' Association, and one by the Government. I have inserted a provision that the amount of gold so held in the central gold reserve is to be reported on at least twice a year by the officers of the Finance Department; in other words, there is a provision for the inspection of the central gold reserve on the part of the Government.

The custody of that gold and the conditions under which it is to be held, are to be determined upon in accordance with the by-laws of the Canadian Bankers' Association, which by-laws have to be approved by the Treasury Board. The result will be that in some central place—Montreal, I would imagine, would be a proper place—the banks will be able to deposit gold, and, up to the amount of the respective deposits of each, notes may be issued in excess of the circulation authorized by the existing Act. I should point out to the House that there is no profit to the banks in the issue of their notes against gold deposited as there is in the case of the issue of notes against their own credit, because the gold could be used, not so conveniently, of course, but could be used instead of the notes, or, in the alternative, the banks could deposit the gold, get Dominion notes and issue circulation in that way.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Will this fund have any special designation?

Mr. WHITE: No, there is no provision for any special designation. The same check will be applied to the note circulation of a bank when the gold reserve is established as obtains to-day; that is to say reports must be made not only to the Government, but to the Canadian Bankers' Association, and there will be the same check precisely upon the note circulation of the banks as exists to-day. The Act has been enlarged only to the extent I have indicated, namely, up to the amount of gold held in the central gold reserve for the banks. This matter has been given very careful and weighty consideration on behalf of the Government.

I believe that, as a result, in time, Canada will be known as one of the great gold countries in the world, and that this reserve of gold will be built up to the great advantage of Canadian credit and prestige. The policy is one which is adopted in European countries. As I have indicated the Bank of England has its issue department and its notes are issued against gold. In the same way, to a limited extent, the Bank of Scotland, issues notes, and, in the same way, upon the continent, notes of the banks are issued against gold or gold reserves, the result being that many of these countries have accumulated very large reserves of gold which are immediately available for the redemption of note circulation by the banks which have issued it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Will the Government make any charge for the issue against gold?

Mr. WHITE: No, the Government will make no charge for this issue against gold. The Government very properly makes a charge for the additional note circulation which the banks at the present time are privileged to make during the crop moving season because they issue as against their credit, but, if gold is deposited, it is perfectly obvious that the bank makes no money upon that note circulation; in fact the banks would be money in pocket if they deposited the gold and used Dominion notes because in that case the Dominion has to bear the expense of engraving, whereas, under a provision of the new Act, the banks, in so far as they avail themselves of the privilege of issuing notes against gold, will be obliged to bear the cost of engraving these notes.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is quite clear, but I thought there might be some costs incurred in the keeping of the gold and in the administration which would mean some little expense to the Government.

Mr. WHITE: I did not understand that that was the question, but I may say here that the entire cost of the administration of the central reserve is to be borne by the banks. I have under consideration and will probably introduce a Bill later whereby the banks, continuing to use as they do the office of the the Receiver General for the purpose of depositing gold for the issue of the large legals whereby they make their clearances from day to day, will be obliged to pay a reasonable amount for the service thus rendered by the Government. For the information of the House it may not be out of place to state that we hold now a very large amount of gold—I think $70,000,000 or $80,000,000—in the office of the Receiver General for which large legals are issued. The banks use those large legals for the pur-

pose of making their clearances from day to day amongst themselves. But, in addition to that, there is no doubt that the custom has grown up by which the banks make use of the office of Receiver General for the purpose of conveniently storing their gold. The point I am making is that if the banks continue this practice, it is only reasonable that they should contribute a certain amount, which may be regarded as fair, to the Government for the service which it renders them in the storing of gold.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): How much of an increased circulation will this give the banks if they avail themselves of the privilege up to the full extent of the gold deposited in the central reserve?

Mr. WHITE: It is impossible to state that for this reason: The Bank Act does not make it compulsory upon the banks to carry any specified amount of gold as part of their assets. The result is that some of them carry more, we will say, proportionately, than others, and the amount fluctuates and varies from time to time, from day to day. This Bill will enable the banks as I have stated, to deposit, let us say, $5,000,000, and to practically allow it to remain there. That is what I hope will be the result of the Bill. Up to that amount the banks may issue their notes in accordance with their requirements, but not exceeding that amount. As to the extent to which the provisions of the Bill in this regard will be availed of, I am unable to state. I believe that most of the banks will deposit gold, and issue notes against it. I am inclined to think at the outset that the bank note circulation may not be greatly enlarged, but I believe that over a course of time it will be very considerably enlarged, and that the banks will be enabled in this way to more adequately meet the circulation requirements of the country.

Mr. NESBITT : Might I ask what check the department would have over the issue of the notes and the return of them ?

Mr. WHITE : The same check that exists at present. Statements must be made by the officers of the bank under the existing Act as to the amount of circulation outstanding. A similar report is made, I believe, to the Canadian Banking Association, which has the duty of supervising the note issue.

Mr. NESBITT : But you have no supervision ? You have to take their statement ?

Mr. WHITE : That is true, but, so far as I know there has been no abuse of the note issuing powers of the banks; and with the Canadian Banking Association having the matter under its supervision, with the present provisions in the Bank Act and the penalties therein provided for false statements, and the experience of the past; I think no question is likely to arise as to over-issues. The point I am making is this, that under the new Act, the same evidence will be obtained as at present, as to the note issues of the banks from time to time.

Mr. NESBITT : I am sorry I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman made his explanation. Might I ask if it is the intention of the hon. minister to send the Bill to the Banking and Commerce Committee after it has passed the various stages ?

Mr. WHITE : It is the intention that this Bill should go to the Banking and Commerce Committee. I understand how important a piece of legislation this is, and how complex a matter our banking system is; and I do not pretend for one moment to say that this is the last word in legislation in regard to banking. I wish to assure hon. members on both sides of the House that any suggestion of a practical character will be welcomed by me for the consideration of the committee. While the Government, of course, takes full responsibility for the Bill as brought down, still, any suggestion that will improve it, any additional safeguard about the operations of the banks, or any suggestions to improve the machinery which we have provided for carrying out its intentions, will be welcomed and carefully considered.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Will the hon. minister explain whether or not the Government now issues legal tender in excess of the gold reserve, and what power the Government has in that respect?

Mr. WHITE: Under the Dominion Notes Act, it is provided that the Dominion Government may issue $30,000,000 in notes, of which $22,500,000 is not secured by gold. $22,500,000 of the entire Dominion note circulation at the present time is therefore not secured by gold. As to the remaining $7,500,000 of the $30,000,000 which I mentioned, and as to all further issues of Dominion notes, the Dominion has deposited in the vaults of the Receiver General throughout the country gold to a corresponding amount. In other words, for every note now issued, gold is deposited. The Dominion is therefore practically upon a gold basis, for this reason, the Dominion ones and twos are the small change, so to speak, so far as the note circulation of the people of Canada is concerned, and it is perfectly apparent that notes of the denomination of $1.00 and $2.00 to the extent of from twenty to twenty-five million dollars are out in such general use, that

they are not likely to be presented for redemption under any circumstances. If my hon. friend will refresh his memory by reading the history of the banks in England up to the Peel Act of 1844, by which the issue of the Bank of England were provided for, he will see the theory on which they proceeded was, what amount of notes are so outstanding that they are not likely to come in under any conditions, and, having established that, they then proceeded to enact that as to future issues gold should be deposited to a like amount. With regard to the Dominion of Canada, it may be said that we are on a gold basis for the reason that about $25,000,000 is out among the people, and would not, under any circumstances that we can conceive of, be presented for redemption.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Is the whole issue of $5.00 bills secured by gold?

Mr. WHITE: Oh, yes. In fact, all issues of recent periods have been against gold. In the early days, of course, the revenues were not as buoyant as at present, and the 40 per cent provision, that is in the present Bank Act, was really there for the purpose of holding out this circulation which was not secured by gold. In other words the Government inserted that provision in order that the banks might be obliged to hold Dominion notes, so that they would not come in for redemption. That condition has long passed, and we have been on a gold basis for a long time.

Mr. EMMERSON: I do not wish to ask as to the locus where the gold is deposited, where it is received by these trustees, but I should like to ask if any portion of it finds its way back in to the banks on deposit for the trustees who hold it in trust?

Mr. WHITE: The custody of the gold and the conditions under which it is held, as I have said, will be under the supervision of the Canadian Banking Association. That is a matter of detail. I may assure my hon. friend that that gold reserve has to be held in vaults absolutely under the control of the four trustees, one of whom is to be appointed by the Government. Of course, if a bank had not issued notes up to its gold reserve, it would be able to go to the four trustees and say that it wanted to take out the surplus gold.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I presume, of course, that this Bill will go to the Banking and Commerce Committee. I wish, however, to ask my hon. friend if the Bill contains the same provisions which were in the old Bank Act, that the bank shall not lend money upon the security of its stock to any shareholder?

Mr. WHITE: I am not aware of any change of that kind having been introduced. I think I can say, no, positively to my friend.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I should like to call my hon. friend's attention to this. While that is the case, that banks shall not lend money upon the security of its stock, there is another section which seems to be inconsistent with that, and which I think is very objectionable. It provides that if a shareholder of the bank transfers his stock, the bank may refuse to register the transfer unless and until all liability of the shareholder to the bank is wiped out. I think that is entirely inconsistent with the provision that the bank shall not lend money on its own stock, for the bank can make such a loan in an indirect way. If that section be not struck out, there ought to be a provision that, on the face of the certificate of the shareholder, the section shall be clearly set out, so that any person buying the stock may know the nature of what he is buying.

Mr. WHITE: I would suggest that the hon. gentleman give me a memorandum of his suggestion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. WHITE: When the Bill is in Committee—and I suppose it will be in the Committee for some weeks—we shall be able to consider the question raised by my hon. friend.

Mr. MURPHY: The hon. minister indicated one respect in which his Bill differed from the Bill introduced by Mr. Fielding in the session of 1911. Would it be convenient for him now, or later, to indicate in what respect his Bill differs from that of Mr. Fielding? Or is that indicated, by italics, in the Bill?

Mr. WHITE: I would not say that the portion in italics is the only portion of the Bill that differs from the existing Acts. Most of the matters to which I have been adverting were not dealt with, I think, by my predecessor on the day he introduced his Bill. I have explained that he made external audit permissible, and we have made it compulsory. The provision for a central gold reserve was not contained in his Bill. The penalty clauses to which I have adverted were substantially provided for in his Bill.

I come now to one other feature. We have given to the farmers of the West the privilege of borrowing under the Bank Act upon grain in his own possession. Or, to put it in another way, we have permitted the banks to loan to farmers on the security of threshed grain in their possession.

Mr. EMMERSON: How about the farmers in the East?

Mr. WHITE: The legislation is general.

Mr. EMMERSON: The hon. minister, in speaking, limited it to the farmers of the West.

Mr. WHITE: I mentioned the farmers of the West because it was having regard to the situation in the West that it was thought desirable that the law in this respect should be changed. The matter was given very careful consideration, because it does raise very important questions as to the lien of the bank, the rights of creditors and other matters that have been discussed in this House before, particularly, I think, in 1890. However, having regard to the desirability of encouraging the farmer of the West to provide storage facilities; having regard to the transportation problem, we thought that the advantages of the legislation would more than counterbalance its disadvantages. That is a matter also that will be more fully discussed in the Committee.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Is it confined to grain, or does it apply also to live stock?

Mr. WHITE: We have also given the rancher the privilege of borrowing upon his cattle.

Mr. WHITE: The lien is a banker's.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Does the Bill provide that the lien upon the grain in the possession of the farmer shall be registered or filed as a bill of sale, so that the public may have some notice of it?

Mr. WHITE: The lien is a banker's lien, which requires no registration under the Bank Act. I know, of course, what the hon. member has in mind.

Mr. EMMERSON: The hon. minister is merely extending the privilege?

Mr. WHITE: We are extending the privilege. Hitherto, under the existing Act, the privilege of hypothecating property in the possession of individuals has been practically confined to wholesalers. While one may borrow upon warehouse receipts, or on personal property in the possession of a third party who may give a receipt, in the past the privilege of using the liens provided for in the Act has been confined practically to the wholesalers. In the West, banks to-day take security of this kind upon cattle. But, by reason of a decision in the courts of Alberta some doubt has been thrown upon their right to do so, and the provision that the rancher may borrow upon his cattle—the rancher being in a sense a wholesaler—has been inserted for the purpose of removing all doubts as to that point and making it clear that the rancher may borrow upon his cattle. As to the advisability of the extension of the bankers lien to other personal property owned by farmers or others, that raises very many weighty considerations indeed; and I am sure the House will agree that the whole subject is one that requires very careful consideration. And, so far as I am concerned, as I have said, I shall welcome any criticism or suggestion with regard not only to this but to other provisions of the Bill when it is under review by the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Mr. NESBITT: Will the Bill be printed before the Christmas adjournment?

Mr. WHITE: I arranged with the law clerk that copies should be ready—he said this afternoon, or at latest to-morrow. So the Bill will be available for hon. members.

One other matter—and I hope I may be allowed to conclude. There is a feature of this question to which the attention of the House has been directed by discussion and otherwise—the question of so-called bank mergers. That is not a very happy expression. For while it is in one sense a merger, the Act really provides for the purchase and sale of the assets of a bank. When one bank purchases the assets of another bank that is popularly called a 'merger.' There has been a good deal of discussion with regard to the propriety of so-called bank mergers. Without going into the question as to whether bank mergers are desirable or not, I would merely indicate my own opinion that no hard and fast rule can be laid down. Under certain circumstances, the purchase of one bank by another may be not only desirable for the banks concerned, but may strengthen the whole financial situation. On the other hand, cases can easily be suggested in which a grave question would arise as to whether, in the public interest, banks should be allowed to merge—or, to put it technically, one bank be allowed to purchase the entire assets of another. I think instances will readily occur to hon. members in which it might be most undesirable that two large and powerful banks, say doing business in competition throughout the country, should be permitted to come together, unless for very good and very weighty reasons. Under the present Act, when a bank desires to purchase the assets of another bank, a certain course is followed. An agreement is made between the boards of directors of the respective institutions. That agreement is not known to the public until the meetings of shareholders of the respective banks are called for the ratification of the agreement. If these meetings of share-

holders sanction and ratify the agreement entered into by the respective boards, in due course, application is made to the Treasury Board, and upon its sanction being given the so-called merger or purchase is complete, valid and effective. In the present state of the law, when that application is finally made to the Treasury Board, the agreement has been made public, the matter has been discussed at the meetings of shareholders, the inspector of each bank has thoroughly gone over the affairs of the other bank; and, except in very exceptional cases a very serious question would arise as to the propriety of refusing the sanction of the Treasury Board to a purchase which has gone so far. I have introduced a feature into this Act, which I shall ask the Committee to consider, which provides that, before an agreement may be entered into, the consent of the minister must first be obtained that an agreement may be made. That, I think, will at an early stage enable the Government, in a clear case, to prevent the amalgamation of two banks, if in the opinion of the Government such amalgamation would be against the public interest.

Mr. CARVELL: At what stage would that consent take place?

Mr. WHITE: Before the agreement is brought before the shareholders—before it becomes public.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Through the Treasury Board, or through the minister?

Mr. WHITE: The minister; but if it is thought that would cast too much responsibility upon the minister, there would be no objection to substituting the Government or the Treasury Board. That is a matter of detail.

Mr. EMMERSON: Are all transactions of the Treasury Board concurred in and approved of, formally at least, by the Governor in Council?

Mr. WHITE: Not every transaction, for the reason that the Treasury Board has a statutory existence, and is charged with certain duties and certain acts quite apart from the Governor in Council.

Mr. EMMERSON: Does not the Treasury Board report to the Governor in Council?

Mr. WHITE: The Treasury Board is constituted a committee of the Governor in Council. Its report goes to the Governor in Council, and is approved of or referred back, as the case may be. But by statute there are a number of matters dealt with by the Treasury Board. I should say, in regard to bank amalgamation, that this is one of the matters which goes from the Treasury Board to the Governor in Council.

Mr. TURRIFF: Has the hon. minister considered the advisability of compelling banks, when the desire to amalgamate or form such a merger as he has described, to come to Parliament for authority to do so, just as they have to come to Parliament to get a charter? This matter of bank amalgamation has assumed a very serious aspect, and, if it continues for any length of time as it has existed in the last two or three years, the whole of the financial interests of the country will be in the hands of as many men as can be counted on the fingers of one hand. It seems to me, instead of applying to the Treasury Board, or even to the Minister of Finance, who is a member of the Treasury Board, that if two or three banks wish to amalgamate they should be compelled to come before Parliament and secure its authority, just as they have to obtain the authority of Parliament before they can go into business.

Mr. WHITE: While I have not given special consideration to the matter, I should say off-hand that that is not feasible, for the reason that Parliament is not in continuous session. Parliament may last for five or six months, or for a longer or shorter period. My hon. friend will, no doubt, bear in mind that we are acting under the principle of responsible government and that it might not be advisable to compel the banks to come to Parliament for its sanction in matters such as this. I think the Act may very well be left as it is in that regard. My hon. friend will realize that circumstances might arise in which a delay of six months would be very inexpedient, and against the public interest. On the whole, I think in the amendment to the Act which I propose, the interests of the public in regard to the matter under discussion will be reasonably safeguarded. As I have said, the discussion of the Bill will naturally be upon its second reading, and I must apologize for occupying the time of the House for such a length of time; though I submit that for this I am not altogether responsible.

Mr. ROSS: In regard to the protection of the interests of depositors, the hon. minister must know that the depositors in the Farmers' Bank will lose nearly a million dollars, and, if I am informed correctly, some six hundred depositors have been absolutely impoverished. I think one of the most important amendments that could be made, considering the privileges enjoyed by banks in this country, is that depositors should be adequately protected, and I think

it would not be difficult to frame an amendment embodying such a provision. I would like to ask the hon. minister if he proposes to introduce any such amendment?

Mr. WHITE: I do not believe any legislative provision could be made which would absolutely secure the interests of depositors. I believe that on the whole, the Canadian Banking system is one of very high character, and constitutes a strong financial situation. But in the last analysis we must never forget that the security of depositors rests more upon the integrity and ability of the directors and officers of the bank than upon anything else. I do not believe we shall ever emancipate ourselves from that condition. The interests of the bank are entrusted to the president, the directors, the general manager and other officers, and I believe, speaking with regard to Canadian banks, that no more capable body of men exists anywhere than is found in connection with the banking institutions of Canada. I have a very high opinion also of their integrity, but with regard to the particular case referred to by my hon. friend, I believe the provisions we have introduced for external auditing would have prevented the disaster in connection with the Farmer's Bank, because the auditors would have seen that improper entries were made, that accounts were falsified, and that fraud was practised. I have great confidence in the moral effect of such supervision by capable auditors upon the staff of the bank, and, in all probability, none of the frauds that wrecked that institution would have been attempted under a proper system of external audit. There is no doubt whatever that the officials of an institution whose work from day to day is checked up by capable accountants would feel it incumbent upon them that those accounts should be correct, in the event of contemplating any fraud, should fear its speedy detection. Answering my hon. friend more fully, the provisions of the audit and the penalty clauses which are provided in the new Act go as far as it is possible to go in legislating to prevent such occurrences as he has referred to.

Mr. ROSS: Could the minister not introduce some clause whereby protection could be given to depositors in much the same respect as in connection with the bank note circulation fund? Why not exact from them a certain percentage of their deposits, place that percentage with the Government and make all the banks responsible for any failure that would occur to any one bank. The banks enjoy such privileges that this would not be a very great hardship to them even if you allowed interest on the deposit at the rate of 3 per cent which the banks themselves pay, and then you would not have to depend on the honesty of any man or set of men but they would have absolute security for the depositors, who are not investors.

Mr. WHITE: I do not think the suggestion feasible. My hon. friend suggests the securing of deposits in the same manner as bank note circulation is secured. So long as the notes are issued against anything but gold the circulation must be the first charge against the assets of the bank. I do not think that any member would seriously put forward the view that the note circulation of the bank should not be a first charge upon its assets.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: That is not the point at all. The point is that at present the notes are the first charge upon the revenue of the bank, the deposits are the second; but there is a provision in the last revision of the Bank Act, making a fund out of which the notes are to be retired. The suggestion is, could not a similar fund be made for the depositor.

Mr. WHITE: That provision which is in the Act to-day by which all the banks contribute is continued in the present revision that is in reference to note circulation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The suggestion of the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) is whether or not a similar fund could not be established for the protection of the depositors.

Mr. WHITE: Off-hand I should say it would not be feasible for this reason, if for no other, the enormous amount of the deposits in the chartered banks of Canada. Not only that, but I understand my hon. friend to suggest that say three per cent should be allowed upon such a fund, and that the fund should be administered by the Government. If the proposal were at all feasible I should say that a very large amount would have to be deposited in that way and that would, of course, cut down the earnings of the banks, and affect the rates of discount in respect of their total deposits, and it raises many considerations which I think we could hardly discuss to-day, but which, of course, might be discussed fully in the Committee. Personally I do not believe that the suggestion that has been made is feasible, but I do not say it is not worthy of consideration.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I would have been obliged if the minister had given a little more information as to the scope of his proposed independent audit. I understood him to say that he would follow the English

practice. Like other members I have received many pamphlets, &c., containing suggestions as to what particular kind of audit should be provided for in the Bank Act.

Mr. WHITE: I thought I had gone fairly far in a general way.

Mr. GUTHRIE: What is the English system in regard to joint stock banks?

Mr. WHITE: The appointment of auditors by the shareholders.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not by the Government?

Mr. WHITE: Oh, no, not by the Government. The English system regards the shareholders as the real proprietors of the bank and of course they are and they appoint at their annual general meeting auditors for the purpose of checking the accounts, vouchers and securities of the bank or institution in question and certifying to the shareholders that the annual statement presented by the directors is a correct statement of the affairs of the bank or company.

Mr. OLIVER: Is there provision in the proposed Act for discovering the disposition that is made by the banks of their assets?

Mr. WHITE: In the ordinary course of conducting business the banks from day to day make disposition of their assets. That would be checked, of course, by the auditors, to whom I have referred.

Mr. OLIVER: It is commonly stated that there are banks which hold property which cost those banks many million dollars, but which is charged in their accounts at comparatively trifling amounts. Is there any provision for discovering that and giving such information to the public?

Mr. WHITE: I should say that there is no specific provision for that, but if the attention of the auditors were directed to anything that, prima facie, appeared improper, of course, he would call it to the attention of the directors. I am not aware of these particular matters to which my hon. friend refers unless he means that banking premises are sometimes carried at a comparatively small amount on the books of the bank. I think that in some glaring cases a few years ago a change has been made so that the statement now made more nearly represents the actual state of affairs, but I would ask my hon. friend to bear in mind that a very expensive bank building may be useful only for the purposes of banking and that, therefore, a very nice question arises as to its value. Of course there is no doubt that reasonable valuations might be placed upon these buildings. I do not see how the discretion of the board of directors could very well be interfered with except in extreme cases.

Mr. GUTHRIE.

Mr. OLIVER: I wish to know if there is any provision in the Bill and if it is the policy of the Government to procure information on the point I have mentioned and to place that information before the people of Canada?

Mr. WHITE: The Bill has certain provisions which I have explained as to the occasions which the minister or the Government would consider it necessary to make inquiries. It would be impossible to answer a specific, almost a hypothetical question because I have not in mind at present any such matter as my hon. friend has alluded to.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The hon. member for Edmonton has raised——

Mr. CURRIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It has invariably been the custom of this House not to permit any discussion on the first reading of a Bill. We have been departing from that custom during the present session, and I would ask your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER: This is not a motion for the first reading of the Bill, but for leave to introduce the Bill, which permits the minister presenting it to give a clear and succinct explanation. Of course, it is not the usual custom to enter into a discussion.

Mr. PUGSLEY: To-day an exceptional course has been taken. The House unanimously consented to the Minister of Finance taking this Bill out of its regular order with the view of giving to the House and to the country information as to its contents. My hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has raised a question of a great deal of importance to the people of the the country and to the shareholders of banks, that is, as to investments which banks are to be allowed to make in real estate. As my hon. friend no doubt knows, in the present Bank Act there is a provision that a bank shall not invest in real estate except in so far as may be necessary for the purposes of its banking business. But we all know that banks have gone far beyond that, and that they have erected large and expensive buildings in various cities in Canada, which are brought into competition with those of real estate owners.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Under the Bank Act they are prevented from doing so.

Mr. CURRIE: Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is not the commanding officer of this House.

Mr. CURRIE: The hon. member is making a speech. He can only ask questions; he cannot make a speech.

Mr. PUGSLEY : It is a very brief speech that I am making, and it will not take up much of the time of the House. I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance whether, in view of the fact that the intention of Parliament evidently was in passing the Bank Act that banks should not invest their money in real estate beyond such buildings as are necessary for the carrying on of their banking business, and whether with the knowledge of the fact that they have gone far beyond that, and have invested vast sums of money in buildings which they rent for ordinary business purposes, he will give attention to the matter with the view of making some clear provision in the Bill which will limit the investment of money by a bank in real estate for the purposes of their business only. Some of the banks, such as the Bank of Montreal in the city of Montreal, have erected splendid buildings which, I understand, are used entirely for banking purposes, and many other banks have done the same. In St. John, N.B., there are very fine bank buildings of the New Brunswick Bank, used entirely for the purposes of its business; but other banks have adopted the practice of investing large sums in buildings which are used for purposes entirely apart from the requirements of their banking business. May I ask my hon. friend the Minister of Finance if he has given attention to this phase of the question ?

Mr. WHITE : This matter, and any other matter in which my hon. friend from Edmonton or any other hon. member may be interested, should, I think, be considered, and will, so far as I am concerned, be considered and discussed in the Committee, which would seem to be the proper place in which to discuss it. Let me say further—because I do not believe that my hon. friend is aware of the circumstances under which I was permitted to-day to introduce this measure out of its order—that it was due to the request of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, so that the Bill might be presented for their consideration and perusal during the recess. My desire was to present it as concisely as possible, and not to enter upon any prolonged discussion. I do not question that the course pursued has been proper up to date, but, unless there is a very good reason for doing otherwise, I would ask that the matter to which my hon. friend has referred, and other matters of a cognate character in connection with the Bill be dealt with, either on the second reading, or in the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LOCATION OF SOUTH AFRICAN SCRIP.

On the Orders of the Day being called:

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Roche), who I am sorry is not in his place, but who, no doubt will be notified of my question by the Prime Minister, to the fact that on Friday last I asked if he had reached a decision in regard to an extension of the time for the location of South African scrip. The hon. minister said he had not yet reached a decision. I then pressed him to reach a decision as soon as possible. It is very important, in the interests of those who hold scrip at the present time, that they should know before the end of this month what the intention of the Government is, and I would ask very respectfully that an answer be given to the House to-morrow.

Mr. BORDEN: I will direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the matter. I have no personal knowledge of the situation.

DRY DOCK AND SHIPYARD PLANS.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I would like to ask the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has laid upon the table, or if he is prepared to lay upon the table of the House, the information which I asked for, namely, a plan of the layout of the proposed shipbuilding yard in connection with, and adjoining the dry dock at the port of St. John, N.B.; also a plan of the layout of the shipbuilding plant in connection with the dry dock at Sydney, in the province of Nova Scotia; likewise the plan in connection with the dry dock at Montreal and also at Esquimalt in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is disinctly out of order. It seems to me that these questions are of a character which should properly be answered after notice has been given.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Surely, before the Orders of the Day are called, I have a right to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether he has done what he very kindly said he would do. It is very important that we should have those papers before continuing the discussion of the naval question.

Mr. HAZEN: My hon. friend's request was conveyed to me only yesterday afternoon. I have the plan that my hon. friend asked for with regard to Courtenay bay, which I shall lay on the table to-morrow. I have asked my officers in the department for the other information, and if it is ready,

will lay it also on the table of the House to-morrow.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is entirely satisfactory.

DUTY ON WHEAT AND OATS.

Mr. ROBB: I would like to draw the attention of the acting Minister of Customs to 'Hansard,' of December 4, and to the fact that questions 5 and 6 of that date were not answered. The questions related to the duty on wheat and the duty on oats.

Mr. WHITE: My hon. friend is correct. The questions referred to were not answered, but it was entirely by an inadvertance, and I now beg leave to lay upon the table the answers to several questions, including the two which were overlooked.

Mr. ROBB:

1. How many bushels of wheat and of what grade were imported from United States to Canada, during twelve months ending October 31, 1912, and the number in each grade?
2. What was the value of wheat imported from United States to Canada during twelve months ending October 31, 1912?
3. How much duty was collected on wheat imported from the United States during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?
4. What quantity of such wheat was re-exported, either as wheat or flour?
5. Was any portion of duty refunded on account of grain, flour or mill feed exported during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912? If so, how much?
6. Has any application been made for a refund of duty on account of wheat, flour or mill feed exported during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?

Mr. WHITE:

1. The quantity of wheat imported from United States to Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, amounted to 4,927,473 bushels. Imports of wheat are not classified by grades in Customs statistics.
2. $4,922,628.
3. Duty collected on wheat imported for consumption from United States was $23,-691.60.
4. Quantity and value of foreign wheat exported from Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, amounted to 6,564,360 bushels, valued at $6,602,437.
5. No.
6. No.

Mr. ROBB:

1. How many bushels, and what grade of oats were imported from the United States to Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, and the number of bushels of each grade?
2. What was the value of oats imported from the United States to Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?
3. How much duty was collected on oats imported from the United States during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912?
4. What quantity of such oats were re-exported either as oats, meal, oatmeal, rolled oats or feed?
5. Was any portion of duty refunded on account of grain or meal exported during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912? If so, how much?
6. Has any application been made for a refund of duty on account of grain, flour or meal, exported during the twelve months ending October 31,1912?

Mr. WHITE:

1. The quantity of oats imported from the United States into Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, amounted to 1,742,786 bushels. Imports of oats are not classified by grades in Customs statistics.
2. $771,671.
3. Duty collected on oats imported for consumption from the United States was $12,633.20.
4. The quantity and value of foreign oats exported from Canada during the twelve months ending October 31, 1912, amounted to 2,256,037 bushels, value, $1,076,442.
5. No.
6. No.

SALMON RIVER INDIAN SCHOOL.

Mr. KYTE: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the answer which was given yesterday to a question of mine relating to the hours prescribed for the opening and closing of the Indian school on the reserve at Salmon river, in the county of Richmond. My question was 'What is the hour for opening, and the hour for closing?' The question was answered in regard to the hour for opening, but there was no statement with regard to the hour at which the school closed. Perhaps the hon. minister will observe my remarks in 'Hansard,' and bring down his reply later on.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of and concurrence in the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine): Mr. Speaker, for several days I have listened carefully to the speeches made by hon. members on both sides of the House in connection with this naval question. I am reminded of an experience which I had some years ago when,

one day, standing on a hill that overlooked a small winding valley, I saw two railway trains approaching one another. One was coming from the north and the other from the south. Apparently, there was to be a collision, but when I was just expecting this to occur, I saw that the two trains passed each other and went on their way and I realized, what I had not noticed before, that there was a double track. Now, to a very considerable extent in this debate, the two proposals are not necessarily contradictory and for those of us who are considering this matter more from a national than a political point of view, the principal question is: what is the first duty that we as Canadians owe to ourselves?

I think it is necessary that we should clearly distinguish between special action and permanent policy. There is a great deal of confusion at present in the public mind, confusion which our hon. friends opposite have done their best to create and done their least to clear up. The speech of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, when introducing his Naval Bill, dealt, as you well know, mainly with the question of special action. The memorandum of the Admiralty, which we all have before us, contains, in the last paragraph, the question that was put by the representatives of Canada to the highest naval authorities of the Empire. The question was: In what form would any immediate aid that Canada might give be most effective? And the answer was this:

It is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

In this instance, when our representatives went across to consult with the Admiralty, they did not take it upon themselves in advance to tell them that Canadians' generosity would be exceedingly limited. It was in consequence of the answer which was given to the question put to the Admiralty that the Bill now before the House was brought down. The Bill is for the purpose of immediately increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire for the common defence of the Empire. You there have the purpose and you there have the method.

Now, the Opposition attitude in connection with this debate is two-fold: it is an attitude of attack and it is an attempt to produce an alternative policy. In the attitude of attack they endeavour to deny that there is any need for special, immediate action. I think that those of us on this side of the House who have carefully read the despatch of the Secretary of State for the Colonies with his instructions to the Governor General transmitting the memorandum prepared by the Board of Admiralty, or the general naval situation and communicated to the Government of Canada by His Majesty's Government on November, 1912, are quite convinced, and are quite willing to submit the question to any impartial body of people throughout the Dominion of Canada, that necessity for prompt and special action has been, by that memorandum, disclosed. But, there is more than this memorandum. We know perfectly well that our representatives who were present in London in July last had laid before them certain confidential information as to the exact condition of affairs throughout the Empire and the relationships of Great Britain with other countries, information that they cannot disclose to this House, but which, nevertheless, had an effect in convincing them that special action for the common defence of the Empire was requisite and necessary. While they cannot disclose this information, its existence cannot be denied, and the responsible ministers of His Majesty's Government in Canada are prepared to tell us that it is of such a grave character that it must be, by them and by this Parliament, immediately acted upon.

There has been an attempt on the part of the Opposition to reduce this debate to a comparison of permanent policies. It is nothing of the kind. Hon. gentlemen opposite are overlooking entirely the fact that the permanent policy of the Government has not yet been disclosed. It is as if the owners of a building were sitting down and asking one another how they might make that building fireproof while smoke issuing from the very windows told them that it was time to ring the fire alarm.

Although the Prime Minister has not disclosed a permanent policy he has, nevertheless, indicated that it is his intention in due course so to do and he has also laid down some of the lines that will probably be followed. The Prime Minister is aware that there are grave difficulties in the way of a permanent policy. He realizes that steps must be taken to remove those difficulties. He knows that certain preliminary arrangements must be made, certain barriers removed, certain constitutional relationships defined before a permanent policy can be put in force in this Dominion which will stand for future generations to build upon. We made one false start in connection with this navy question. We do not want to make another, it is not dignified, it does not tend to make Canada stand higher either in her own self-respect nor in the respect of the nations of the world and we do not care to make such a blunder a second time.

There are certain prerequisite conditions that must be met and satisfied before a permanent policy can be put into force. They

are of three kinds—physical, constitutional, and what I may, for the want of a better term, call honourable. Since they have been foreshadowed by the Prime Minister, these conditions may, I think, be discussed with propriety in this House.

What are the physical prerequisites that are necessary to a permanent Canadian naval policy? I think that the desire for a Canadian navy, built in Canadian shipyards and manned by Canadian seamen, is a patriotic and worthy desire that many people throughout Canada share, but it will be many years before we shall see that desire realized. We are sometimes told of the Japanese navy. The Japanese have been building warships for thirty years. When I was in Japan sixteen years ago I was not permitted to go into the shipyard at Kure, so jealous were they of what they were doing and yet, for the last two battleships built by the Japanese, the Satsuma and the Kurama, sixty-one per cent and fifty-eight per cent respectively of the materials used in their construction had to be imported from other countries. You talk of the Australian proposal to build ships; the Australian dreadnought was built in England, is manned by Englishmen and is patrolling the waters of the North sea. As to the torpedo boats they are assembled in Australia, while as to the cruiser that they are beginning to build, the work is dragging along to the dissatisfaction of all concerned. It takes many years to establish the physical prerequisites necessary for the construction of a navy. Now, the proposition of the Prime Minister points the way. He makes what I think to be the most reasonable possible proposal towards this end. He says, we shall endeavour to interest and we have assurances that we can interest the great experienced ship-building firms of the old country to establish branch shipyards in Canada; they will bring over their engineers; they will bring over their skilled workmen; they will construct their plants; and in order that the venture may be a business venture, they will receive orders from the Admiralty; we will undertake as well to see that if they construct in Canada, a share of the additional expense will be borne by us. That it seems to me is beginning at the beginning, building from the ground up, building with a permanent basis, building with something definite in view. Further, by the proposition of the Prime Minister, training of officers will take place on those three dreadnoughts built by Canada's money. Why should there not be Canadian officers trained there? Any one knows that a man, in order to be an officer on one of those great fighting machines, has to go through many years of careful training. The sooner we commence to train men for that purpose the better. Take for example Japan. What has made it possible for Japan to have an educational system? She sent her bright young men to the schools of England, the United States and Canada, and they were taught to be teachers; they came back and set up an educational system in Japan to teach the citizens of the East in regard to the service of the West. If we are to train officers, it is not a matter of seamanship, it is a matter of mechanical operation, we too must train men for the higher places that they in due course may come back to Canada and train men who shall occupy places on those ships. Last of all, be it remembered that provision has been made that these dreadnoughts in due time may be brought back to Canadian waters should it be the wish of the Canadian people that they should form part of a Canadian unit of the British navy. Therefore, it seems to me that the wisest, most careful preparation is being made to provide the physical prerequisites that may be necessary to some day construct, to equip, to man, and to maintain ships that will be built in Canada.

The constitutional prerequisites are perhaps more important than those of a physical nature. In my opinion, the most significant part of the speech of the Prime Minister was that in which he intimated that the British Government were prepared to receive and that we in Canada were prepared to send a member of the Cabinet of the day to sit as a permanent minister in the Council of Imperial Defence. The fact that we are to have regular, continuous, permanent representation in the councils of peace and war, is to my mind the most important declaration the minister gave to this House. Defence is of two kinds, land defence and naval defence. We of Canada can at all times and will at all times probably have complete control of our land defence; but the moment a ship flying Canadian colours is upon the water, that ship becomes and must become part of the fighting force of the British Empire, because the enemy that ship may have to encounter may be in the most distant waters of the globe. Naval warfare therefore cannot be local; defence of all is defence of each, and it must move in unison; such defence involves joint control; such control can only be based upon common knowledge, where the utmost frankness occurs between all concerned. Hence a necessary prerequisite to any permanent naval policy must be to find an acceptable basis for consultation.

The attitude of the present leader of the Opposition necessitates the same consideration. If you establish a fleet unit on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, you do not get away from dealing in a straight-

forward manner with this question of joint control. The Pacific unit to be of any value whatever, must be regarded as merely a part of the navy that flies the British flag in the Pacific ocean. It must be possible to assemble at one point if necessary, under one control, all the contributions of Australia, of New Zealand, the fleet in the China sea and the fleet in the East Indies. It must be possible to unite them, to direct them against a common enemy, and if necessary to scatter them again. To anchor a fleet unit on the Pacific coast may be as absolutely useless as if they were grounded on the rocks of Yarmouth. So, the leader of the Opposition does not get away from this question; he must meet this constitutional question even with his navy proposals, because he must decide how the fleet units of the Atlantic and the Pacific shall be subject to joint control which shall be the control of the fleet of the Empire.

Now, this permanent policy necessarily foreshadows a change in constitutional relationships. It is no new problem. It has been looming above the horizon for many years. It has been viewed by different public men in different ways. The leader of the Opposition has seen it; he has tried to evade it; he has tried to procrastinate in the consideration of it. The member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) the former Minister of Public Works, has seen it, and being a constitutional lawyer of repute has known what it meant and has cried out against the beginnings of it, because he felt it would end where he did not wish it to end; but the Prime Minister of to-day, who also sees it with equal clearness, sees it, accepts the responsibility of it, and glories in it as a working out of Canada's manifest destiny.

The other day we were treated to a eulogium of autonomy by the member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). He went back to 1763 and traced the history of Canada. Perhaps, following his illustrious example, I may be permitted to do something along the same line. Let me remind members of this House that this very day is the one hundred and twentieth birthday of the establishment of representative government in the old province of Quebec. One hundred and twenty years ago to-day, the first legislature assembled in the ancient city of Quebec to take the first step towards Canada's self-government. Canada's history of the last century has been a steady progress and a gradual development. In the early part of the century, our forefathers were anxious and active to gain for us the full degree of self-government. In the latter part of the century they have been especially busy in developing our natural resources. In both, they have been eminently successful. Autonomy, which was the slogan of the last century, has done its work, accomplished its purpose, and belongs to the last century. It does not belong to the Canada of to-day. For confirmation, let me make a few comparisons. The early governors of Canada thought it was their duty to impose upon Canadian citizens the British point of view. The later governors of Canada have felt it was their high office to point out to the citizens of the British Isles what was the Canadian point of view. You have only to compare Lord Durham and his understanding of his instructions, with Earl Grey and how he carried out his work here in Canada. Prior to the Union, the public lands were the property of the Crown, and were regulated from Downing Street; but since that time they have come into our hands, and the last Land Act has been disallowed that will ever be disallowed in Canada, for to-day every foot of soil from the 42nd parallel to the North Pole is under the undisputed control of the Canadian Parliament. Prior to 1843, the Judiciary was nominated by the representative of the British Crown in Canada, without necessary consultation with his responsible advisers. But, during the last portion of this century, judges have been named by the Governor in Council solely; and we have the Chief Justice, the highest judicial functionary in Canada enjoying the honour of also being a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the highest judicial body in the British Empire. In the early part of the century, prior to 1843, our tariff and customs laws were made for us by Downing Street. But, since the last ineffectual protest on the part of the Sheffield manufacturers in 1859, that Canadian tariffs were interfering with the free access of British goods into Canada, we have heard not one murmur to that effect. Between 1840 and 1850, Canada was garrisoned by British troops; and we have been told in this House that the amount of money spent by Britain upon the garrison exceeded the total revenue of Upper and Lower Canada for their own local purposes. But, by 1871, we had seen the last of the British regiments withdrawn; and when we took over Halifax and Esquimalt and assumed the defences of these two fortifications upon the Atlantic and the Pacific respectively, we felt that the whole question of land defence was under the control of the Dominion of Canada. Prior to 1868, when Great Britain made treaties, she included us and the other colonies, whether we liked it or not. Then came the day when we were permitted to assent or dissent, where treaties were made. The next step came when we were permitted to participate in the negotiation of treaties. And the final step came when our representatives, as fully endowed plenipotentiaries, were enabled to make

trade treaties with the nations of the world as they saw fit.

While governors would not act upon the advice of their responsible advisers, while our lands, and tariffs and garrisons were regulated in Downing street; while our judiciary were appointed by men not responsible to the people although they had to be paid from local taxes;—while these things lasted, there was room and need to invoke the spirit for which the word 'autonomy' stands, and for pressing to the full our demand for local self-government. And all honour to those who, in those days, suffered that we might secure self-government, and who worked as pioneers to develop the resources of this great country. All honour to them! But the time has come when to push on still further along the line of autonomy means to push towards absolute independence of the British Empire; it means to set Canada up as a sovereign state; it means to step forward towards excessive individualism and separation. No, no. Autonomy was a good word for the last century. But it has done its work, a noble work of which all are proud. But the word of the twentieth century is 'co-partnership.'

The spirit of the Canadian constitution is full of this idea, the idea of a unit within a unit. We have the municipality making its own by-laws, collecting its own taxes, looking after its own local affairs, absolutely autonomous within its own sphere of action, although it lies within the province. Again, we have the province completely supreme in the matters which are relegated to its control, although it lies within the Dominion. And I say the day is coming when the Dominion will hold the same relation to the Empire that the province holds to the Dominion. Prior to 1865, there was great misgiving on the part of many leading French-Canadians as to whether it would be desirable that a federal union of the provinces should take place. Read the pre-Confederation debates, and you will see that many serious men felt that from the French-Canadian point of view such a step would be a mistake. But what have we? Have the French-Canadians of the province of Quebec lost one iota of the rights and privileges that they previously enjoyed? Not at all. The very reverse is true. They have entered into a larger and fuller life; they exert their influence throughout the whole Dominion from the Atlantic to the Pacific; they are an element of stability and permanence throughout all Canada. And every other province of Canada, re-acting upon the French-Canadians and pouring their life blood into our province, have regenerated, revivified, awakened the old province of Quebec. And the benefit has been decidedly mutual. And what has happened there we may expect to happen when Canada assumes fuller relationships with the other parts of the British Empire. We are not losing anything that we have or hold dear; we are gaining, we are getting more than we had. They who lose their lives shall save them, is a proposition true in this case.

Now, Mr. Speaker, permit me to point out to you the evidence on which I base my assertion that this idea of co-partnership is growing, extending, sweeping along with a flow that cannot be stayed. Within the memory of men sitting in this House to-day, the colonies of Great Britain were looked upon by responsible British statesmen as of very doubtful advantage. It was thought that, as ripe fruit, they would in time drop from the parent tree. It was a question as to whether it was worth while to keep them all. Now, mark the change of recent years. Queen Victoria, of blessed memory, was crowned Queen of Great Britain and Ireland; she subsequently was also called Empress of India. Under that title she lived, under that title she died. And when Edward VII was crowned her successor, he too, assumed that title. But, shortly after his accession, Lord Salisbury, after communicating with the self-governing dominions, proposed the Titles Act of 1902. That Act altered the title of the King. And those of us who were privileged, eighteen months ago, to be present in the Abbey, when our Sovereign was crowned, heard the Archbishop of Canterbury say, 'King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions beyond the seas; Defender of the Faith, and Emperor of India.'

Then, too, mark the development in the Colonial conference. In 1887, at the time of the Queen's Jubilee, it was merely an informal gathering of delegates. They took it for granted that it was Great Britain's duty to look after the defence of the Empire and other similar matters. They discussed merely matters of mutual trade. By 1897, this Imperial conference had reached the dignity of being called together by the Colonial Secretary and of being participated in by the prime ministers of the several self-governing colonies. At that time, the request for periodic and stated contributions was made. And it was rightly refused. We did not then, and we do not now, advocate stated and periodic contributions. By 1897, the constitution of the Imperial conference had crystallized in definite form. It sloughed off the word 'Colonial' and took on the word 'Imperial.' Instead of being called together merely from time to time, it was decided to call it together every four years and to hold subsidiary conferences when required. Where previously called together by the

Colonial Secretary, it becomes a conference presided over by the British Prime Minister. And its constitution declares that this conference

—to be called the Imperial conference is held every four years, at which questions of common interest may be discussed and considered as between His Majesty's Government and His Governments of the self-governing dominions beyond the seas.

Let us now take up the third indication of the tendency of the times, as evidenced in the Committee of Imperial Defence. Originally the Committee of Imperial Defence was a committee of the Cabinet. It absorbed the old Colonial Defence Committee, which became a sub-committee thereof. True, it is but an advisory body, but inasmuch as the leading ministers of the British Cabinet are members, and inasmuch as leading naval and military experts are called in, it is a very influential body, and occupies a very important position. The results arrived at are put into effect by the members of the ministry who form so large a part of the committee. Sir Frederick Borden was the first Canadian to attend a meeting of the Committee of Imperial Defence, in 1903. He was invited as a guest, for the consideration of only one question, and that a Canadian question, namely, the taking over of the defence of Halifax and Esquimalt. In 1909, if I am rightly informed, Sir Frederick Borden and Mr. Brodeur were present, again on invitation, and again dealing with Canadian questions. Let me now read what Mr. Asquith said in the British House of Commons on the 25th of July last in reference to the position the Committee of Imperial Defence had at that time attained:

Last year (1911) we had the pleasure of summoning to the committee—and they sat with us at the deliberations three days—the prime ministers of our self-governing dominions. I was in the chair myself, and I was the sixth prime minister; for there were five other prime ministers sitting around the table. I do not think there has ever been in the history of our Imperial development a more momentous, or, in many ways, a more significant occasion. Of course it is almost impossible to go into any detail in public as to what was done and said upon that occasion. We were all acting, naturally and properly, under the seal of confidence. There is no reason, however, why I should not indicate to the committee and the country generally an outline of our proceedings on that occasion. First of all we had a statement from my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs on the general course and direction of our British foreign policy. He spoke with the greatest frankness and freedom in the presence of these prime ministers of the various dominions of our relations with other powers, and disclosed to them with a candour, intimacy, and fullness, which would have been impossible in official or written communications, exactly what our relations were with each of the various European and other powers, and how far those relations affect, and must affect, our naval and military situation.

Imagine, if you can, the nature of the conference of last July, at which three Canadian representatives were present. But to continue:

This statement was followed by one equally full and frank, made by the then First Lord of the Admiralty, in regard to the naval policy, and finally a statement from the Secretary for War in regard to the military policy.

Leaving out a few words, I go on:

This year (1912) we had the privilege of having with us, not indeed the representatives of all the dominions, but a considerable representation from the Canadian Cabinet, including its distinguished Prime Minister, Mr. Borden. They have, at my invitation, attended a meeting of the Imperial Defence Committee more than a week ago, and again my right hon. friend the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs spoke to them and to us all on our foreign policy, and the First Lord of the Admiralty on our naval situation; and I am glad to say that a further adjourned meeting, which we propose to have next week, Mr. Borden and his colleagues will again attend, and I hope we may arrive at conclusions satisfactory to them and to us. I do not think it is possible to exaggerate, in the necessarily loose and informal development of our constitutional arrangements as an Imperial power, the value of a body like this, which, from time to time gives the statesmen of the dominions and the statesmen of the mother country a meeting ground on which they can exchange with the fullest confidence their respective views, experiences and knowledge in regard to those matters which we growingly feel affect not only the Mother Country, but the dominions as much as ourselves.

We have corroborative expressions from Mr. Balfour also, along similar lines, which I have not at this moment time to read.

The Prime Minister has stated in this House that hereafter a member of the Cabinet over which he presides will be present for the greater part of the year at the meetings of the Imperial Defence Committee—not as a guest, but of right; not occasionally, but regularly; not called in only for the discussion of special Canadian subjects, but with every detail of the policy of the Empire in its relations with foreign nations open on the table before him. Could there be any more complete expression of the sentiment of co-partnership than that found in the proposed arrangement? Can we estimate its influence in Canada and in the motherland? The representative from Canada and those from the other self-gov-

erning dominions who sit from day to day in the Committee of Imperial Defence, will exercise, there is no doubt, a pacific influence. Canada, and the rest of the self-governing dominions do not wish to engage in any war of conquest; their whole influence will be towards the preservation of peace. Perhaps the time may come when England will find it possible to withdraw from some of those entangling European alliances which to-day threaten her peace because she has to be true to her allies. Is it not also possible that the representatives from the Overseas Dominions may be the means of preserving a permanent and continuous policy when governments in England change, and British representatives on this committee come and go? There is another consideration we should not forget, and it is this: that the member who belongs to the Committee of Imperial Defence as representing Canada will be the connecting link between the Government of the Empire and our own Canadian Government.

These three examples, I think, show conclusively that the tendency of the twentieth century is a tendency towards co-partnership. The sweep of the tide is too strong to be thrust back. One might as well try to check the waters of Niagara midway in their fall and push them back over the brink from which they have fallen as to endeavour to prevent Canada from proceeding along the course of her manifest destiny.

The third prerequisite is a peculiar one. It is a barrier of honour. There are some who do not consider that the pledges of politicians are expected to be carried out, but that is not the policy on this side of the House. One of the pre-election pledges of the Prime Minister was that before Canada entered upon her permanent naval policy the people of the country should have an opportunity to express their opinion upon it. The people, therefore, must be consulted, and this is the barrier of honour that stands in the way of putting this policy into immediate effect.

Such consultation in the present instance is unnecessary. The proposed contribution is for a specific and distinct purpose. It is to provide immediate and effective aid. When we have given it, when the amount has been paid as it will out of our super-abundant revenues, without adding a dollar to our debt, without any permanent interest charge, when it has been paid, our status will be exactly what it was before, it will not have been altered one whit. It is a free gift. We owe it to our self-respect, if to nothing else, to make it. There are no conditions, there are no obligations and our constitutional relationships will be exactly the same after that amount is paid. Consequently there is no necessity to consult the people on that phase of the question. If, however, as a natural consequence of this token of spirit on our part and of ability to do something that counts within the Empire, we are to become co-partners in defence, then there is a changed relationship, then the promise holds, then the people of Canada must have the proposition submitted to them and be permitted to pronounce themselves thereon. Only the other day our friends opposite pretended to welcome an opportunity to lay their propositions before the people. They will get their opportunity, they will have their opportunity when the permanent policy of this Government is placed in contrast with the permanent policy of my hon. friends opposite.

The Conservative policy as it is to-day before this House falls naturally into two parts, immediate and permanent policy. The gift that we make renders the heart of the Empire secure beyond peradventure. As to the permanent policy, that will be developed later. But the Prime Minister realizing that he is choosing not for to-day or for to-morrow, but for generations yet unborn is preparing to lay his foundations strong and deep. He realizes that certain obstacles must be removed, that certain prerequisite conditions must be arranged, that the question of our status within the Empire must be settled before that permanent policy comes into effect; and because he realizes the difficulties in the way and does not rush in, as fools do, where angels dare not tread, because he realizes the seriousness of the question he is taking the time necessary for the preparation of a policy which will outlive any of us in this House.

What is it, after all that binds together the Empire? Is it origin, race, language, religion? No, we differ on all these points. It is not that, it is the recognition that the British system of government is the best, the freest and the highest development of government that the world has ever seen. It is the determination that as far as we are concerned we want to see that system continued and maintained, because we believe our best development will go on under it. It is because we believe there are other races under the flag more backward than ours, struggling towards the light, who need this system of government, to come into the full stature of manhood as we have done. The Empire can only be preserved and maintained by supremacy on the sea. Supremacy on the sea demands common action. Common action is based on complete interchange of knowledge and that involves co-operation. Hence I consider the proposition submitted here that we are henceforth to have a member of this Cabinet as a permanent member on the Committee on

Defence, the most important feature of the whole speech of the Prime Minister.

Frankly, freely, courageously, let us face the trend of events as they are and realize what they are. It is a great thing to be a Canadian. You are proud of it and so am I; but there is an even greater thing than being a Canadian, and that is to be a participating citizen of the British Empire.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): Mr. Speaker, I apprehend it will be generally conceded among most people, at any rate outside the walls of this Chamber, that it makes but little difference in regard to at least a large number of matters coming before this Parliament, which political party may happen to be in power. We often hear the expression in the country: Oh, there is no difference between you; it is only the ins and the outs; and I admit that I have in many instances some of that feeling myself. We are all Canadian citizens, all striving as best we can to work out the best destinies of this great Dominion and usually, as regards most of the business that comes before Parliament, so far as policy is concerned, there is very little difference between the political parties. But questions do arise and have arisen which are of prime importance and which mark a distinct line of cleavage between the political parties which stand like monuments planted along the pathway of Canada's political advancement showing clearly the bottom principles which divide the Liberal and Conservative parties in this country and which have divided them for one hundred years past. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Ames) has given me an opportunity of perhaps referring to somewhat ancient history as he did himself, and I am delighted that he gave me that opportunity.

Without desiring to draw this question more strongly into the political arena than is absolutely necessary, I feel it necessary, as shortly as possible, to refer to some past matters which were mentioned by my hon. friend. There is one thing which I assert with confidence, backed up by the knowledge of every one who has read the speeches of public men in the past and the acts of various parliaments and legislatures: that is that since Canada has been Canada the Liberal party in Canada have stood for reforms which have made the bottom rock of our Canadian freedom. They stood for the extension of the franchise; for the decentralization of power and full local autonomy with absolute self-control over all local affairs; for the absolute control of the raising and spending of public moneys; and for the imposing of a tariff commensurate only with the needs of government. To each of those matters the Conservatives were in Opposition, except in one notable instance to which I will refer later on.

My hon. friend spoke of responsible government the building up of which in this country has been one of the great features of our history. But, Sir, it is to the Liberal party and to Liberal statesmen that we owe those liberties. Prior to 1838 we were governed by an executive council and a legislative council, appointed for life by the Crown through the Lieutenant Governors, and those gentlemen according to Bourinot in his Parliamentary Government, had exclusive control over the revenues, expenditures and taxation of the country. That became an intolerable state of affairs. The Liberals of that time fought against those principles, and in 1838, so far as Upper Canada at any rate was concerned, they succeeded in destroying the condition of affairs that existed then, and from that time until the present hour we have had responsible government in Canada.

The next great question was representation by population and extension of the franchise. The Liberals found that they were not being properly represented even in the legislative assemblies of those days, and they made a struggle to right matters; and they succeeded in righting matters against the strong opposition of the Conservatives of those days led by the then John A. Macdonald. That brought about Confederation, and, Sir, even in the confederation of this great country we found the Tory element of centralization trying to thrust itself to the front. My hon. friend (Mr. Ames) stated that a legislative union would have been intolerable, and every one knows now that it would have been intolerable; a confederation based on legislative union could not have lasted till now, could not have lasted even for twenty years, and yet it was a legislative union that Sir John A. Macdonald and the Conservative party struggled for. George Brown and his associates determined to have a federal union giving to each of the various provinces of this Dominion exclusive autonomy and control of its own local affairs. These were the principles which actuated the Liberals and Conservatives of those days.

The next question of very considerable importance in Canada was what was known as the National Policy. That was a question of taxation. The Liberals always stood for a revenue commensurate with the needs of government. Alexander Mackenzie was Prime Minister of this country and the head of a Liberal Government, and every one knows that the manufacturers of Upper Canada at that time went to Mackenzie before they saw Sir John A. Macdonald, and suggested to him that he should put a protective tariff on imported manufactured goods. Had he consented to do so, the chances are that he would not have been

driven out of power in 1878. But unyielding Liberal as he was, true to the principles which had actuated him throughout his life, he would not impose a tariff for the purposes of protection. He refused the request of the manufacturers; they went to Sir John A. Macdonald; he appealed to the country, and on that appeal he was sustained. That, Sir, in a modified form—because it was very considerably modified when the Liberals came into power in 1896, —has been the policy of the successive governments in this country since, and possibly in that modified form it may remain the policy of Governments for many years to come. It is true that the hon. leader of the present Government talked for some years about adequate protection, but so far we have not been able to discover what he meant by that term. Year after year he was closely examined by the then Minister of Customs, the hon. Mr. Paterson, but notwithstanding the most severe cross-examination, we never discovered what he meant by adequate protection, and we have not been able to discover its meaning yet, though he has been in power for the last two years.

Now we have got the present proposition, and I say that in this proposition the distinctive feature which has divided the Liberals from the Conservatives for the last 100 years, is in existence. Cover it up how they may, the cloven hoof of the old family compact still shows up in this resolution. What is the proposition? To give $35,000,000 for the building of three dreadnoughts for the British Admiralty. The great Napoleon once said, 'If you scratch a Russian, you will find a Tartar.' Well, Sir, I think that if you scratch a Liberal-Conservative of to-day you will find a Tory of a hundred years ago, and the same political principle, the same desire as far as to get control of the government out of the hands of the people and to centre it in the hands of what we might call an oligarchy.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

RICHELIEU AND ONTARIO NAVIGATION COMPANY.

Mr. LESPERANCE moved second reading of Bill No. 20, respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.

Some hon. MEMBERS : Explain.

Mr. LESPERANCE : This Bill is for the purpose of increasing the capital stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.

Mr. GERMAN.

Mr. GRAHAM : What is the increase ?

Mr. LESPERANCE : Five million dollars, from $10,000,000 to $15,000,000.

Mr. CARVELL : Mr. Speaker, this Bill has been called a number of times during the last two or three weeks, and we have asked to have it stand for explanation by the hon. member who is promoting it. The hon. gentleman is here to-night and I think he is not treating the House with the courtesy to which it is entitled in practically failing or refusing to give it any explanation. I do not know that this House objects to any company increasing its capital stock to that amount so long as it is a proper increase and the money is being provided for a proper purpose. I do not say that it is not the intention of this company to expend the money for a proper purpose. I find that the present capital stock of this company is $10,000,000, and that it is proposed by this Bill that it shall be increased fifty per cent, or to $15,000,000. That is all right if the money is going to be used in connection with the legitimate enterprise of the company. But, what I cannot understand and what I think this House should have some explanation upon is clause 2 of the Bill, which provides that:

> The company may invest and deal with the moneys of the company not immediately required in such manner and upon such terms and conditions as may seem expedient.

The evident intention—there is not only an intention but there is practically the statement in the Bill itself—is that all the money which will be received from this increase of stock is not to be used for the benefit of the undertaking itself. It says that the money not immediately required may be used as may seem expedient. If my hon. friend were coming here and asking for an increase in bonding powers I could then understand that it might be necessary to grant those powers with respect to a lump sum. It might be necessary to issue and sell bonds at one time because they could be sold to better advantage, and if anything remained which was not immediately required for the purpose of the company, the balance might be carried over and used in some other way so that the company might not be under the necessity of carrying idle capital. But, this is not a proposition to increase the bonding powers; this is a proposition to increase the capital stock of the company, and the company does not have to sell all the capital stock. It only has to sell the amount of stock which is necessary to carry on the undertaking. It seems to me that we must come to the irresistible conclusion that it is the intention of this company, or of the promoters of this legislation, to use a portion at least of this $5,000,000 for some purpose

other than the legitimate business of the company. It is on that ground that I was objecting to it, it is on that ground that many hon. gentlemen object to it, and it is on that ground that we ask for an explanation from the promoter, or some other gentleman, as to the real intention of those who are behind this legislation.

Mr. LANCASTER: Mr. Speaker, I agree to a great extent with my hon. friend who has just taken his seat, but it occurs to me that we are rather wasting time. If this Bill has to go to one of the select committees I think that would be the proper place to put into operation whatever may be necessary with regard to protecting the people in view of what has been said by the hon. gentleman. I do not think that, on the second reading of a private Bill, we are in the habit of undertaking to, so to speak, lick it into shape, but I rather think that we usually do that in the select committee. This Bill will go to one of the select committees and that will be the proper place to scrutinize the Bill and to take any precautions that may be found necessary, having regard to what my hon. friend has just said; and it has to come up here afterwards before the third reading anyway.

Mr. GRAHAM: I do not pretend to object to this Bill. I think that probably it is a very proper Bill but when there is any question at all about it there should be a fuller explanation than that which the hon. gentleman who has charge of the Bill has given us. The hon. member perhaps has not studied the Bill or he may not be in a position at the present moment to give us a full explanation. If not, I think he should allow it to stand so that we may get an explanation on another occasion because it is desirable that hon. gentlemen who are not members of the committee to which it will be referred may have an opportunity of understanding what its provisions are.

Mr. LANCASTER: It has to come back to this House from the committee to which it is referred.

Mr. LESPERANCE: The increase in the capital stock is to provide for new equipment, boats, and terminals. It will be used progressively as the necessities of the company may require. As to clause 2, the charter of the company at the present time does not allow it to use its spare funds, and as the company has no traffic to care for in the winter time, its spare funds would then lie idle and it is not desirable that it should be under the necessity of losing interest on this money. As the clause will go before the Railway Committee it can be put in such shape as will satisfy my hon. friend. I can assure my hon. friend that the only intention of this provision is that the company shall not lose interest on the spare funds that it may have on its hands.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

INDEPENDENT ORDER OF FORESTERS.

Mr. MACDONELL moved the second reading of Bill No. 30, to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Supreme Court of the Independent Order of Foresters and to change its name to the Independent Order of Foresters.

Mr. GRAHAM: Explain.

Mr. MACDONELL: This Bill is very simple. Its primary object is to change the name of this well-known organization and to consolidate and amend the Acts under which it is incorporated and the amending Acts. I see its original incorporation took place by Act of this House in 1889. Since then it has had various amendments, and this Bill is designed to consolidate, revise, and amend the laws governing this organization; to provide for certain by-laws for its future government; and also to make provision for various other matters, such as the holding of real estate, the relationship between the supreme court and subordinate lodges, the liability of the branches, the investment powers of the supreme court and of the subordinate branches, and various other matters. The Bill further provides that the company shall come under the Insurance Act, and be under the jurisdiction of the Superintendent of Insurance and the Insurance Department. A schedule is attached providing for certain by-laws and other regulations for the future government of the organization.

Mr. GRAHAM: Anything about the rates?

Mr. MACDONELL: No, there is nothing in particular about the rates, except as regards the means of ascertaining the rates. The by-laws and regulations cover them.

Mr. GRAHAM: I have no objection to the Bill; but I think that with organizations of this kind, we ought to be very careful as regards legislation. Most of us have had experience with fraternal societies, and our difficulty has always been to have the membership at the annual meetings agree as to a rate sufficient to meet the liabilities as they occur. In any legislation or any amendment that is proposed, I think we ought to keep in view the fact that we should not loosen the reins at all; but we should, if anything, draw them a little tighter, so that there may be no chance in the future of any of these organizations failing, owing to unwilling-

ness of members to pay the amounts requisite to keep all the certificates in good standing. I just throw out this hint, as I have had some experience as regards fraternal societies. I would urge upon the committee when this Bill comes to be considered, to watch closely that nothing is contained in any of the amendments that will in any way loosen the restrictions providing that sufficient funds shall be on hand to protect the widows and orphans, when they come to need that protection.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN (Welland): Mr. Speaker, when you left the Chair at six o'clock, I was making the suggestion that the present proposition of the Government embodies a principle, which has marked a distinct line of cleavage between the Liberal party and the Conservative party for very many years past, and that it is the absolute right of Canada to control its own financial affairs, to have full control over all the money which is raised from the people of Canada, no matter to what purpose that money may be devoted. This Bill encroaches upon that principle. The right hon. the leader of the Government says in answer to that: Oh, but the Bill says that the money shall be spent under the direction of the Governor in Council, in the construction and equipment of battleships. I know that the Bill says that; but it also says that the battleships, which are built with Canadian money, are to be handed over to the British Admiralty, and to be absolutely under the control of the British Admiralty. I doubt very much that even the wording of the Bill will solve the problem as against the proposition which I have suggested. I saw in the Citizen today a very significant statement made by the leader of the Conservative party in the British House of Commons, Mr. Bonar Law. What does he say? The article shows that the very instant a man begins to go downwards in a wrong path, he finds plenty of people ready to push him along. The leader of the Conservative party in England is beginning at once to push Mr. Borden along the path of centralization of power, and the control of our funds by another power outside of ourselves. It seems to me that what he says is pregnant with meaning. Speaking of this very proposition, he says:

> If the whole Empire is ever to become in reality as well as in name, a united empire and a united nation, it can do so in one way only, by the establishment of a real federal system by the United Kingdom and our colonies, in proportion to their population contributing to the defence of the Empire, and sharing in the glory of governing the Empire.

If that means anything, it means a principle of continual contribution by Canada to the British Government. That is the principle which is evolved at once in the English Tory mind, by reason of the proposition which is put up by the Tory Government in Canada, that we shall from now on make periodical appropriations towards the maintenance of the British navy. We Liberals in Canada do not take a second place with the Tories in Canada or Britain in our loyalty to the Empire. Many of us are descended from men who gave up their homes in the United States, and came to Canada to maintain their British citizenship; and we do not have to make excuses in Canada for our loyalty or for any statements we make in regard to the business affairs of Canada. We stand as Imperialists for one people, one flag and one Empire, but within that Empire, and beneath the folds of that flag, we will work out our own destiny as a Canadian nation, as best suits our own interests and our own advantage. Hon. gentlemen opposite say: Give money to England—thirty-five millions of dollars. In the name of all that is sensible, why? England has not asked for it. England does not want it; she certainly does not need it. Then why should we give it? There has been no reason given by any hon. member who has spoken on this subject from the Government benches. There is a complete absence of argument in favour of the proposition. The hon. member for St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), who so eloquently addressed the House, but very shortly, this afternoon, produced no argument—absolutely no argument in favour of it. And there has been no argument put forward—nothing that could be dignified by the name of argument—in support of the proposal. It is simply, and solely, and only sentimental—nothing else but pure sentiment. Sentiment is a very good thing. But we do not want all sentiment. It is the same old story which Tories have put up from time immemorial—'The old flag and an appropriation.' But they do say—and perhaps I was a little hasty in declaring that there was no argument—it was said by the hon. member from St. Antoine: See what you are going to get. Give thirty million dollars to Great Britain to build three dreadnoughts, and you will have a Minister of the Crown from Canada on the Defence Committee of Great Britain. That is the only reason that is given. And that is the bargain the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) is trying to make. They always want a bargain. They wanted a bargain on the question of preference for Great Britain when it was introduced by the late

Government. They said: It is all right to give a preference to Great Britain, but you must not give them a preference unless they do something for you. And now they say to Great Britain: We will give you the money to build three dreadnoughts, but, if we do this, you must give us the right to have a Tory Minister of the Crown sitting on the Defence Committee. Let us see what Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, said about that only yesterday:

London, Dec. 17.—In the House of Commons last night Keir Hardie asked the Premier why the House of Commons was being committed to a policy which had been communicated to the head of the Canadian Government and of which this House was ignorant.

Rt. Hon. Mr. Asquith replied that His Majesty's Government was not committed to any policy.

Mr. Hardie asked if the three Canadian battleships would entail an addition to the naval estimates for their manning and maintenance, and whether one of the conditions of the loan of the ships was that Canada should have a seat on the Committee on Imperial Defence.

The Prime Minister said he deprecated any discussion of these matters until the debates of the Dominion Parliament had been concluded. He might repeat, however, that the offer of representation on the Committee of Imperial Defence was made to the dominions last year by His Majesty's Government before any question had arisen as to the present proposals.

Where, then, is there consideration for this grant of thirty-five million dollars? The only argument they have put forward is: We shall have a minister on the Imperial Defence Committee. And last year, the Prime Minister of England offered to the then Prime Minister of Canada a seat on that Imperial Defence Committee without any proposition of dreadnoughts or any contribution. One would suppose that we should hear no more of that suggestion of a consideration for giving this thirty-five million dollars to Great Britain.

But, Sir, the Prime Minister tells us that the situation is exceedingly grave and requires that immediate financial aid be given. Who believes it? I do not think he believes it himself. Is there a man living to-day who believes that there will be a war between Germany and England? Here are two nations which, for hundreds of years, have not only practised, but disseminated the religion which teaches peace on earth and good-will towards men. What has become of our boasted civilization? Where are the beneficial effects of that religion? Sir, if these two great nations, in this twentieth century, are to fly at each other's throats and to let loose the dogs of war, one would be inclined to say that their Christianity is a farce and their civilization a failure. I do not believe it. No man believes it. English statesmen do not believe it, and the leading English statesmen so declare. On July 10 last, Sir Edward Grey, speaking in the House of Commons, said:

Our relations with the German Government at the present moment are excellent. We are perfectly frank with each other about all questions of mutual interest, and I believe that when questions come up, whether they be for instance, in connection with our respective interests in South Africa, or whether they be in connection eventually with the Baghdad railway, both governments are convinced that their mutual interests can be perfectly reconciled.

And about the same time—in the same month, certainly,—Mr. Asquith, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, speaking in the House of Commons, said:

Our relations with the great German Empire are, I am glad to say, at this moment—and I feel sure are likely to remain—relations of amity and goodwill. My noble friend, Lord Haldane, the present Lord Chancellor, paid a visit to Berlin early in the year. He entered upon conversations and an interchange of views there which have been continued since in a spirit of perfect frankness and friendship, both on one side or the other, and in which I am glad to say we now have the advantage of participation of a very distinguished diplomatist in the person of the German Ambassador.

And Mr. Bonar Law said:

But in spite of all that has been said, does the country—do the House of Commons, do any of us, really believe that there is danger and vital danger? I confess that I have the greatest difficulty in believing it myself.

What more need be said of the matter? From remarks made by some hon. gentlemen opposite, one would believe that Great Britain was on her knees—that the poor old lady was drooping to decay, that her financial condition was deplorable, that she must have some assistance from Canada. The hon. member for St. Antoine, this afternoon, said: 'The gift we give makes the Empire perfectly secure.' No question about it—not a doubt about it! Thirty-five millions is to secure the Empire from all peril! What are the facts? Great Britain is a country whose total wealth approximates sixteen billions of pounds, and whose income is two billions of pounds or over.

In the last nine years, according to the British Naval Annual, edited by Viscount Hythe, Great Britain has expended on her navy the sum of £365,000,000, and in the year 1912-13 has appropriated £45,000,000, making a total of over £400,000,000. During the same length of time, she has spent on her army more than half as much, making a total expenditure on army and navy in nine years of about £600,000,000. Hon.

gentlemen may say: We must come to her aid with $35,000,000 that burden is so teriffic. But it must be remembered that England has paid that enormous amount of money out of her revenues, and during that period has not only paid that money, and carried out all the laws in regard to the relief of the poor, and other public interests, but has reduced her public debt to the extent of £65,000,000. But this Government says: 'Oh you poor unfortunate old England! Out of your revenues you can spend on your army and navy £600,000,000 in nine years, and you can reduce your national debt by £65,000,000, but we must give you $35,000,000 or you will go to ruin, and the Germans 'will get you if you don't watch out'. That is too absurd for discussion. Sir, these figures make one pause in wonder and amazement in realizing that this little sea-girt isle has such gigantic financial possibilities. And why is this so? One of the reasons is that some two hundred years ago she captured Canada from the French, and has since held Canada as one of the great assets of the British Crown. She has, in her great scheme of world-wide colonization, obtained possessions in every sea. She owns to-day half the mercantile tonnage of the world; she is the commercial toll-gate of all nations, taking toll from nearly every dollar's worth of commerce carried on the ocean. That is why she is to-day such a gigantic financial possibility. Hon. gentlemen say: 'Oh, we must give her money', because forsooth, as stated by the hon. member for Brandon yesterday Canada could never exist were it not for British protection. I know not whether the hon. gentleman referred to a physical or a political existence—possibly he thought he might not have existed were it not for English protection. Sir, England became possessed of Canada 200 years ago because the acquirement of this country was a business transaction. She wanted Canada as an asset to the British Crown; she has held it as such until the present day, and now Canada is one of the best assets England has—a country embracing a larger territory than the United States, capable of accommodating 60, aye, one hundred million people; loyal to the British Crown and the British Empire; ever ready to stand by Great Britain in time of trouble, but ever striving to build up Canada and make her a nation, in the accomplishing of which she is doing what is best for the Empire as a whole.

Let me cite an illustration in connection with this gift to England. It is said that the hon. member for West Toronto (Sir Edmund Osler) is a very wealthy man, and I do not doubt that he is. Supposing I went to the hon. gentleman and said: You are engaged in very extensive and profitable commercial transactions, but your financial position is very grave, and you need assistance. There is a man down street, Mr. Burlowitz, who borrows money from you continually, but is going to give you a great deal of trouble. Lend me $3,500, and I will place it in the bank to your credit, thus saving you from absolute financial destruction.' Hon gentlemen may think this statement too far fetched, but is it too far fetched to be within the range of reasonable comparison with the proposition the Prime Minister has put before us? I think not.

England does not need money; does she need ships? Mr. Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, has been referred to in this debate, and I also intend to place him on the witness stand. Here is the statement of Mr. Churchill in regard to shipbuilding in England. Between April 1, 1911, and March 31, 1912, the following ships were completed and have become available for service: 4 armoured ships, 4 protected cruisers, 2 unarmoured cruisers, 20 destroyers, 5 submarines and 4 miscellaneous ships; 39 in all. On April 1, 1912, there were under construction, 10 battleships, 6 battle cruisers, 8 second-class protected cruisers, 2 unarmoured cruisers, 31 torpedo boat destroyers, 15 submarines, and 2 river gunboats, 74 in all. As 6 of these ships were for Australia and New Zealand, the total number of ships for the British Admiralty is therefore 68, and the total number of ships constructed and under construction between the 1st of April, 1911, and the 1st of April, 1912, was 107.

Let us now note Mr. Churchill's statement regarding the naval situation in general. In introducing the naval estimates on the 18th of March last, he said:

> I propose, with the permission of the House, to lay bare to them this afternoon with perfect openness, the naval situation. It is necessary to do so mainly with reference to one power. I regret that necessity, but nothing is to be gained by using indirect modes of expression.

Now, Sir, what do we find?

> We possess more dreadnoughts than any other two powers in the world to-day and if all the dreadnoughts in the world were sunk to-night our naval superiority would be greater than it is at the present time. We cannot imagine the course of a naval war which would tend steadily to increase the relative fighting value of the large resources we possess in pre-dreadnoughts, until, as time went on, quite old vessels would come out and play an important part. We therefore keep such vessels carefully in a material reserve and arrangements are being perfected by the war-staff to bring them into commission at the sixth, ninth, or twelfth month of any war. All this must be considered in judg-

ing the standards of new construction which are appropriate to our needs.

* * * * * *

Having reviewed our existing naval resources in the light of the foregoing observations, we are not prepared to recommend at the present time the two keels to one standard in new construction against Germany. The time may come when that may be necessary, but it is not necessary now. I will, however, state precisely the standard which we regard as appropriate to the present situation. Before doing so I would like to make it clear that, as a result of the measures taken by my right hon. friend the Home Secretary, there is no cause whatever for alarm or despondency. The Admiralty are prepared to guarantee absolutely the main security of the country and of the Empire day by day for the next few years, and if the House will grant us what we ask for the future that prospect may be indefinitely extended.

He further says :

Lastly, the House is entitled to be relieved of any anxiety which members may feel in regard to the expensive power of the shipbuilding resources of the country. It is not possible to say whether our most prominent competitors can build as fast as we do. What is certain is that they do not, in practice, do so, and it is also true, I am pleased to say, that we can build, arm and equip great ships each year and we can continue that process year after year upon a scale largely in advance of any other single power, according to its present resources. The House may take it for certain that there is absolutely no danger of our being overtaken unless we decide as a matter of policy to do so.

And further :

We have faced combinations over and over again in the past, and sometimes heavy odds, but we must never conduct our affairs so that the navy of any single power would be able to engage us at any single moment—even our least favourable moment—with any reasonable prospect of success. If this is 'insular arrogance' it is also the first condition of our existence! I am glad to be able to assure the House that no difficulty will be experienced in making arrangements to maintain our relative position in the near future, and to secure as quickly as we need them adequate margins of safety. I am glad also that these measures will not involve any excessive disproportionate expense.

In the light of that how can any man say that England needs gun-ships ? As I stated before it is too absurd for even an attempted argument. They do not need the ships. Now do they want them ? Let us see what Mr. Winston Churchill says about that problem. I might here refer to what was said by the Minister of Marine (Mr. Hazen) a few nights ago, condemning the policy of the late Government on the ground that if they began to build the ships, these ships would be obsolete before they were completed; he meant that as an argument against the late Government's policy of beginning to build ships under the tenders on which they were intending to base a contract. What does Mr. Churchill say about this question of ships ?

My third observation is this,—it is wrong and wasteful to build a single ship for the navy before it is wanted. Up to the moment when the contract for a battleship has been definitely signed, the vessel is the heir to all the expanding naval science of the world; but from the day when the design has been finally fixed she is obsolescent. She has become a wasting security. Nearly three years of her brief life have been lived before she is born. Before she is even launched the vessels which are capable of destroying her have been projected. It is an ill service to the navy and to the state to build a single ship before its time. We have to sow each year for the harvest we require two years later, as such as we require and no more. What I might venture to call the 'more the merrier' argument is as detrimental to efficiency as to economy. The only safe rule which the British Admiralty can follow is to maintain the minimum consistent with full security.

This Government is proposing to build three dreadnoughts which the British Admiralty do not want. Mr. Churchill says they do not want them, he has looked at the situation from every point of view and these gentlemen must say either that Mr. Churchill is deceiving the King and the Parliament of Great Britain or else that he knows what he is talking about. He says they do not want them, that it is practically a crime to build them before they are wanted, and yet this Government propose to build three dreadnoughts with the money of the people of Canada, and before they are completed, vessels will be projected capable of destroying them. That is what Mr. Churchill says. What more does he say on that very subject ?

Upon the establishment of ships maintained in full commission and upon the number of active service ratings actually permanently available depends our immediate readiness for war. . . There is a considerable difference between the number of ships available any day, taken at random throughout the year and by chance and the number that could be got ready for a particular date or period marked out in advance. For instance, if the House of Commons sent a committee down to Portsmouth to-night and orders were given to mobilize all the ships in the harbour, we could produce a certain number. If, however, we were told privately beforehand that the committee were going down to see how many ships we could turn out at short notice, say on April 1 or May 1, we could produce from 25 per cent to 35 per cent more. That is a very important fact which any one can appreciate. It is a fact which makes it necessary for us to have a sufficient margin to be able to meet at any moment the naval force of an attacking power at their selected moment.

So you will see he is taking every possible contingency into consideration.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario): When did he say that?

Mr. GERMAN: On the 18th of March, 1912, in introducing the navy estimates to the British House of Commons. Having taken all these things into consideration he comes to the question of maintenance. It will be remembered that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, in proposing his amendment, said: You are building dreadnoughts, but you are sending them to England unmanned, England to man them and England to maintain them, and the policy of the Liberal party is to build our ships, maintain our ships and man our ships. Now, Sir, what does he say about maintenance?

The second observation which I would wish to make is this—it is very easy to make rapid increase in new construction so long as you are not burdened with the expense of maintaining a great establishment. Our German neighbours have not yet begun to feel the weight of maintaining year by year a gigantic naval service. These charges mature slowly but remorselessly. The expenses of maintenance apart from new construction must grow irresistibly with every year, and therefore it may be found that as time passes the very rapid rate of new construction which we have seen elsewhere may to some extent be abated by the dead weight drag of increasing maintenance charges.

That, Sir, is what the Government is forcing on Great Britain to-day, the dead weight drag of increasing maintenance charges. The right hon. the Prime Minister says we are going to add to your dead weight charges three dreadnoughts which you do not want, but we shall impose on you the whole cost of maintaining those dreadnoughts which Mr. Winston Churchill says are a dead weight drag upon any country that has to maintain them. What more need be said in regard to that matter? As I have already stated, it is nothing but sentiment. There is no argument in its favour. Those gentlemen love to wear their loyalty on their sleeves, ever in view, but never useful.

Now, Sir, what have we got as an alternative to that proposition? I do not think that any one can or will say soberly and fairly and honestly that England needs money or ships or assistance from Canada. The contention is that we are going to build ships in Canada. They say we will give $35,000,000 now. This is a make shift policy, it is not a permanent policy. Well, evidently Mr. Bonar Law and the Tories in England are trying to make a permanent policy, and if those people get into power it will be a permanent policy before long. They say we cannot build ships or establish a navy in Canada for 25 or 30 years. That was the remark of the right hon. the leader of the Government. I say that that is an insult to the business ability, energy, and intelligence of the people of Canada. It is not all dreadnoughts that they want over there; they want cruisers as well as dreadnoughts. The editor of this book from which I have quoted, Viscount Hythe, says:

In the cruiser classes we have a large superiority, but hardly so great as is required for the protection of the enormous interests we have at stake on the sea. For the protection of commerce, more second-class cruisers are required.

Let us build the second-class cruisers; let them build the dreadnoughts. $35,000,000 spent on cruisers would be just as valuable to Great Britain as $35,000,000 spent on dreadnoughts. She needs cruisers; she is building cruisers continually. She is building cruisers to-day, and she is spending not $35,000,000, but $135,000,000 on cruisers. Let us build the cruisers which we can build, and let her build the dreadnoughts. I do not see any difficulty in that problem. The right hon. the leader of the Government says,—Oh, some time in the dim and distant future, we will get the British Admiralty to build coal-hookers, or oil-tank boats over here. Why, they are building them here now. We do not need the British Admiralty to come over here to build them. He says he will get the British Admiralty to come over here, and he will pay part of the expense. That is another of the great considerations offered. There are two considerations, first, that he, or one of his colleagues, is to have a seat on the Defence Committee. That was promised to Sir Wilfrid Laurier a year ago without any suggestion of a navy donation. The second is that the British Admiralty shall come over here and build a few coal-hookers or oil tanks. Sir, as I have already said, we are building those ships here now, but if we cannot build them, or establish a navy in twenty-five years, are we going to complete the operation sooner by delaying it at the beginning? Shall we begin now? The Conservative policy is, we will give $35,000,000 to England, and we shall postpone for an indefinite period a permanent policy of establishing a Canadian navy. The Liberal policy is, use the $35,000,000 in Canada, establish now a Canadian shipbuilding yard, and begin now to build a navy for Canada which will be a part and parcel of the British navy in time of war.

I have said there was nothing in this but sentiment, and there is nothing in it but sentiment. But the sentiment of hon. gentlemen opposite goes into divergent fields. They have a sentimental idea of

giving $35,000,000 to England. They have another sentimental idea. They say, oh we don't need ships to protect Canada's shores forsooth, because the shores of Canada are fully protected under that great American doctrine, the Monroe doctrine—truly a lovely sentiment for those high-flying Tories to entertain, that Canada must remain under the protection and only under the protection of an effete doctrine suggested by a President of the United States fifty years ago.

An hon. MEMBER: Who said that?

Mr. GERMAN: The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens). We say that we can build the ships in Canada, and we believe that now is the time to begin.

It was contended by the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the late Government in the first place did not want to carry out the policy which was placed on the statute book by them, that they had an opportunity to carry it out and to sign the contracts, but that they failed to do so. I do not care as a matter of argument whether they wanted to carry it out or not. As a matter of argument, the question is, can we in Canada establish a shipyard and build naval ships suitable for a Canadian navy or for the British navy. That is the question and the sole question, and I say we can do so, and the Canadian people feel that they can do so. The Canadian people are willing to begin now, and the Canadian people prefer to use their own money in that way rather than to send it to England, not to aid England but absolutely throw it away. You are foisting on England something that she does not require, and something she does not want.

Now, the right hon. the Prime Minister says that when he has got his permanent policy he will appeal to the people of Canada, but we know not when that will be. We have propounded a permanent policy. He has got a makeshift policy. Let him go to the country on his proposal to appropriate $35,000,000. It is no small sum of money. They say, we can take it out of our surplus. It is owing to the fact that we had a Liberal Government in power for fifteen years that we have a surplus. We can take it out of our surplus, but every one knows that we are borrowing the money, and if we take it out of the surplus to-day we will borrow the money to-morrow. Let him go to the country and he will get his answer promptly and emphatically, that the overwhelming majority of the people of Canada stand for a navy built and maintained in Canada, for a fleet unit on the Atlantic and on the Pacific oceans, manned by intelligent young Canadians, ever ready on all occasions to go forth when duty calls and give loyal, courageous and effective aid in maintaining the supremacy of the British flag on every ocean of the world.

Mr. O. J. WILCOX (North Essex): Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) prefaced his remarks by saying that there was no difference between the two political parties in Canada. I thought that he was going to take upon himself the attitude of a statesman, and that his address could only possibly be surpassed in quality and character by that of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) himself. But, he did not go far until he fell into the political swim with most of the other hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who have spoken in this debate. I was not surprised at the attitude which my hon. friend took as he rose in this House and told them all the great things which, in his opinion, the Liberal party had accomplished in the last hundred years. There were, however, a great many things that my hon. friend might have told us the Liberal party did not do in that time. But, when he proclaims himself an ardent Liberal and a supporter of my right hon. friend who leads the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and when he can go down to his constituency, jump upon the Tory horse of anti-reciprocity and get elected without a contest, he certainly is taking upon himself the attitude of a politician. I am not going to follow my hon. friend in detail, but when he seeks to minimize what the great Conservative party has accomplished in this country, let me point out to him that there are a few epochal periods in the history of this country which I must draw to the attention of my hon. friend. In the year 1878, the industrial life of this young country was born, an interest in which there is to-day $2,000,000,000 invested, in which there are 800,000 pairs of Canadian hands engaged and drawing $400,000,000 in wages, and that this great interest exported to the nations of the world last year over $1,000,000,000 worth of manufactured products. It is that great interest which has developed our magnificent home market and which has permitted me as a Canadian farmer to stand up in this country and say that I am proud of the land in which I live. I ask you, Sir, where would have been that great interest if the Liberal party had had their way in 1878?

Let me refer to what I consider to be another epochal period in the history of this country. In 1882 and 1883 a great line of railway was launched by that distinguished statesman, Sir John A. Macdonald, and as a result a double line of steel extends from Montreal around the north shore of

lake Superior, through the virgin prairies of the West, over the Rocky mountains and down to the blue waters of the Pacific ocean. That great railway has opened up our splendid heritage in the western part of Canada and has given to us the life and prosperity which we enjoy at this present hour. I ask you where would that railway have been if the policy of the Liberal party had prevailed?

Let me point out to my hon. friend from Welland what I consider to be another epochal period in the history of this country. In 1891 when the battle of British connection was fought in Canada, when our friends went through the length and breadth of this land declaring in favour of the policy of unrestricted reciprocity, which the Hon. Edward Blake subsequently declared meant commercial union with the United States, where would have been our British connection, if the Liberal party had succeeded? Another great epochal period to which I may refer in this connection was on the 21st September, 1911, when the battle of the fiscal independence of Canada was fought. I do not intend to refer to my hon. friend's speech at greater length. I have learned that it is not the part of good sportsmanship to waste your ammunition on a fox when there is bigger game in sight.

As a layman, I should have in all probability refrained from offering any argument in support of the resolution introduced in this House by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, purporting to deal with the great question of Imperial Defence, had it not been for the fact that the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals , who I understand, and I say it as courteously as I can, is recognized as the Moses, the political Moses of the Liberal party in Ontario, with higher aspirations and ambitions, of course, charged the hon. member for North Essex with bowing down to false gods in respect of a certain amendment or amendments introduced in the years 1910 and 1911. Our friends opposite take up a good deal of time in making various references to the contingent occupying seats upon the Government side of this House from the grand old sister province of Quebec. Let me say to them that as an Englishman—I am not all English, I am part Irish—that I have been most intimately connected with my hon. friends from the province of Quebec; and I declare from my seat in this House that there are no more loyal or more patriotic members in this House than they, and that they are a credit to the province from which they come and an honour to the country in which they live. My hon. friends opposite are past grand masters in the art of the political game, and they are seeking with all their eloquence—some of it, God knows, not very eloquent—and with all the force of argument, to make it appear in the province of Ontario that the Liberal-Conservative party in Canada is linked up here in Ottawa with some kind of a disloyal class. Let me repudiate that statement of those in the Opposition. Let me invite them to adopt, in the discussions of public questions in this country, the method that is pursued by the hon. gentleman who leads this Government. Let them discuss those great questions, with which the future interest of this country and of the Empire in which we live is identified, upon their merits, and not get down into the mire of partisan politics. I am inclined to the view that the conditions which surrounded my entering public life as a layman are more unique than those of any other man that I know of in this House. When I came to Ottawa to represent a great and a free constituency in this country, the paramount thought that I had in my mind was to give my best to the constituency that I served and the country in which I lived. In what little part I may have taken in the debates of this House and in the votes which I gave upon the various questions which came before me for consideration, notwithstanding that my parliamentary experience had been greatly limited, and my patient constituency might, under the circumstances in which I was placed at that particular time, have excused any errors that I might have made, I was so able to speak and to vote that when I went back to my constituency on the 21st of September, 1911, my majority was increased more than two to one, whereas my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals lost his own election. Therefore, I think my hon. friend should not stand in a glass house and throw stones. He said that I and others from the province of Ontario had associated ourselves with a despised class in this country. I say to him, as courteously as I can again, for I do not feel at all bitter, because I am beginning to understand the game of my hon. friend opposite, that I do not think that a man, called upon to represent an independent constituency in this country, has yet risen to that dignity of manhood where we would expect him to be, who would throw a charge of that character across the floor of this House. On December 15, 1910, when he addressed this House rather flippantly, eloquently in some respects, and my hon. friends opposite were rattling the tambourines and pounding the cymbals politically, he made, in my opinion, a rather significant statement, in view of the

allegation which he had made previously. It was this:

For years I had been considering as a journalist the duty of the press and the people of Canada on this question of adding to the naval defence of the Empire.

A portion of the press contended that we were niggardly; we were not performing our duty; we were not proceeding with enough expedition. I for years had taken the ground that, up to the time of writing, at least, the greatest benefit we could confer upon the British Empire was the development of our own resources.

I ask hon. members to remember that statement, in view of subsequent remarks which I intend here to make. Then he goes on to say that when he listened to the able and eloquent address of the Hon. George E. Foster, the present Minister of Trade and Commerce—'without exception one of the most eloquent addresses ever heard in a deliberative body'—I am quoting his own words—he came to the conclusion that it was time that Canada should take another step and take some part in Imperial defence. Mr. Speaker, there has been a conversion here. Previous to the 29th of March, 1909, my hon. friend did not have that view. But upon listening to the Minister of Trade and Commerce, shall I say the genial light and warmth of the doctrine of Imperial defence dawned upon him, the scales fell from his eyes, and immediately he went forth proclaiming a new gospel. I think I may offer to the Hon. George E. Foster my sincere congratulations, in that, after a life of honest toil and conscientious work in the Parliament of Canada, in his declining years he has been able to bring to the penitent bench such a hardened sinner as my hon. friend from South Renfrew. Let me quote this sentence again:

For years I had been considering, as a journalist, the duty of the press and the people of Canada on the question of aiding in the naval defence of the Empire. A portion of the press contended that we were niggardly; we were not performing our duty; we were not proceeding with enough expedition. I for years had taken the ground that up to the time of writing, at least, the greatest benefit we could confer upon the British Empire was the development of our own resources.

I ask you, are not these the views, practically word for word, of Henri Bourassa? I ask you if that is not the situation we find to-day in the Liberal party in this country? That which they charge against our colleagues is that which is paramount in their own ranks, and prevents them from doing their whole duty to this great British Empire.

I wish to make some explanation of the amendments to which my hon. friend referred. But before doing so, permit me to say that these two amendments are the absolute justification of the vote that I gave against the policies introduced in Bill No. 95 of the session of 1910, a policy which they themselves have discarded. It is an admission that the name which was given to the navy authorized under the provisions of Bill No. 95 was justified—it was truly a 'Tin-pot navy.' The first amendment to which my hon. friend referred reads as follows:

This House while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion that the Bill now submitted for its consideration changes the relations of Canada with the Empire and ought in consequence to be submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite.

I ask you if there is a word within the provisions or meaning of that resolution which prevents the Government from giving a contribution to the British Admiralty if the conditions justify?—as the conditions are shown to justify it under the memorandum handed down to the House by the Prime Minister. Not a word. It is only a question, as it appears to me: Are you in favour of the tin-pot navy as authorized under the Bill No. 95—which hon. gentlemen opposite have discarded—or would you prefer to put this question to the people of Canada before you adopt the tin-pot navy. That is the way I put it, and that is the way I voted; and because I voted that way, I have come back here from a constituency as their representative, and my hon. friend who proclaimed the doctrine of a tin-pot navy lost his political head.

There is another amendment against which the hon. gentleman made a rather vigorous charge:

The House regrets that the Speech from the Throne gives no indication whatever of the intention of the Government to consult the people on its naval policy and the general question of the contribution by Canada to Imperial armaments.

Is there anything in that resolution in contradiction of the present policy? Did not every Conservative, then in opposition, vote for that? There is not a thing in it about an emergency.

Therefore, I will not, for the present, refer again to my hon. friend from South Renfrew. But in submitting an argument or two—and I do not desire to proceed at great length—permit me to say that I have sympathy with all those in Canada who say that war is horrible. And when we view the conditions as they exist to-day among the civilized nations of the world we are almost led to the conclusion that the upward movement of humanity has been rather slow.

It is, Sir, a regrettable fact that in this twentieth century, and in this enlightened part of the civilized world, the standard of civilization has not yet reached the height where nations can settle their disputes by arbitration. That cannot be done; therefore we must to-day, as a Parliament and as a country, face conditions as they exist. I believe it is universally recognized that the highest power in the world is physical force, and the same principle applicable to the establishing of peace within the confines of the city of Ottawa applies also to the establishing of peace throughout our great Empire. What more is the navy of the Empire than a police force? But if we removed the police force from the city of Ottawa, and lawless men had no fear of being brought to justice, I venture to assert the belief that we would not be safe within the confines of this city. By the very existence of that police force, peace is established, because that force is beneficial not only in what it does, but even to a greater extent in that which it prevents being done. The same condition therefore, applies to the establishing of peace throughout this great Empire to which we belong.

I have taken a great interest in this debate, because I realize, as the representative of a free constituency, that this is a most important question. As I listened to hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, it seemed to me that in their references to the Empire some hon. gentlemen did not grasp the size or magnitude of Britain and her possessions, for it was referred to, and chiefly by hon. gentlemen who have heretofore addressed the Parliament of Canada on this subject, as if it consisted of those little islands in the North sea, this Dominion of Canada, recognized as the brightest jewel among British Colonial possessions, Australia, New Zealand, Cape Colony and so on. But I would remind hon. gentlemen that the King's subjects number 460,000,000 people, and that 360,000,000 of those subjects are neither of our colour nor our race. Let me remind them of, shall I say, the exquisite delicacy of Imperial diplomacy in the government of many of those colonies forming part of this great Empire, and of the phenomenal degree of fair-mindedness and patriotism exercised governing of 360,000,000 aliens without encroaching more than is necessary upon their individual freedom and their ancient customs, and at the same time establishing and maintaining principles of British justice, and protection of life, virtue and property. I venture to say the statement can be made without successful contradiction, either in this House or out of it, when we realize that those little British Isles with their 42,000,000 people have, in centuries past, taken care of and nurtured her possessions; ever present on every occasion of need to defend, protect and assist the outlying portions of the Empire, that at no time or under no circumstances have the people of those little British Isles asked the outlying portions of the Empire for a dollar. As a Canadian citizen and a British subject I submit that the national self-respect that makes acceptance of this statement universal should redouble our admiration and the fervour of our love towards the people of the British Isles.

Possibly it is unnecessary to point out that the Empire has had to protect the great heritage and problems of the Canadian people, or to enumerate the conditions under which our ocean pathway has been secured, how we have been protected by the Mother Country in all times of need; how our trade, going out on every river and from every port, making its way to the various nations of the world, has been absolutely protected and secured by the power and the might of the British navy; yet the Canadian people have never contributed a dollar. In this connection, the following extract from the memorandum of the British Admiralty, regarding the expansion of Canadian trade submitted by the right hon. Prime Minister, will be of interest:

> The rapid expansion of Canadian sea-borne trade, and the immense value of Canadian cargoes always afloat in British and Canadian bottoms, here require consideration. On the basis of the figures supplied by the Board of Trade to the Imperial Conference of 1911, the annual value of the overseas trade of the Dominion of Canada in 1909-10 was not less than £72,000,000, and the tonnage of Canadian vessels was 718,000 tons, and these proportions have already increased and are still increasing. For the whole of this trade wherever it may be about the distant waters of the world, as well as for the maintenance of her communications, both with Europe and Asia, Canada is dependent, and has always depended upon the Imperial navy, without corresponding contribution or cost.

It is a significant fact that these little British Isles have contributed to the protection of the outlying portions of this magnificent Empire $400,000,000, that the large-hearted British taxpayer has gone down in his pocket and has contributed $150,000,000 since Confederation to protect Canada as a colony of that Empire. That argument seems to me to be absolutely conclusive and to justify the contribution which the Prime Minister has proposed, as a means by which we can do something to keep up that great police force which is necessary to protect our trade, with the other trade of the Empire. I do not believe there was a truer statement in the address of the right hon. the Prime Minister than the statement that if for no other

reason we owe that contribution to the British Admiralty as a matter of self-respect.

My hon. friends opposite and particularly my hon. friend from Welland, who can jump a political fence pretty quick when there is an election by acclamation in it, laboured hard to disassociate Canada from the Empire. As I understand it, if Montreal is attacked the British Empire is attacked just as if Liverpool is attacked. If Victoria is attacked, the British Empire is attacked just as if Liverpool is attacked. If Windsor is attacked the British Empire is attacked just as if old London is attacked. The policy of this Government shows that they realize the importance of the consolidation of this great Empire because in its liberties is our heritage and in its traditions is our pride.

I want to refer to the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the great leading light of the party that is now in the political wilderness. I do not impute disloyalty to any Liberal who occupies a seat in this House and I am conscious, God knows, when I say that no constituency in Canada would elect a man to Parliament unless he was a loyal Canadian citizen and a British subject to the core. But my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier)—oh, how many times I have heard that name up in the back concessions of North Essex among my French-Canadian countrymen—and no more loyal or patriotic citizens or electors can be found anywhere—but, Sir, our right hon. friend does play the game of politics down in North Essex just the same as they do, Mr. Sevigny, down in your constituency; the voice is the voice of Jacob and the hand is the hand of Esau in North Essex just the same as with you. My right hon. friend was wise in his day and generation, speaking politically, and he said in this House the other day:

> Let the matter be settled once and for all. Surely I have not lived 70 years of my life in vain.

A beautiful sentiment, if we could only take the sentiments into our inner consciences, if we could believe that my hon. friend meant them, we would think a great deal more of that eloquent statement and graceful phraseology. In 1896 Mr. Bourassa was a disciple and follower of the right hon. gentleman; they bowed together, they rose together and they were at one politically. Mr. Bourassa uttered these words:

> Well sir, what was the language of Mr. Laurier in Boston in 1891? That Canada would never consent to Imperial confederation even on commercial lines alone because the consequence would be the participation of Canada in British wars and Canada would never consent to that.

Again at page 1142 of the 'Hansard' of 1892 we find these words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

> I hold out to my fellow countrymen the idea of independence, but whenever the day comes it must come with the consent of both countries and we must continue to keep the good feeling and the good will of the motherland. If we are true to our record we will again exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of nation achieving its independence by slow degrees as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree.

Imperial defence, bowing to false gods, 70 years of my life sacrificed in Imperial defence. I say again, Sir, the voice is the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau. Again, on page 1,143 we have the words of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, this man, whose statements, as the leader of a great party in Canada should not be such as to appeal to those sentiments. In those sentiments he has sowed the wind, and he is to-day reaping the whirlwind. Because of the differences of view that exist in his own party, he dare not support a policy which is Imperial in its nature, and which is in the interests of this great Empire. He says:

> Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy?

That is the statement of my right hon. friend, and I presume that if my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) had the opportunity, and would rise, he would say that that is simply an unfettered, promulgated free speech. That is, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would rise if the House were not singing 'God Save the King'. I want to quote these statements for the benefit of those on this side of the House, and for the benefit of the young member from North Essex. Let me give you a little political history that has just come to my mind. My hon. friend the ex-Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) was in North Essex in 1909, at the time of the by-election, and my hon. friend, his colleague, the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) was with him. I am not going to narrate what took place because I think I would be ashamed to tell it. But I shall say this, that some of the professional minions of the party got into a part of the constituency where I was not well known and what do you think they said? I do not know whether they believed it or not, it does not make a particle of difference, it was said. They said, you farmers of Essex, you are picking out now a man to represent you in Parliament. The constituency has just conferred an unbounded honour upon your former representative, by giving him a good fat job for the rest of his

days at your expense. They did not put it that way, but that was the construction of it. They said, you farmers want a man to represent you. If you want a man to go out into the cornfield and plough, Wilcox will be all right. But you want a man qualified to express your views upon the floor of Parliament. Well, they did not know me then. I took it as an insinuation that a representative farmer was not qualified in their judgment to occupy a seat in this House. Let me digress from the point just a moment to say that as a farmer—and my hon friend from Red Deer (Mr Clark) always gets up and takes a crack at the protectionist—I have no quarrel with the industrial life of this country, because, as I said before there is a close connection between the farmers of Canada and the industrial life of Canada. We produce the raw material; they produce the manufactured product, and you cannot dissociate the one interest from the other. As I have said before, Mr. Speaker, they are like the old maid and the old bachelor. Together they thrive and prosper, but separated they will shrivel up and die. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was quoting from the speech of my right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, and I desire to quote him just a little further:

It is no use whatever at this stage of the proceedings on the floor of the Canadian Parliament to try to deceive ourselves as to what is intended by this subject of Imperial defence. If it is intended simply to discuss what part Canada is prepared to take in her own defence, what share of the burden must fall upon us, being responsible for the safety of the land in which we were born and to which we owe allegiance, in which our hopes and affections are centred, certainly, we are always prepared to discuss that. But there is a second school abroad in England and in Canada, a school represented perhaps on the floor of this Parliament which wants to bring Canada into the vortex of militarism which is now the blight and curse of Europe.

A little tin-pot navy for Canada, but nothing, not a thing for the Empire. My hon. friend from Red Deer says that all England wants is our moral support. Well I am perfectly willing to give Engand our moral support and to accompany it with a little bit of our cash.

When the right hon. leader of the Opposition, then a younger man, wise in his judgment and generation, made these statements he believed that they would bring political grist to his own mill and to his own party. It is astounding to me, in view of the campaign that has been carried on in various parts of this country, that hon. gentlemen opposite would stand for hours slinging accusations across this House at hon. gentlemen who honourably and ably represent their constituencies. That conduct is responsible for the sentiment which has developed in this country and which makes it pretty hard for the leader of the Opposition in the circumstances in which he finds himself at the present time. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) dwelt upon the amendment. I imagine that that lengthy amendment was submitted to the Liberal caucus, and that there was a great amount of courting going on in the caucus between the Hon. George and some others. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) told a story or two last night. Probably it will not be considered a digression from the argument if I were to illustrate what I mean. Up in our part of the country, on one of the back concessions, near where I live myself, there was a young man whose name was George, but it was not George Graham. He was accompanying a young lady home one evening and he felt that it was his duty, or desire, to ask her to be his wife. It was the proper thing for him to do, but, when he reached the point in the conversation when he was about to say: 'Nellie, will you be my wife,' his courage failed him and he said: 'Mary, it looks like rain.' I imagine that this political George was just in about that position when he submitted the conglomeration of ideas in this resolution to the caucus. But, finally his inner consciousness seemed to be wounded, his eyes were opened as they had never been before, and he looked up into Nellie's face and said: 'Nellie, will you walk down the stream of life with me?' 'Oh, yes,' she said, 'George, I will, but do not tell anybody.' I imagine that was going on in this building and George looked up into Nellie's face and said: 'Oh, Nellie, I won't, because I am just as much ashamed as you are.' I am inclined to believe that things were not so smooth as they appeared to be on the surface.

Reference has been made by many hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to the part which Canada took in the South African war. I think my hon. friend the ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has referred time and time again to the part that Canada took in the Boer War. Let us investigate that. As a loyal Canadian my heart was thrilled when I saw the colonial possessions of this great Empire sending their sons to assist the Mother Country in the time of stress and trial. In the Globe of October 4, 1899, appears this statement by the right hon. leader of the Opposition:

As I understand the Militia Act, and I may say that I have given it some study of late, our volunteers are enrolled to be used in the defence of the Dominion. They are Canadian troops, to be used to fight for Canada's defence. There is no menace to Canada, and although we may be willing to contribute troops I do not see how we can do so. Then again, how could we do so with-

out Parliament granting us the money? We simply could not do anything. In other words, we should have to summon Parliament.

If in that time of stress and trial, the then leader of the Government and his colleagues could not send the young Canadians, whose hearts were pulsating with loyalty to the King, to defend the flag in South Africa without summoning Parliament, what is he going to do with his Canadian navy ? But, they were urged to do it. Boards of trade, mayors of towns and loyal citizens throughout the length and breadth of Canada showered their messages into Ottawa and the groundhogs were compelled to take their holes. Then, in Montreal, shortly after this, there was a right-about, turnabout somersault. The right hon. leader of the Opposition said :

We believed it our duty as a British colony to take part in the war, and permit two thousand Canadian volunteers to enlist in the English army and to fight for the Mother Country. We did it because we believed it our duty to do it in response to the unanimous sentiments of the people of this country. We are a free country; ours is a constitutional government, and our duty is to put into execution the popular will, and the moment the popular will was known to us we had but the duty to discharge, and we discharged it of our free will. There was no power to constrain us to act as we did; but in the plenitude of our legislative independence we had the right to reply to the popular will.

The then Government did not allow these soldiers to go until such time as they were forced by the loyal sentiments of the people. When our soldiers made their 7,000-mile journey across the ocean, when they fought upon the hills and sands of Africa, when the blood of many of them was spilled for the flag that floats over this Empire, it was, in my mind, an epochal period in the history of the Liberal Administration, for Canada got an amount of advertising as a result of the action of these loyal volunteers that it had not had for many, many long years.

There are just one or two quotations that I desire to read in concluding. I wished to discuss several other matters in respect to this question, but I have spoken longer than I intended. I have quotations here from the Toronto Globe of March 24, 26 and 29, 1909, when the resolution over which there has been so much discussion in this House was submitted to Parliament. I desire to place on record an editorial from the Toronto Globe, because, mark you, I have no doubt that very many people will read it, and I recognize that while there are some people in this country who bow the knee daily and say: 'Give use this day our daily bread,' there are others who say: 'Give us this day our daily Globe.' The Globe of 24th March, last, said in its leading editorial:

British feeling for Germany until the last few years has ever been friendly and admiring. Germany's feeling for Great Britain, as was manifested during the Boer war, has been jealous and unfriendly. This unfriendliness reached its climax when Britain and France recently entered upon a friendly understanding. The policy of Germany since the war of 1870 has been to isolate France in Europe. The friendly relations with her neighbour across the channel have been openly and avowedly resented by the Berlin war party.

The German nation has groaned for years under the weight of military preparations. Without lightening that burden an ounce, the Kaiser and his advisers have superimposed the burden of creating a great navy. There is not another nation in Europe which if in the same position as Great Britain, would allow another nation to prepare an engine for its destruction without asking for explanations and an understanding. There is not another nation in Europe which would impotently stand by and see an instrument forged for its destruction. They would seize the reptile while it was still weak and strangle it.

But that is not the British way. They have instead endeavoured to keep pace with German activity in augmenting naval power. The contest has become a desperate one. It is a contest between a nation of 65,000,000, and constantly growing, with a nation of 42,000,000, from which its sons swarm across the seas year in and year out. War is deprecated, but, as a matter of fact war is in progress. The contest in shipbuilding is war. If the Mother Country were engaged in a deadly conflict, Canadians could not get across the ocean fast enough to the aid of the motherland. The Canadian exchequer would be open to the last dollar in such a cause. But we must recognize that our aid is as much needed now as if a physical war, instead of a war of shipbuilding were on. Germany appreciates that if ever she is to challenge British supremacy and break up the British Empire, now is the time.

This is from the Toronto Globe, I would ask my hon. friends opposite to remember:

Every year is adding to the might of the British possessions, and ten years hence would be too late. The colonies can show by prompt and decisive action that it is already too late. They have it in their power to proclaim to all the world that the Empire is one and indissoluble. It will be a stroke for peace, for the moment Germany perceives that the strength of the resources of every colony have been cast into the scale, from that moment she will see that she has lost the game. She began her programme too late. It is Canada's duty, from every point of view, our affection for the land of our fathers and our own self-interest to take prompt action and practical action.

Here is what the Globe said on March 31, last:

While the British fleet is master of the channel no European fleet could be a serious menace to the shores of Canada. . . . In the day of trial the all-important aim would be to make the Imperial fleet so strong that the issue of a combat would not be doubtful.

On the day the resolution was passed, March 29, last, the Globe said:

There can be no resisting the conviction, in view of these facts, that the Mother Country will accept the aid of her colonies at this time of crisis with thankful enthusiasm. Nothing is so likely to bring the mad competition to a stop as a conviction on the part of Germany that it is hopeless. In such case the colonies will be conferring a boon on the German taxpayers as well as on the British. We are not of those who believe that an invasion of Britain just now is feasible. That is not the danger. The danger lies in the future, when the German fleet would have arrived at a pitch of strength when there would be no need for evasion. There would be a direct challenge to a trial of strength, and if the German admiral prevailed, the British Empire as now constituted would be at an end. English, Scotch and Irish valour would be of little avail. The islands would be beleaguered, their food supplies cut off and a surrender at discretion formed on them. That is a consummation which cannot be paltered with or derided, and while it is even remotely possible that every part of the Empire must stand shoulder to shoulder in rendering it impossible.

I have another quotation from the Globe of March 26. I want them to pay particular attention to this:

The sort of vessel that should be built is fixed by the circumstances. The competition now raising between Great Britain and Germany is in the direction of first-class battleships. If Canada were to build a little fleet of wasps and hornets it would have no moral effect on the situation at all. What we would like Canada to do would be to manifest by a veritable act that in this competition of the fleets she ranges herself proudly and gladly by the side of the Mother Country.

Without going farther into details, I want to say that I am heartily in accord with the proposals of the Canadian Government at this time of need to do the best we can to assist in keeping up that great naval force which is necessary to preserve peace within the confines of our own Empire and the great country in which we live.

Some one has said, concerning our great Empire, that amongst all the monarchs of the world, King George can truly say: 'The sun over my dominions never sets;' and he goes on to say:

Let us begin at old London, 'the heart of the Empire,' as it is called. When its eight million dwellers have been but a few hours astir, the sun is waking up the fishermen of Newfoundland. On it sweeps up the majestic St. Lawrence, opening up the great vista of that mighty water; on and on over the spacious lakes and the thundering cataracts, which flash like jewels at his coming. Soon he smiles on the golden wheat fields in Alberta and Saskatchewan; then he gleams over the boundless prairies of Alberta and the Northwest, and climbs the snow clad summit of the Rockies. He sheds his genial light and warmth upon the fertile slopes of British Columbia; next the sun reveals the pasture-fields and mountain peaks of New Zealand; then in their turn Australia welcomes the glorious morning sun, still shining on the British Empire. He rolls on and on across the Icelanders; in the East Indies he sweeps over Borneo to open up the bazars of Calcutta, and all the majestic life of India and the Persian gulf; then it is day-break on the African belt and in the diamond fields of Kimberley, and before our brethern in the sandy desert of Egypt, or the jungles of Africa, have rubbed their eyes, lo! a day and night have passed, and once again the sun rises over Britain.

That is a glorious world embracing panorama, but how small would be the most of Canadians, or any of the people of the Empire, if they had nothing to be proud of, save the size of that Empire. Fancy a Canadian or any other Britisher having nothing more to stir his pulse than the knowledge that the Empire to which he belongs is a bit bigger than that of Russia. What makes our people justly proud is, that they are freeborn inheritors of not only the biggest, but the best Empire that the world has ever seen, an Empire unique in the world's history, a united family of nations, with common interest, common ideals, a common cause, and all devoted to human progress and peace.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Edmonton): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the hon. member (Mr. Wilcox) who has just taken his seat upon having made—if I may be permitted to say so—by all odds the best presentation of the case of the Government that has come in the course of this debate. I also wish to say that with many of the positions he has taken I entirely agree. But I recognize these positions rather as arguments for our side of the case than for his. There is, however, one point that I must criticise in his remarks. If there was one matter that he seemed to lead to more strongly than another, it was the exceeding loyalty of himself primarily, and of his friends secondarily, to the British Empire; and, by contrast, the disloyalty and treasonable attitude of members who have the audacity to oppose the proposals of the Government of the day, and particularly of the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), with his seventy years of service to his King and country. He did us the honour to read to us quotations from remarks made by the right hon. leader of

the Opposition many years ago as evidence of that lack of loyalty to the Empire that he desired to claim for himself. Let me call the attention of the House to the fact that these quotations were read without statement as to their context, without reference to their bearing. And, while I have no knowledge of the matter myself, I think I shall be safe in saying that they had no bearing whatever on the question that is before the House to-day, and that, so far as they related to military service, it was military service by land and not by sea. But the question before us to-day is sea service, and not land service. And, if I am permitted by the House, before I conclude my remarks, I will take the liberty of showing what the position is to-day in regard to land service held by the Government and people of Canada even under the jingo leadership of the Minister of Militia (Mr. Hughes). But when my hon. friend (Mr. Wilcox), if I do not misquote him, calls high Heaven to witness the loyalty of himself and his friends and the disloyalty of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and his friends, because of alleged opposition to Imperial defence, I am sorry to have to question the sincerity of my hon. friend, even though he made his statement with such an air of sincerity. He might have quoted statements made by some of his colleagues sitting beside him, behind him and even in front of him, made not fifteen or twenty years ago, but within the last year or two; and not made on some subject which has no relation to the question before the House, but made on the very question that is before the House—statements which were not veiled treason but were open and palpable treason to the well-being and defence of this Empire. I will not trouble the House to go over these statements again, but I see before me hon. gentlemen who have been publicly accused in this House of making such statements and they were not able to deny them. The hon. gentleman mentioned the name of Mr. Henri Bourassa, and he was good enough to say that Mr. Bourassa was a political associate of members on this side of the House. But it is within the knowledge of some members here that the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Smyth) holds his seat in this House because of having signed a document pledging him to support the naval programme of Mr. Bourassa; and that the seat held by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane), was secured by his predecessor in that seat, now Senator Gordon, by having signed an identical document. And, as my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, is heir to the seat held by Senator Gordon, so I say he is heir to the pledge made by Senator Gordon. It comes with ill grace from any hon. gentleman who is in association with these gentlemen on that side of the House, who stand convicted before this House and before Canada of sentiments that I am not permitted by the rules of the House to properly characterize—I say that it ill becomes any hon. gentleman sitting in this House under these circumstances to charge treason or disloyalty against men who never have been found, and never will be found to hold their seats here under such conditions.

I said there were some points in my hon. friend's remarks with which I absolutely agree. One was to the effect that peaceful development is the natural and proper ambition of Canada. For my own part, I am not a military man; I have no military ambitions and have had no military experience. I have always looked to the work of peacefully developing the resources of this country, and of improving its conditions, so that it might become the home of an ever increasing number of ever more prosperous people by peaceful means.

But if circumstances arise that compel us to consider other possibilities than those of permanent peace, then I agree with him that we must take those possibilities into consideration. I agree with him also as to the horrors of war, and if there were any way of avoiding war by ignoring it, I would be glad to do so. But it is a matter of fact—and I need not dwell upon it—that war comes without regard to time or circumstance. I have heard it suggested that wars were made by kings. I have heard it suggested that wars were made by diplomats. I have heard it suggested that wars were made by the antagonisms of people. May I, with all reverence and respect, suggest that war is the crucible of God, by which it is decided what races of men shall hold dominion and what races shall be subject. Whether the reason be one or the other; whether it be this or that, considering the history of this world from earliest ages to the last few weeks, I am forced to the conclusion that war is a condition that must always exist or be in prospect, and for which we must always be prepared.

The political condition created by the proposals now before the House is a new condition, and I may say, a startling one. In 1910 a provision was made for the first time for Canada's participation in Imperial naval defence. It was assented to, by Parliament, having in view rather the foundation of a naval service than active participation in the wars of the Empire. I speak of it in regard to the amount of money involved. It was not the intention at that time to trench heavily upon the resources of the Dominion in regard to

naval defence. It was intended, I say, to lay the foundation, and to subsequently build up year by year as condition required and as circumstances permitted. But to-day we are face to face with proposals made from both sides of the House involving very much more than the mere laying of a foundation. The sum of $35,000,000, which is now at issue, constitutes a serious inroad upon the financial resources of Canada, and not only this—let it be the proposition of the Government or the Opposition—it means inevitably still further trenching upon the resources of Canada. I say we are face to face to-day with proposals to enter actively, seriously, and expensively into the question of Imperial naval defence —a condition essentially different from that which prevailed two or three years ago; and the members of this Parliament will have to justify to the people of this country the position we take in asking for such large appropriations, and incurring such large prospective obligations.

I am here, Mr. Speaker, to absolutely justify the position that we have taken, both as to the amount of the present appropriation and as to the fulfilment of future obligations imposed thereby, and the consequences thereof. I am aware that the position I take is somewhat different from that hitherto adopted in the course of this debate, but the matter has been impressed upon my mind as being of the most serious importance—as being the most important matter that has come to the attention of this Parliament since I have had the honour of being a member of it, both as to the manner of present and prospective expenditure, and as well the principles underlying the several proposals relating to that expenditure. If it were possible for Canada to separate itself in some way from the rest of the world; if it were possible for Canada to protect itself by preaching peace, then such an expenditure would not be necessary. If conditions in the world to-day were as they existed one hundred years ago, such expenditure would not be necessary. But I am afraid some of our people are apt to forget that they are not living within a very few years after the battle of Waterloo. That battle occurred 100 years ago. Its consequences have to a great degree passed away, and to-day we are face to face with new conditions regarding military and naval matters such as the world has never before seen.

When the civilized nations of the earth entered upon the policy of national armament, as they did many years ago, the citizens of the British Empire, whether of the British Isles or the outlying dominions, looked upon the adoption of the principle of universal military service with somewhat careless eyes. So long as Britain held the seas, so long Britain and her dominions were safe, although the European countries might number their soldiers by millions, as they do. But that madness, if you like, which has caused the European nations to enrol their whole population as soldiers, having achieved its climax, when France, Germany, Austria, Italy, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Russia, are absolutely nations in arms, we find that instead of the idea of military dominion stopping with that, having established the nation in arms on land, forthwith they proceed to attempt to secure control of the sea, and each of these nations to-day is building a fleet to do at sea what it has already done by land. For many years the British Islands were protected by the narrow seas and the British dominions were protected by the width of the ocean, but to-day we must recognize the fact that it is merely a matter of time when the millions of men who are or who can be placed under arms in Europe at practically a moment's notice can be transported over sea as quickly and as certainly as may be necessary to carry out the will of the nation to which they belong.

There is no purpose in Canada ignoring this condition of affairs. It does absolutely exist and the question is what interest has Canada in it. I was astonished to hear the Postmaster General speak as though Canada had no direct interest in this condition of armament, of men and fleets; as though Canada in some way stood apart from the rest of the world, and that whatever danger might menace Great Britain or the United Kingdom was a matter of academic interest to Canada but did not in any material way affect Canada. Let me suggest to this House that a fleet that can sail across the North sea can sail across the Atlantic ocean, can sail around the world, and that Canada has, no guarantee of immunity from the presence of such fleets or of individual members of such fleets, and that our fair provinces by the sea, including the one which my hon. friend represents, stands in just as much danger as the British Islands themselves in case of any outbreak of war in which the British Empire is involved.

To-day in case of a declaration of war between Great Britain and any other civilized country of the world, there is nothing to hinder one small vessel, and she need not be armoured at that, from absolutely holding up the trade of Canada. There is no country in the world whose trade can be as easily blocked as that of Canada, and when my hon. friends opposite sneer at the idea of the tin-pot navy that the Laurier Government was going to build, even a tin-pot navy such as that could protect the commerce of Canada as it is not protected

to-day but as it must be protected somehow by somebody in case of war, if it is to continue to exist. In such case Canada will suffer as she never suffered before; as, apparently, if we may judge from the utterances of some public men, she has no idea that she is liable to suffer. Canada needs naval defence in case of war just as much as England does, and it is as essential to England that Canada shall be defended in case of war as that England shall be defended.

I have heard statements attributed to the right hon. leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in respect to this question of naval defence. I have heard him make the statement in his place in the House that when the Empire was at war Canada was at war. Such a statement does not need to be repeated but may I impress upon the minds of our friends opposite who seem to think that Canada is in no danger in case of war and that only England is in danger, that wherever the flag of the Empire floats there is danger to the Empire in case of war and loss if that flag should be pulled down. The Empire cannot afford to lose the prestige that results from the hauling down of its flag on the most remote island of the sea. The Empire, as an empire, must be defended in all its parts, or it ceases to be an empire, or at any rate, it loses prestige by such losses as may occur in that way. So I come again to the point that the responsibility for the defence of Canada is just as much a responsibility for the defence of the Empire as if it were for the defence of the county of Devon, or of the county of Kent or of the city of London, it is just as necessary for the Empire, and just as necessary for Canada. I lay stress on this, Mr. Speaker, because the suggestion has been made, and no doubt it will be repeated, and heralded through the press—we have seen indications of it in the debate already—that because we have already made, and are now making proposals for a Canadian navy, therefore, we are not showing proper loyalty to or proper consideration for the Empire. Canada is a part of the Empire. Canada is necessary to the Empire. The defence of Canada is the defence of the Empire.

I need not draw attention to the special matter in which there is an absolute community of interest. Great Britain draws a large part of her food supply from Canada. She must draw, and we hope she will draw an increasing proportion of that food supply from Canada; and it is just as necessary, in order that that food supply may be transported safely from Canada to Britain, that the shores of Canada should be protected, that the ports of Canada from which the laden ships shall sail should be protected, as that the ports of Britain, at which those laden ships shall land, should be protected. Whatever might be the case in regard to other parts of the Empire, there is no question that, so far as Canada is concerned, the protection of her coasts and ports is just as important to the maintenance of the Empire and to the security of the United Kingdom as the protection of the ports of England herself.

I said a minute ago that it was necessary to keep the flag flying wherever it floats, that wherever it was pulled down the Empire would suffer a loss of prestige. I want to bring this matter home as closely as possible to our friends opposite, and I do not think anybody will deny that the case, as I present it, is absolutely according to fact. We will assume that there is a great combination of European powers, that they are able to give more or less successful battle on the North sea or on the North Atlantic to the British navy. In the meantime, it has been possible for this combination of powers, by the use of a trifling number of warships, to absolutely blockade the seaports of Canada, to practically control Canada, to land men in Canada, to occupy Canada, to take Quebec and Montreal. I ask my hon. friend the Postmaster General to-day what is to hinder it? Supposing such a thing took place, supposing there was an effective occupation of a part of Canada, the part in which my hon. friend the Postmaster General lives, the part in which my other friend Mr. Bourassa circulates his views chiefly, in which he preaches the doctrine that there should be no preparation for military or naval defence; supposing that that part of the country were occupied by hostile troops from the continent of Europe, supposing that the prospective battle in the North sea resulted unfavourably to the British navy, and supposing there was a settlement of the terms as between Great Britain and that combination of European powers, I ask my hon. friends what would likely take place? I ask them if they realize just how much interest Canada would have in that transaction?

Mr. PELLETIER: That is in the event of England being defeated in the North sea?

Mr. OLIVER: Exactly. Supposing it became necessary to make terms. What are those overcrowded countries of Europe looking for but a place for their surplus population, where they can build up trade for themselves, where they can establish their own institutions, where they can strengthen themselves overseas as Britain has been strengthened overseas? I ask our anti-militarist friends in Canada if it is not an absolute certainty that under such conditions, Canada would pass from the control of the British Empire to the con-

trol of the successful one of those European powers? We are apt to shut our eyes to the possibilities that are around us, but we have seen within the past two months just such transactions take place, or, at any rate, they are in process of taking place to-day. Out of a condition from which no one suspected that anything would arise, the fact emerges that delegates are meeting to-day to apportion conquered territory. And so, assuming the possibility of such an occurrence as I have suggested, in my mind there is nothing more certain than that Canada would be the prize that would go to the victor. Do my hon. friends think that such a thing is not possible? They have used the name of Germany as the great possible aggressor against Britain. Do they think that Germany, if she should happen to be in that combination that I have supposed, and was successful against Britain and her fleet, would not wish to become owner and control this Dominion of Canada? Do they think that because they happen to belong to another race that they would not fall under German dominion, supposing such a thing took place? If they have any ideas on this subject, let them recall Alsace and Lorraine, the prize of a successful war, and let them figure to themselves whether Canada would not be just as fair a prize, or whether Canada would not, in absolute fact, be the prize for which those fleets would contend in the North sea if ever such a terrible event should take place.

Mr. PELLETIER. That is quite possible.

Mr. OLIVER: It is what I wanted to bring to the mind of my hon. friend.

Mr. PELLETIER: Then Great Britain will have been defeated in the North sea?

Mr. OLIVER: Precisely.

Mr. PELLETIER: The moment the British fleet is defeated there, the British Empire goes.

Mr. OLIVER: Surely there is no reasonable probability that the United Kingdom can be conquered and kept by any other power or combination of powers any more than France was kept because she was conquered by Germany. But a price was taken for the conclusion of peace. In the settlement of matters after a war has taken place, possession is ten points of the law and the victorious power which holds possession of territory at the negotiation of peace retains that territory after the conclusion of peace. It is not too much to say perhaps that it has been exactly on that principle that the British Empire has been spread around and around the world. What has been done may be done again. What I am trying to impress upon the House is the absolute necessity of Canada, as a part of the British Empire, and in the interest of the British Empire, providing for her own defence to the limit of her ability.

Mr. PELLETIER: In the event of the defeat of Great Britain on the North sea, say, by the Germany navy, to carry out my hon. friend's argument to its legitimate end, Canada would need a navy strong enough to defeat the German navy which had defeated Great Britain's navy.

Mr. BELAND: What about occupation?

Mr. PELLETIER: How can we prevent occupation if we have not the strongest, and greatest navy in the world?

Mr. OLIVER: If my hon. friend has read the papers giving an account of the war in the Balkan peninsula, he will have seen that the four allied powers have systematically gone on the principle that what they were able to capture before the negotiations for peace began they were entitled to hold in accordance with the terms of peace. What I am trying to impress upon my hon. friend is that it is up to Canada to prevent the occupation of Canadian territory, so that, whatever may occur, in the first place, Canada will have done her share in the maintenance of the Empire, and, in the next place, Canada will not be the prize that will have to go to the victorious country if, unfortunately, such a case should occur. I am for the British Empire in defeat or victory, for I believe that Canada's destiny can best be worked out in accordance with the ideals upon which the British Empire has, up to the present time, been built and upon which we hope it will continue to grow.

I have listened—I must say I have not listened with pleasure—to the repetition and repetition and repetition of suggestions of the discreditable character of the late Government's proposals with regard to naval defence; to the allusions to that proposal as a tin-pot navy and as an ineffectual means of securing a measure of naval defence. It has even been suggested that the fact of the limited character of this measure of defence was due actually to disloyalty to the Empire. And again it is suggested to-day that the proposal now before the House, to provide for two fleet units on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts respectively, is of no value at all because these two fleet units are not sufficient to defeat the German, or the French, or some other European navy. Now, let me get my position before the House by instancing a parallel case. We have the little countries of Belgium, Holland and Denmark lying alongside of the great German Empire, and one of them adjoining the great republic of France. As many soldiers can be put under arms

in the two countries of France and Germany as the whole population of any of these three countries. Is that a reason to these countries why they shall not arm their population? Do you not find in Belgium, Holland and Denmark——

Mr. LEMIEUX: And in Switzerland.

Mr. OLIVER—and in Switzerland, identically the same provision for universal military service as in France and Germany? Is it true that the people of Belgium, or Denmark or Holland, do not know what they are doing or why they are doing it? I do not think that the people in these countries need to come to us for instruction in regard to military matters. The reason of their doing as they do is this: In the first place in establishing universal military service amongst their own population they are providing a first line of defence and, in the second place, they are providing a foundation upon which an alliance may be made with some other country, thereby securing a combination strong enough to give them protection. What is common sense for Belgium, Holland, Denmark and Switzerland, is surely just as good common sense for Canada and it is just as much the business of Canada to provide a first line of defence on land and on sea, now that the question of sea power has come to the front, as it is for Belgium, or Holland, or Denmark, to do the same. If Canada does not make such provision, Canada is not doing her duty by herself or by the Empire. Let us take our own case. We are keeping up here a militia force and not only a militia force, but a force of regular soldiers. We are alongside a country of a hundred million people; we cannot, by any stretch of imagination expect to put under arms enough men to withstand a premeditated onslaught in war by that hundred millions of people to the south of us and still, from year to year, we spend money on a militia force. We are training men and providing arms and equipment of all kinds; and we take some pride in our militia and military forces generally, and we desire to see them brought up to the highest possible point of efficiency.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria): Does the hon. member know what the relative proportion of men in the field, in the war of 1812, was between Canada and Great Britain on the one hand and the United States on the other?

Mr. OLIVER: I do not know the exact proportion, at this moment.

Mr. HUGHES (Victoria): I may say that it was one Britisher and Canadian against 43 on the other side.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not think that has any bearing on the case. I am very glad, however, to know that our predecessors in this country, our forefathers in the case of some of us, were such excellent fighters; and I only hope if the day of trouble should come, that our people of the present day would acquit themselves as well as did those men of 1812. At the same time I think the minister takes a rather optimistic view; and I would again say that we are keeping up this militia force; we are spending this money, not in the expectation of withstanding a premeditated onslaught from the United States, but for the purpose of providing a first line of defence; and we would be doing less than our duty to ourselves and less than our duty to the Empire, if we did not make that reasonable provision. Now to come back again to my first position, conditions having arisen that constitute sea power as much a necessity for the protection of the Empire as land power used to be, it is our business to provide a first line of defence in sea power, just as it is in land power, even if it does cost us this large amount of money to do it. If we do not do it, we are not doing ourselves or the Empire credit.

I just want to say further, that I believe that this preparation should be made, because of the obligation that we owe to ourselves and to the Empire as we stand to-day; and should not be made contingent upon the establishment of some other relationship, in regard to which no man can give any idea as to what it will be or when it will take place. I ask my hon. friends who speak of introducing a permanent naval policy, when and after they have secured the establishment of satisfactory Imperial relations, will the fleets and armies of the militant nations of Europe wait their convenience and until they have made those satisfactory arrangements? It would seem to me that that is their view; but my view is that we should recognize practical conditions as they actually exist, make our preparations accordingly to meet those conditions, and depend on the future to take care of the question of inter-Imperial relations, just as the past has done; and I believe it will do it satisfactorily. I will go further and say that, in my humble opinion, the suggestion to defer preparation by Canada for taking her proper part in Imperial naval defence, until some arrangement in regard to inter-Imperial government is made, is a suggestion which is not founded upon loyalty to the Empire; but is dictated by party exigency, the result of disloyalty to the Empire.

I was somewhat struck by the promise held out by the right hon. the Prime Minister, that when the dreadnoughts that we are to provide for were built we would have the privilege of having them officered

by Canadians. Later on, he told us it would take from twenty-five to fifty years to establish a navy in Canada. It would take from twenty-five to fifty years, not surely to build ships? We could surely build them in less time than that, but I presume to train men is what he meant, and particularly to train officers. He told us we could not get men in Canada; but he tells us that we can provide officers for those dreadnoughts that are to be built in Britain. Now I would hesitate to characterize the suggestion coming from such a source. Was the hon. gentleman trifling with the intelligence of the members of the House when he threw out such a suggestion, which he himself contradicted. I think in all fairness and with all due deference, that the House has not been treated fairly by the right hon. gentleman on this question. We are told that we cannot build ships in Canada; we cannot find men in Canada; we cannot train men in Canada. On the other hand, he tells us that the Admiralty can build ships in Canada, providing Canadians will pay the extra cost. Really I cannot imagine a more humiliating position to be taken by the leader of a party, no, by the leader of the Government of this country of Canada. Surely his party exigencies were pressing him very strongly when he was compelled to make such an answer to the people of this country.

I do not wish to introduce controversial matters into this debate; but they have been introduced by members who have spoken on the other side; they have given an interpretation to our acts and our position on the other side, and may I be permitted to return the compliment. May I be permitted to say—I am sure, Mr. Speaker, you will call me to order if I trespass—that, in my hunmble judgment, the proposal to provide money for the building of empty dreadnoughts to be handed over to the Government of Great Britain, is a policy inspired not by the interests of Canada, and not even so much by political exigency in Canada, as by political exigency in Great Britain, and is put forward at the instigation of the Tory Opposition in England for the purpose of discrediting the Liberal Government of that country.

There is a remarkable community of interest between the two sides of the Atlantic on this question. We have heard to-day from the First Lord of the Admiralty that Britain is equal to the occasion on the shores of Britain against all comers. But we have heard and seen in the newspapers the assertions repeated, and repeated, by the Unionist party that the Liberal Government of Great Britain was not making adequate preparation for the conditions as they exist, that they should have greater naval expenditure, that they should have more dreadnoughts. And, by arrangement with our friends on the other side of the House, conveniently but unfortunately at the present time directing the affairs of Canada, forthwith Canada comes forward and says to the British Government: You do not know your business; you are not providing adequately for the defence of the Empire; we are going to help provide for you. Thus they attempt to discredit the Liberal Government of Great Britain for the benefit of their Tory Unionist allies.

Mr. PELLETIER : That is pretty hard on the Liberal Government of England.

Mr. OLIVER : No, I do not think it is.

Mr. HAZEN : They ask to be discredited.

Mr. OLIVER : My hon. friend (Mr. Hazen) will not find anywhere any word from the Government of Great Britain asking for anything. In all they have sent, what we read is that they asked to be left alone, that they are equal to the occasion as it arises, and they suggest to us that we shall meet the occasion as it arises to meet us. But we do not do that. Under the leadership of our friends on the other side, we do not attend to our own business. On the contrary, they tell us that we do not know enough in this country to build ships, that we have not patriotism enough or men enough to man them. But we know more about the needs of the heart of the Empire than the men who are charged with the responsibility of conducting those affairs, and we come to their rescue ostensibly, but for the purpose of discrediting them as far as possible.

Mr. PELLETIER : And the idea of my hon. friend is that the Asquith Government is not cute enough to see that ?

Mr. HAZEN : They fell into the trap.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not see that there is anything the British Government could do that would prevent my hon. friends from doing what they have done.

Mr. PELLETIER: I found them more intelligent than that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You have not fooled them—be sure of that.

Mr. PELLETIER: The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) says we have.

Mr. OLIVER: Not at all—I never made such a statement.

Mr. GRAHAM: You offered them something, and they are willing to take it.

Mr. OLIVER: Certainly, but they are careful to say that they never asked you for it and they do not want it.

Mr. HAZEN: Curious that Mr. Asquith should say that he was going to take an

opportunity of thanking Canada for its action.

Mr. OLIVER: He would have to be polite—certainly. In discussing, a few minutes ago, the duty of Canada to provide a first line of defence by land and sea, I forgot to mention that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, in his presentation of the case to the House, informed us that, as a possible result of the presenting of the three dreadnoughts to Great Britain, the flag that has disappeared from the shores of Canada would be replaced by Britain sending vessels to these shores—which vessels, I presume, would be a duplicate of the 'tin-pot navy' that the Laurier Government was going to provide. Which is to say, they are going to send vessels that would form a first line of defence, just as the Laurier Government would have provided. But it was only a 'tin-pot navy' and discreditable if provided by the Laurier Government, but is to be regarded as the height of Imperial statesmanship if done by the Imperial Government. Now, I protest against this drawing of distinctions between Canada and the United Kingdom, between Canada and the Empire. I take the position that what is for the naval and military protection of one part of the Empire is for the naval and military protection of all parts; and I want, further, to protest against the suggestion that has been made, by inference if not by words, that loyalty to Canada is disloyalty to the Empire. On this side of the House we take no second place to our friends on the other side in the matter of loyalty to the Empire. But we say that Canada is a part of the Empire and that loyalty to Canada is loyalty to the Empire.

In regard to this matter of contribution: Canada is rich. We have an abundance of revenue. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries told us that we could pay this contribution out of our surplus this year. That is very gratifying. But he did not tell us how many more contributions would be expected of us before that wonderful permanent naval policy would be adopted. I cannot imagine that, if the adoption of this permanent policy is to be deferred as long as there is every prospect of it being deferred, the needs of the Empire, which are increasing from year to year, will not, in reason, call for further contributions from Canada. And I ask hon. gentlemen to say to this House and this country what their intention is in that regard. I see that their newspapers, their ultra-loyal newspapers are proclaiming that their proposal of a $35,000,000 grant is cheaper for Canada than the proposal that has been made on this side of the House. Is that the ground upon which they are going to justify it? We want to know, we are entitled to know, whether they take the ground that this $35,000,000 is a settlement in full or only an instalment of the claim. I take it for granted—and I am entitled to take it for granted—that it is not a payment in full, but that it is only what it purports to be, a contribution on account; that it is, as my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) said, the beginning of a permanent policy.

Now, how does he justify this contribution? Some hon. gentlemen on the other side say that this $35,000,000 is made to save the Empire from ruin. My right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) did not say so, but, if I understood his remarks correctly, he said this $35,000,000 was to be put up by Canada as a token of her loyalty to the Empire, and was expected to have the effect of deterring other nations from competing with the Empire in matters of naval defence. In other words, we are putting up this $35,000,000, as a bluff to the world. I think this is a fair conclusion to draw from the remarks of hon. gentlemen on the other side; but I want to say it is a conclusion not big enough and not good enough. $35,000,000 will not bluff the nations of the world that are arming to-day by sea as they have already armed by land. If it is intended that Canada is to continue to make contributions in order to keep up the bluff, I say, that with all regard to Canada's riches, Canada's prospects and Canada's loyalty, that the contract is too large even for a country such as ours. In opposition to that suggestion we propose the establishment of naval defence for Canada according to Canada's needs and possibilities—not as a result of any scare; not as a matter of emergency, but as Canada's duty to herself and to the Empire, carried out without bargaining as to conditions of control of Imperial foreign policy.

This policy of a contribution is absolutely contrary to the principles advocated by both parties in this country ever since Confederation, and I would like to point out wherein it seems to present a great danger to Canada and to the Empire. We are to-day gathering immigrants from many countries of the world—they are coming in by the hundred thousand. The Department of the Interior reports that during the past year our population has by immigration increased by about 400,000 people. Some of these people are from the British Islands, but the large majority are from other countries—very many of them from the United States; very many of them from these warlike countries of Europe. When they come to Canada it is our business to plant in their minds the principle of loyalty to Canada and to the Empire. That is our duty, and it is the only way in which we can preserve Canada's present condition and sustain her progress.

It is a fundamental principle of our political institutions that there shall not be taxation without representation; that there is not and shall not be payment of tribute. Having come in contact with many of these immigrants, I have found that one of the very first questions they ask is: 'What is the amount of taxation that Canada pays to Great Britain?' I have been asked that question by many immigrants from the United States, many of them fully believing that we did pay tribute to Great Britain, and I have been asked the same question by emigrants from the continent of Europe. I was able to say to them, however, that Canada pays no tribute to Great Britain, that Canada's connection with Great Britain costs her not one cent; that Canada pays no money that she does not absolutely control. That is the first question that comes to the lips of many of those emigrants, and when we are made to answer it as we have been doing up to the present time, we establish in their minds, by that means and at that moment, a gratification and satisfaction with Canadian conditions and British institutions which is the first step towards their establishment as loyal Canadians and loyal Britishers. But if we have to tell them after the Government's Bill passes, that Canada does pay tribute to Great Britain; that Canada is now paying tribute to Great Britain for naval protection, we are deprived of the strong position we have hitherto held. Hon. gentlemen are taking very long chances on the future of Canada when they introduce that practice into our country.

It is urged on both sides of the House as against this proposal that it involves the idea of separation of Canada from the Empire, and that suggestion is largely based on the provision contained in the Naval Act providing for control by Parliament of the Canadian navy. Who should control a navy paid for by Canada and manned by Canada, except the Canadian Parliament? Do hon. gentlemen say that control by the Parliament of Canada of that which has been provided by Canada and belongs to her, indicates separation from the Empire? What is our position in regard to our military forces, which are in an absolutely parallel position to the naval forces? Does anybody suggest that the Parliament of Canada should not absolutely control the Canadian military forces? Did anybody ever suggest anything but that? What is the condition to-day in regard to the military forces of Canada? I will take the liberty of reading to the House something which bears on the matter, for I think there has been no subject upon which there has been greater misrepresentation, and I will go so far as to say greater wilful misrepresentation, than on this matter.

Mr. OLIVER

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is going a little too far.

Mr. OLIVER: I do not wish to trepass upon the rules of the House, and I absolutely withdraw the expression.

Mr. SPEAKER: To say that a thing is wilfully done is unparliamentary.

Mr. OLIVER: I absolutely withdraw any reference. The Naval Service Act of 1910, this separatist proposal, this proposal that has been declared to be evidence of disloyalty on the part of the Government, contained this provision:

Section 22. The Governor in Council may place the naval forces or any part thereof, on active service at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of an emergency.

And the Militia Act says, in Section 69:

The Governor in Council may place the militia, or any part thereof, in active service anywhere in Canada, and also beyond Canada, for the defence thereof——

For the defence of Canada only, you will observe.

—at any time when it appears advisable so to do by reason of emergency.

In section 23 of the Naval Service Act it says:

In case of an emergency the Governor in Council may place at the disposal of His Majesty, for general service in the Royal navy the Naval Service or any part thereof, any ships or vessels of the Naval Service, and the officers or seamen serving in such ships or vessels, or any officers or seamen belonging to the Naval Service.

And in section 24:

Whenever the Governor in Council places the Naval Service or any part on active service, as provided in the two preceding sections, if Parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall issue for a meeting of Parliament within fifteen days, and Parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

The Militia Act says:

Whenever the Governor in Council places the militia, or any part thereof, on active service, if Parliament is then separated by such adjournment or prorogation as will not expire within ten days, a proclamation shall be issued for the meeting of Parliament within fifteen days, and Parliament shall accordingly meet and sit upon the day appointed by such proclamation, and shall continue to sit and act in like manner as if it had stood adjourned or prorogued to the same day.

And in section 72:

In time of war, when the militia is called out for active service to serve conjointly with

His Majesty's forces, His Majesty may place in command thereof a senior general officer of his regular army.

The provisions of the Militia Act have been on the Statute Books for many years, I suppose since Confederation, and they are absolutely identical, so far as circumstances wil permit, with the provisions of the Naval Act. The provisions of the Naval Act were intended to be absolutely of like effect with those of the Militia Act and they are absolutely of like effect but the same men who were satisfied with the provisions of the Militia Act, who could see no separatist idea in those provisions, when they came to the Naval Service Act could see all kinds of treason and separatist ideas in identically the same provisions.

You have prevented me, Sir, from giving my opinion of the gentlemen who argue from these standpoints. You have prevented me expressing my opinion of men, either in or out of Parliament, who would use such arguments based on such facts. I leave the facts to the consideration of the public and I believe that when the public are acquainted with those facts they they will hold identically the same opinion as I do in regard to the men who make such statements

Mr. SPEAKER : I wish to correct the hon. member. My ruling did not refer to what he might characterize as men in or outside of the House. It referred only to members of the House. The hon. member, who is an old parliamentarian, will agree that the rule is laid down very clearly that it is not permissible to say that a member wilfully and purposely did an improper thing. That is all I referred to, the rule that controls members of Parliament in the discharge of their duties here.

Mr. OLIVER : I did withdraw, and I wish to be understood as absolutely withdrawing any such wording and to say that I thoroughly desire to support you, Sir, in preventing the use of improper allusions in the House. I think you have taken a very proper course on the occasions which have come to my notice, and I wish in every way to conform to your ruling.

The other night my hon. friend the Postmaster General resurrected a Bill—I am rather in danger of trespassing again, but you have heard of course of those people who dig around in graveyards and what they are called and what opinion people hold of them. He by some means had got possession of a document which purported to be, and which he desired to place before the country as the matured opinion of the late Government in favour of naval conscription. I need not traverse the ground; there never was such a Bill. No such Bill ever received the approval of the late Government; so far as I know, as a member of that Government, it never received consideration at the hands of the late Government, and if it ever did receive consideration, inevitably under all the circumstances it would have been rejected by the late Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX : It was a dead-letter.

Mr. OLIVER : But my hon. friend desires to alarm the people of the country by the word 'conscription.' He desired them to understand that this was a new idea that was going to be brought upon them by this villainous Liberal party if they ever were given another chance. There is no manner of doubt that the Postmaster General knew that on the Statute Book, in the Militia Act, section 10, there is a provision not only for conscription but for a levy en masse of the people of Canada, not only those above 18 years of age, but even those under 18 years of age. Section 10 reads :

All the male inhabitants of Canada, of the age of 18 years and upwards, and under 60, not exempt or disqualified by law and being British subjects, shall be liable to serve in the militia.

I hope my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue will listen to this:

Provided that the Governor General may require all the male inhabitants of Canada, capable of bearing arms to serve in the case of a levée en masse.

Subsection 2 makes this further provision:

Nothing in this section shall prevent any male inhabitant of Canada under the age of 18 years enlisting as a bugler, trumpter or drummer.

So we have had in Canada for sixty years a provision whereby every male citizen of Canada, between the years of eighteen and sixty, may be called upon to do military service, and my hon. friend, with that section on the statute book, undertook to create the impression in the minds of the people of this country that the late Government had in mind the introducing of a new principle into the administration of military or naval affairs in this country. Again, Mr. Speaker, I shall not attempt to characterize such an attitude. In order, however, that there shall be no misapprehension, I desire to say that the Naval Service Act does not make provision for conscription, that it never was a part of the policy of the late Government that there should be conscription, and that it is the belief, I take the liberty of saying, of those who were members of the late Government, and of their followers in this House, that there is not now, and never shall be the need of conscription in connection with the Naval Service of Canada. There are enough Canadians to man a Canadian navy. But

they tell us that we were not able to man the Rainbow and the Niobe. We were able to man the Rainbow and the Niobe, but they were not able to keep them manned.

Mr. STEVENS: With what did you man them? With British seamen, imported.

Mr. OLIVER: The Rainbow and the Niobe were manned under the administration of the late Government, and the commonsense reason why the present Government have not been able to keep them manned is that they proclaimed to the world that they intended to abolish the so-called tin-pot navy, and no man is going to enlist in such a service, unless he has the assurance of permanence of employment.

Mr. STEVENS: They never were manned.

Mr. GRAHAM: The report says they were.

Mr. OLIVER: They certainly are not manned now, and no Government could expect them to be manned under the conditions that have governed them during the administration of the present Government. I would certainly say that it would be a bad thing for Canada, and for any naval service that should ever be organized in Canada, if it were to be under the control of a government constituted and supported as this Government is, with one part of their membership and support absolutely pledged against the Canadian navy, and pledged to repeal the Act, and the other part of their support prepared to go to any length to discredit the policy of their predecessors, even though it meant injury to the Empire and to Canada.

There was no part of the addresses delivered by my hon. friends on the other side of the House that attracted my attention more than their protests against partisanship in dealing with this question. The mire of partisanship, I think my hon. friend the member from North Essex called it, and he said he protested against it most strongly. Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is any reason why members of Parliament, elected as members of political parties, elected as partisans, and by partisans, should protest against partisanship, or be ashamed of it. I do not know that there is anything discreditable in being a member or a supporter of a political party, that is, as I understand political parties, and partisanship. My understanding may of course be different from theirs, but my understanding is that a political party stands for certain principles, that the support of that party is the support of those principles, and is something that is absolutely creditable to the men who believe in the principles; that it is elevating, and not degrading, and that it is absolutely necessary to the honest carrying on of the government of our country. The men who are protesting against partisanship are the men who—I may be trespassing, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure you will call me to order if I am—the men who in my humble judgment have sacrificed loyalty to partisanship on the one hand, and what they were pleased to call their principles to partisanship on the other. Well, perhaps I should not say partisanship alone; I should say office as well as partisanship. I do not think that on this side of the House we have to take any lesson from our friends on the other side in the matter of dealing with this or any other question from the standpoint of the public interest. We believe that it is the maintenance of the principles of Liberalism as applied to the conditions of Canada and to the conditions of the Empire that will bring the greatest measure of success to both Canada and the Empire.

The House will perhaps permit me, Mr. Speaker, not to digress, but to make a personal allusion in this connection. Some of the speakers on the other side have made more or less covert allusions to myself and to the fact that on the conclusion of the address of my right hon. friend the Premier, I remained in my seat while the House generally stood and sang 'God Save the King.'

I have been made the subject of very unfavourable comment by the newspapers supporting hon. gentlemen because of my action on that occasion and the suggestion has been made that I did not show proper respect to the National Anthem by not rising in my place when it was sung. May I be pardoned if I say that there is no man in this House or out of it who believes more thoroughly in the propriety of doing honour in the proper and accustomed form to the National Anthem whenever and wherever it is sung as a national anthem than I. But, permit me to say that when the National Anthem is sung not as a national anthem, but as a partisan demonstration, by partisans, on a partisan occasion, and for a partisan purpose, it is those who are singing the National Anthem who are showing disrespect and not the man who refuses to join in that disrespect. When my hon. friend concluded his remarks it was desirable from the party point of view, maliciously prearranged by the whips of the party—I am given to understand——

An hon. MEMBER: Maliciously?

Mr. OLIVER: I say maliciously.

Mr. STANFIELD: What about Thursday?

Mr. OLIVER: I am coming to that—maliciously arranged by the whips of the party in order to create a false impression in this country and across the ocean as to the unanimity of the reception of the proposals of the Premier that, on that side of the House, they should rise to sing the National Anthem, thereby compelling, by the ordinary procedure that takes place in this country when the National Anthem is sung, those on this side to join and thereby appear to show agreement with the proposals of the Premier——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Mr. Speaker——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. OLIVER: Wait until I get through.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: If I have the hon. gentleman's permission——

Mr. OLIVER: Wait until I make my statement and I will answer any question that anyone desires to ask me. But, I wish to finish this statement. It was desirable that the impression should be telegraphed throughout Canada and across the ocean the House unanimously supported the proposals of the Premier and in order that there might be some foundation for telegraphing that impression, I say it was maliciously arranged by the whips of the party on the other side to start the National Anthem in order that they might thereby serve their party ends.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: Do I understand from the hon. gentleman's explanation that it was under compulsion that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House also sang God Save the King?

Mr. OLIVER: Not at all; I am speaking for myself. I have been made the subject of most unfair comment by the friends of hon. gentlemen and I say that they deliberately did what they did in the hope that they would have not only one, but that they might have more members on this side of the House that they might have the opportunity of attacking as I have been attacked.

Mr. WILCOX: Was it any more malicious upon the part of the members on the Government side of the House to rise and sing 'God Save the King' when the Prime Minister introduced his proposals than it was malicious upon the part of the members of the Opposition to rise and sing 'God Save the King' when the leader of the opposition introduced his policy?

Mr. OLIVER: I am speaking for myself.

An hon. MEMBER: Answer.

Mr. OLIVER: I will answer all right. I am speaking for myself, making a personal statement of the reasons why I did as I did and I want to repeat that, in my humble judgment it was not I who showed disrespect to the National Anthem but it was those who misused the 'National Anthem' on that occasion. With regard to what the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Wilcox) wishes to know, I do not pretend to justify the misuse of the 'National Anthem' whether it be on that side of the House or on the other.

An. hon. MEMBER: What did you stand up for?

Mr. OLIVER: I stood up because I agreed with the proposition as it came from this side of the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER: I did it because I agreed with the proposition as it came from this side of the House and by standing up I was not causing any misrepresentation of opinion to go out to the country. But, if I had stood up when the right hon. gentleman's proposal was made I would have assisted in giving out a wrong impression as to the opinions of the members of this House with regard to that proposal. I recognize that the singing of the 'National Anthem' is a proper expression of the feelings of the loyal people of Canada whenever it is sung under circumstances that will permit of that expression being given, but again I say that, when it is sung as the anthem of a political party, it thereby and, to that extent, ceases to be a national anthem and becomes a party anthem.

Now, my hon. friends have made a great deal of political capital against my humble self in this matter. They are welcome to all the capital they can make. I have been in public life for a matter of nearly thirty years. I have held the confidence of my friends and neighbours during the greater part of that period. Many of them will bear witness that I do not have to ask any member of this House for a certificate as to my loyalty to Canadian institutions or to the British Empire. I am aware that the possibility of my having retained the good will and confidence of my friends and neighbours during so many years has not been because of brilliant ability, for nobody is more thoroughly aware of his own shortcomings than I am myself, but if I have held the confidence of the people of Edmonton, it is because they knew, by the experience of thirty years, that they could depend on me to stand for the principles that I be-

lieve in under all circumstances, under all conditions and in the face of any amount of misrepresentation no matter from whence it came.

In regard to this matter of party, I have said that I think it comes with ill grace from members of this House to decry party. Let me say that I think there was nothing that tended to discredit the late Government in the country so much as the claim on the part of our friends on the other side and of their friends in the country, that there was not any difference between the two parties. That, I think, was fatal to us. I believe that the defence which our friends on the other side make to every accusation that is made against them now, namely, that their practice is the same as ours, would be just as fatal to us, if it could be proven. The contention that there was no difference in principle then and that there is no difference in practice now, was untrue then and it is untrue now, and on no subject was there or is there a wider difference of principle than on this question that is now before the House. We are prepared to stand or fall by our principles and by our record, but we do not want to be subject to condemnation as being in any way responsible for either the principles or the record of our friends on the other side.

Let me point out in as few words as I may, what strikes me as the differences to-day between these two parties in regard to the question before the House: the difference between contribution and co-operation; between temporizing and decision; between humiliation and self-respect; between hiring naval protection and providing it; between contributing to the Imperial naval forces where they are strongest, and strengthening them where they are weakest; between making an appeal that is to be justified to one section of the people on the ground of Imperial loyalty, and to another section on the ground of Imperial disloyalty, and making an appeal to Canadians of all sections of all races to bear their fair share of the increasing burden of Imperial naval defence; between the traditional Tory policy of Canadian sectionalism and the traditional Liberal policy of a united Canada; between a proposal dictated by party exigency, that its maker does not dare defend except as a temporary expedient, and a policy based on and in accordance with the traditions and principles upon which the British Empire is founded, and by which it is and only can be maintained; between a policy which belittles and weakens Canada in the eyes of the Empire, and the Empire in the eyes of the world, by saying that, for a period to which no limit has been put Canada will only defend the Empire or herself at sea to the amount of $35,000,000 of borrowed dollars—and a policy by which Canadian industry, second to none; Canadian sea-faring skill, second to none; Canadian courage and loyalty, second to none; by which Canada her very self shares in the Empire's defence, and in upholding the standards of British liberty, British justice and British fair play in the face of the world.

On motion of Mr. Stanfield the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers House adjourned at 12.30 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, December 18, 1912.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

PUBLIC SERVICE INQUIRY.

Right Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): I desire to lay upon the table of the House the report of Sir George Murray, who undertook to inquire into certain matters committed to his charge by Order in Council passed on the 7th day of October last. In order that the House may understand the scope of the investigation, I shall read the Order in Council under which Sir George Murray discharged the duties assigned to him:

The Committee of the Privy Council have had under consideration a report under date of the 30th September, 1912, from the right hon. the Prime Minister, in which he observes that he has engaged the Right Honourable Sir George Murray, G.C.B., to undertake an inquiry into certain matters affecting the operation of the Civil Service Acts, the organization of the public service and the methods of administration under which the public business of Canada is carried on; and that Sir George Murray has arrived in Ottawa and has commenced the consideration of the matters aforesaid.

The Prime Minister further reports that the time which Sir George Murray will be able to spend in this country will be somewhat limited, and that it is desirable to define the scope of the inquiry upon which he is to engage.

The Prime Minister recommends that his action in engaging the Right Honourable Sir George Murray be confirmed, and that he be requested to give such consideration as may be possible within the time at his disposal to the following subjects and to report thereon:—

1. The methods employed in the transaction of public business.

2. The control of appropriations and expenditure.

3. The administrative methods and operations of the chief spending departments, including:—

(a) the manner in which appointments to the public service are made;
(b) the manner in which promotions within it are made;
(c) the manner in which retirements are effected;
(d) the classification of the staff and the distribution of duties in each department and the duplication of the same or similar work in two or more departments;
(e) the distribution of the work between the several departments or authorities.

4. Generally the manner in which the public business of the Dominion is administered.

The Prime Minister further recommends that for the purpose aforesaid the Right Honourable Sir George Murray, G.C.B., be appointed a commisisoner under the provisions of the Inquiries Act, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, chapter 104, with all the powers conferred by the said statute, and that a commission do issue to him accordingly.

RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

As pointed out in the Order in Council, the time at the disposal of Sir George Murray for his service was somewhat limited, owing to his engagements in Great Britain. He was able, however, to devote several weeks to the work, and I am personally aware that in the discharge of his duties he exhibited very great energy and industry, and it is needless to say that his marked ability and long experience should render his report of great service to Parliament and to the Government.

On motion of Mr. Borden it was ordered that the report should be printed forthwith

Mr. LEMIEUX: If there are any very radical changes suggested in the report of Sir George Murray, would my right hon. friend outline them?

Mr. BORDEN: I really have not studied the report sufficiently to enable me to do that at a moment's notice. It has just been printed, and I hasten to place it on the table of the House so that it may be available to hon. members during the recess.

DRY-DOCKS.

Mr. HAZEN: I desire to lay on the table of the House plans included in the tender of Cammell, Laird & Co., in connection with the construction of dry-docks for the Canadian Naval Service. These are the only plans asked for by the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) that are in the Department of Naval Service or Marine and Fisheries. The other documents must be in some other department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I thought my hon. friend would communicate that request to any other department in which the plans might be found. Is my hon. friend willing to do that?

Mr. HAZEN: Yes.

NATURALIZATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. CURRIE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 50, to amend the Naturalization Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. CURRIE: This Bill proposes some changes in the Act relating to the voting of aliens at elections. It provides that the alien must speak the English or the French language and forswear his allegiance to a foreign country. In this respect it follows the American practice.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

LORD'S DAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. VERVILLE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 51, to amend the Lord's Day Act. He said: This Bill has the effect of amending the present Act in so far as it prevents musicians from playing in sacred concerts or at funerals, &c., on Sunday. In Winnipeg it seems they have not so far been prosecuted, but they have been threatened with prosecution if receiving any salary for playing on such occasions on Sunday. The Bill also provides for a holiday once a week for cooks and waiters in hotels and restaurants.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—W. F. TYE'S SERVICES.

* Mr. MURPHY:

1. On what date did Mr. W. F. Tye's services begin in connection with the work for which these services were secured by the Transcontinental Railway Investigating Commissioner?
2. What amount has been paid Mr. Tye for services and expenses respectively up to December 10, 1912?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Mr. Tye's services commenced on September 18, 1912.
2. No amount has yet been paid Mr. Tye for his services or expenses.

EMPLOYMENT OF ADOLPHE LANDRY.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Antigonish):

1. Was Mr. Adolphe Landry, now of Amherst, appointed by the Department of Railways and Canals, and did he act as super-

intendent or inspector of the work connected with Station street and grounds at Amherst railway station on the Intercolonial railway? If so, how long was he employed, at what salary or wages, and what was the total sum paid to him for his services?

2. Is the said Adolphe Landry the same person who is said to be employed in the office of the law firm of Mr. E. N. Rhodes, M.P., for Cumberland county, N.S., or articled law student in the office of the said E. N. Rhodes, M.P.?

3. During the period of his employment, if engaged by the Railway Department, did the said Adolphe Landry devote his whole time during working hours to the inspection and superintendence of the said work?

4. How long did the said work last, and is it now completed and are the services of the said Adolphe Landry dispensed with?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. (a) He was employed in the usual way as inspector. (b) Forty days. (c) $3 per day. (d) $119.60.

2. The department has no knowledge.

3. Yes.

4. The work lasted during the months of May, June and July and when the work was completed the services of Mr. Landry were dispensed with.

ACTING MINISTER OF JUSTICE.

* Mr. KYTE:

1. Who was the acting Minister of Justice during the absence of the Hon. C. J. Doherty in England last summer?

2. On what date did the Hon. Mr. Doherty sail for England, and when did he return?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. Hon. W. T. White.

2. June 24; August 29.

REFUSAL TO ACCEPT PRISONERS.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. Has the Minister of Justice been informed as to whether, between September 26th and November 7th, A.D., 1912, there were the following named persons sentenced to imprisonment in the provincial jail at New Westminster for a breach of subsection 'J' of section 238 of the Criminal code:—Nellie Howard, Andell Warren, Bella Morrison, Dolly Wilson, Olie Simpson, Lilian Walker, Estella Vaughan, Mary Field, Silvia Leonard, Evelyn Matthews, Marjorie Dean, Margaret Walsh, Dorothy Crawford, Edna Warle, Irene Reynolds; for a breach of section 288, Mary James; and for a breach of subsection 'A' section 238 or section 228, Rosanna Paragree, Mary Scott, Mildred Hill, Florence Booth and Pearl Emery?

2. If so, has the minister been informed as to whether when the police authorities of the city of Vancouver delivered the said persons to the jail at New Westminster the jailer declined to receive them; and as to whether the authorities were informed by the jailer that he had been instructed by the Attorney General of the province of British Columbia to refuse to receive the said persons?

3. Is the minister of the opinion that, in giving such instructions, the action of the Attorney General in this respect is virtually an assumption on the part of the said Attorney General of the pardoning power?

4. Has the Minister of Justice been informed as to whether the Attorney General of British Columbia on being requested by the mayor and council of the city of Vancouver to give his reasons for refusing to have these persons committed to jail, replied that they had no room in the jail at New Westminster for such persons; and as to whether the city of Vancouver offered to supply the necessary accommodation. If so, as to whether the Attorney General then stated that he did not believe in the infliction of long terms of imprisonment for such offences as those for which these persons had been committed?

5. Is it the intention of the Minister of Justice, if the above questions are answered in the affirmative, to take the matter up with the Attorney General of British Columbia or to take any further action in the matter?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. No.

2. No.

3. The minister can express no opinion upon a state of facts of which he has no knowledge.

4. No.

5. Answered by previous question.

GUYSBOROUGH-HEATHERTON MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. Who was the contractor carrying the mails between Guysborough and Heatherton in 1911?

2. What was the rate paid per year?

3. When did the contract expire?

4. Who was employed to perform the services after the expiration of the contract, and at what rate?

5. For how many months was this temporary amount paid?

6. What is the present rate per year, and who is the contractor?

7. What is the name of each tenderer, and the amount of each tender?

8. What are the names of the sureties proposed by the tenderers?

9. Who was the lowest tenderer in each case when tenders were asked for, and what was the amount of each such lowest tender?

Mr. PELLETIER: This whole matter is still under consideration in the public interest.

CORNWALL-SUMMERSTOWN MAIL CONTRACT.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Who were the tenderers for the mail service between the towns of Cornwall and Summerstown station?

2. Who was the lowest tenderer for the contract?

3. Did the Department award the contract to the lowest tenderer? If not, why not?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. George E. Wert, J. G. Gallinger, Fred. W. Loney, Peter A. Nolan, Henry Laplante, and Louis D. Leroux.
2. J. G. Gallinger.
3. Yes.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY AND NEW HAZELTON.

Mr. MACDONALD :

1. Has any application been made to the Board of Railway Commissioners to direct the Grand Trunk Company to run its trains to New Hazelton, B.C.?
2. Was an order made by said board requiring said company to erect a station at New Hazelton?
3. Has said order been made, and are said trains running?

Mr. COCHRANE : The following information is supplied by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada :

1. Yes.
2. Yes. Order Number 16,987 made July 12th, 1912, directing the Grand Trunk Pacific railway to construct station on lot 882, group 1, Cassiar district, B.C., to be constructed and completed ready for use by public at least as soon as company's railway is opened for traffic.
3. (a) Answered by number 2. (b) board's engineer has been instructed to inspect line between South Hazelton and New Hazelton for opening for traffic. Inspection not yet made, matter being expedited, and no authority has yet been given under section 261 to run trains pending receipt of report.

ST. PETER'S CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. McKENZIE :

1. Who is the contractor for the St. Peter's channel enlargement and improvements?
2. Was the work let by tender or by contract?
3. What are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender?
4. Was the lowest tender accepted?
5. When was the contract signed?
6. What is the date for the completion of the work mentioned in the contract?
7. Will the work be completed at the time mentioned?
8. Is the work progressing with such rapidity that the department expects that it will be completed within the time specified in the contract?

Mr. COCHRANE :

1. W. H. Weller, St. Catharines, Ont.
2. The work was let by tender and contract.
3. F. D. Brown, Toronto, J. A. Aylmer, Peterboro, $427,325.00; M. Connolly, Montreal, $369,040.50; M. J. Haney, Toronto, Hugh Quinlan, Montreal, A. W. Robertson, Montreal, $395,565.00; W. H. Weller, St. Catharines, $266,887.00.
4. Yes.
5. November 17, 1911.
6. November 30, 1913.
7. No.
8. No. The execution of the work this season has been delayed by bad weather and labour difficulties.

CATTLE EXPORTS TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. ROSS :

1. How many cattle were exported from Canada to the United States in the month of November, 1912, and what was their value?
2. How many cattle were exported from the province of Ontario to the United States during the same period, and what was their value?

Mr. WHITE :

1. According to returns to Customs, 6,622 head, valued at $316,473.
2. According to returns to Customs, 4,827 head, valued at $230,169.

THE OCEAN LIMITED.

* Mr. EMMERSON :

1. Has the Department of Railways and Canals positively decided upon cancelling or discontinuing the operating of the train known as the Ocean Limited on and after the sixth day of January next, or will they continue to operate such trains during the winter months?
2. Has the Minister of Railways and Canals considered the question personally and taken into account the desirability of having continued on the Intercolonial throughout the winter months this train, which is practically the only through train exclusively operating on that railway in competition with the Canadian Pacific trains between Montreal and Halifax?
3. Has the Minister of Railways and Canals taken into consideration the fact that when the Ocean Limited train is not in operation on the Intercolonial railway a large percentage of the through traffic between Montreal and Halifax and Cape Breton and intermediate points, and vice versa, is diverted to the Canadian Pacific railway, on account of connections and for the other causes?

Mr. COCHRANE :

1. No decision has been reached by the department as to the cancelling or discontinuing the ' Ocean Limited ' after January 6th, 1913.
2. The minister is giving this question his personal consideration.
3. Yes.

IMMIGRATION OFFICERS QUEBEC.

Mr. BOULAY:

1. What are the names of the immigration officers, regular or extra, employed at the American frontier of the province of Quebec?
2. What is the salary of each of them?
3. On what dates were they appointed?
4. What is the language spoken by each of these officers?

Mr. ROCHE:

Name.	Stationed at.	Salary per Year.	Date of Appointment.	Language.
		$		
C G. Greene	Highwater	1,000	Mar. 3, 1909	English.
L. A. Gingras	"	900	Aug. 20, 1912	French.
Thos. Garceau	Coaticook	900	Nov. 1, 1912	"
P. R Thornton	"	900	" 1, 1912	English.
C. N. Boright	Mansonville	800	Jan. 12, 1912	"
B. Menard	Noyan Junction	900	April 1, 1909	French.
Jas. Demers	St. Armand	800	June 1, 1911	"
D. Neveu	Stanstead Junction	1,000	April 15, 1909	"
W. E. Huse	Beebe Junction	900	Dec. 4, 1911	English.
J. A. Aube	Comins Mills	800	Sept. 1, 1912	French.
N. E. Boisvert	St. Armand	900	July 1, 1911	"
Allan McDonald	Megantic	900	Sept. 15, 1912	English.
C. Commette	Lacolle Junction	1,300	June 1, 1908	French.
F. Marchand	"	900	July 11, 1912	"
A. Pansera	Athelstan	1,100	Nov. 21, 1903	Italian.
L. N. Larche	"	800	July 1, 1912	French.
E. C. Moquin, relieving inspector		900	Dec. 1, 1910	"
J. Sthal, relieving inspector		1,100	May 20, 1906	Australasian.

At places where there is no immigration officer the customs officer acts as such.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY INSPECTION.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has a party of engineers been sent by the Department of Railways and Canals to inspect the Quebec and Saguenay railway?
2. At whose request and for what purpose is this party of engineers being sent?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Advantage was taken of the presence, in the neighbourhood, of engineers from the department to have a small portion of the line inspected.
2. The engineers were directed by the chief engineer of the department to make this partial inspection to determine whether or not the works, upon account of which subsidy payments have been made, were suffering damage as a result of the suspension of construction.

Mr. LEMIEUX: May I point out to the hon. Minister of Railways that yesterday Mr. Justice Fortin, of the Superior Court at Montreal, granted judgment against the Quebec and Saguenay Railway Company to the amount of $400,000, and that there is a similar judgment to come out. Therefore, I advise him to be very careful in this matter.

Mr. COCHRANE.

YARMOUTH PREVENTIVE OFFICERS.

Mr. LAW:

1. What are the names of the preventive officers at the port of Yarmouth, N.S.?
2. What salary does each receive?
3. What are the names of the officials in the customs house at the port of Yarmouth, N.S.?
4. What salary does each receive?

Mr. WHITE:

1 and 2. The names of the persons in the customs service at Yarmouth, designated as preventive officers, and their salaries are as follows: W. R. Cann, $1,150; H. C. Churchill, $850; Andrew Kirk, $800; J. W. Boyd, $1,000; Arthur Rogers, $1,000; J. D. Pothier, $800.

3 and 4. The names and salaries of the customs officials ordinarily attending in the custom house and warehouse at Yarmouth, N.S., are as follows: Smith Harding, collector, $1,500; W. L. Campbell, appraiser, $1,150; W. R. Cann, $1,150; William McGill, clerk (retiring), $1,200; Arthur Rogers, $1,000.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has Mr. R. H. Haines been dismissed as postmaster at Aultsville, Ontario?
2. If so, why was such dismissal ordered?
3. Was there any investigation held?
4. Were there any complaints made against him?

5. Did Mr. Alguire, M.P., sanction this dismissal?

Mr. PELLETIER: Serious complaints were received in regard to the management of this office, which were made the subject of an official investigation. It was also shown that the postmaster had been an active political partisan. The Postmaster General, therefore, directed his dismissal.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has Mr. Sheets been dismissed as postmaster at Farran's Point?
2. If so, why was the said post office taken from Mr. Sheets?
3. Was there any investigation held?
4. Were there any complaints made?
5. Did the present member of the House of Commons for Stormont sanction the removal of the office?

Mr. PELLETIER: Mr. George Kerr was postmaster at Farran's Point in 1896. He was then dismissed and has been reinstated by the present Postmaster General.

*Mr. DOUGLAS:

1. Has William Bow been dismissed from the position of postmaster at Winchester, Ontario?
2. If so, on whose recommendation and for what reason?
3. How long did Mr. Bow act as postmaster at Winchester?
4. Were there any complaints against Mr. Bow during the said period?
5. If so, by whom were they made and what was their purport?
6. Who is Mr. Bow's successor and on whose recommendation was he appointed?

Mr. PELLETIER: The department learned that the Winchester post office had been kept for years in a small room, quite inadequate to meet the requirements of the public, and that the postmaster did not give the duties of the office his personal attention. The postmaster admitted these facts, and the Postmaster General thereupon directed that a change should be made in the post office, and that Mr. Thomas A. Scott should be appointed as postmaster.

*Mr. GRAHAM:

1. Is D. A. Redmond still postmaster at Brinston, Dundas county? If not, when were his services dispensed with?
2. If so, what reasons were given for dispensing with those services?
3. Was any investigation held? If so, when, where, and by whom?

Mr. PELLETIER: The postmaster of Brinston has been removed for political partisanship, the facts being such as to satisfy the Postmaster General that the charge was well founded and that an investigation was not necessary.

SOUTH AFRICAN VETERANS' SCRIP.

On the Orders of the Day being called.

Mr. OLIVER: May I renew my question as to whether a decision has been reached by the Government in reference to the extension of the time for the locating of South African scrip?

Mr. ROCHE: In view of the very large number of requests that have been made for an extension of time, I have decided to recommend to Parliament the granting of a further extension of time for the operation of the Act of last session.

Mr. OLIVER: What length of time?

Mr. ROCHE: At least six months, possibly twelve.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. WILSON (Laval): Could the Prime Minister inform me how it is that an order of the House of January 24 of last year has not yet been complied with? I see by the reports in the papers that my hon. friend the member for Charlevoix (Sir Rodolphe Forget) was provided with a copy of a document showing the number of workingmen who have been dismissed at Sorel, 359 of them, I think. I have not a copy of that document, although my right hon. friend at the end of last session pledged his word to this House that I would be furnished with a copy of the papers showing the number of people that have been dismissed in every department.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. member is rather outside the rule relating to the Orders of the Day. If he simply wants to ask a direct question he would be in order.

Mr. WILSON: My question was properly put, I think, and I am anxious to hear from my right hon. friend his answer.

Mr. BORDEN: I can only say to my hon. friend that this matter is under the control of the Secretary of State, to whom I have spoken on the subject, and he informs me that he has given instructions to his officers to expedite the report as much as possible. If time were available, I would be glad to look into these matters myself rather than that my hon. friend should be afflicted in this way. But, that apart, the only thing I can do is to instruct the officers to expedite these reports. If they are not doing their duty, if they are not expediting them, my hon. friend has just grounds for complaint. I shall make further inquiries and ascertain whether there has been any unnecessary delay.

Mr. SINCLAIR: In this connection I desire to point out to the Secretary of State that a large number of orders that were put through the House last session have not been complied with. I will not particularize them. A number of them were moved for by myself, and they have not yet been complied with. I went over the book kept in the record office this morning, and I found that no less than 64 orders of the House for correspondence and papers, passed during last session of Parliament, have not yet been complied with. I trust that during the recess attention will be given to this matter, as it will facilitate the business of the House when we reach the Estimates.

Mr. BORDEN: Attention will be given to the suggestion of my hon. friend. He will remember, of course, that a very large number of orders have been passed during recent weeks, and that the work of the several departments of the Government devolving upon the officers charged with the duty of supplying those returns, is very great at the present time. I was not aware that so many returns moved for during the last session had not been brought down. I had experience such as that in the past, but I do not remember any occasion when there were quite so many. The attention of the Secretary of State has been directed to the observations of my hon. friend, and we will do the best we can to expedite the bringing down of all those things.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of and concurrence in the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (Minister of Trade and Commerce): Mr. Speaker, Canadians have, in their different legislatures and halls of debate considered very many important and grave questions. The questions of responsible government, of Confederation, of industrial policy, and the great questions and problems of transportation have from time to time been under discussion in this Parliament. But I doubt if there has been any question during the whole history of legislation in what is now the Dominion of Canada which has been quite as important and freighted with quite as great results and consequences as the one we are now discussing in this House. It is not wonderful that the question now being debated has not made its appearance earlier; nor is it wonderful that, after it has made its appearance, it should increase in intensity and grow in volume, and become more urgent in its insistence upon an answer that shall be adequate and complete. It is not wonderful, I say, for in the last one hundred years peace has blessed this country on its borders, and, with three exceptions, within its borders. Our people have been very busy carving out homes for themselves, exploring and connecting up the immense territory which is their heritage, finding out and trying to utilize the most evident of its great resources, and in different ways laying the foundations of a young and strong nationality. It is not wonderful, therefore that, engaged, absorbed in these occupations, with peace during the whole period, and protected by the army and the fleet of the Mother Country almost unconsciously to themselves, the question did not sooner spring into life and activity. But, although most Canadians felt little their obligations, and seemed to prize still less the blessings under which they were living and working, there were always some, and of late an increasing number, who were conscious of obligations that had not been fulfilled, and of the exceedingly precious privileges which they were enjoying by the sacrifices of centuries, sacrifices which extended into the periods of their own lives, sacrifices not by themselves, but by the founders and the fathers of this great country and of the overseas possessions. But those who were conscious of those obligations gradually gave voice to the feeling within them. They communicated their feeling to their friends, and so the circle gradually widened until at last it found its way into the halls of legislature and into this Parliament. Once having found its way there, the question remains there to be solved, and it will stay there until it is solved aright. It has not only arisen in Canada, but it has also had its mission and its course in the sister colonies. Colony after colony, a little in advance of us, has taken up the subject and has carried it more or less to successful conclusions. But the matter has gone farther. It has gone up from the halls of colonial legislatures into Imperial conferences, and it has made its way through the media of these Imperial conferences until it has reached the highest circles of political influence and political control in the course of its solution. To-day it occupies the attention of the best statesmen in the Mother Country and of the best statesmen and the most thoughtful citizens in every one of the colonies in the great Empire to which we belong.

In 1887, at the Imperial conference, there was a hesitant beginning of things. In 1902 there was a further step taken, in 1907 a greater stride was made, but neither in 1887, nor in 1902, nor in 1907, was Canada in step or in stride with

her sister colonies in the Empire. The session of 1909 brought the matter in an abstract form into this House and to a certain extent, in an abstract way, settled certain principles and settled them, I think, for all time. That was succeeded by the Imperial conference of 1909, in which still further progress was made. Then came the Bill which passed this House, known as the Canadian Naval Service Act. Then came the dissolution of this House, a change of parties and a change, in some respects, in the policy in reference to defence.

It will not be out of place for me at this stage to make a very brief, and, I hope, a quite impartial survey of the past history of the Empire defence problem in Canada going back no farther than the 1902 conference. The result of this conference was a step forward by Cape Colony, which increased her contribution from £30,000 to £50,000 yearly; by Australia, which increased her contribution from £100,000 to £200,000 yearly; by Natal, which increased her contribution from £12,000 to £35,000 annually; New Zealand from £20,000 to £40,000 annually, and Newfoundland from £3,000 to £4,800 annually. But in that conference, Canada, never before having made a contribution, still persisted in her refusal. The position that she took was briefly this, that while she felt the obligation to do something for the defence of her own shores, she had hitherto done nothing except by way of perfecting, to a certain extent, her militia. At that conference she refused to go further in reference to the utilisation of a portion of the militia for Imperial purposes, but she promised, through the mouths of her representatives, that she would take up the question of naval defence in so far as respected the formation of Canadian naval cadets. 1902 passed on to 1907 but the promise that was made in 1902 by Canada in reference to the Canadian cadet service was not implemented in any form.

Then came the conference of 1907. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) remembers this as also the preceding conference for he was present at both. The representatives were met as usual, by the statements of the Prime Minister and of the First Lord of the Admiralty. These were not begging for help as they had not been in 1902. England never has. England never will beg either her colonies or others for help, but the fact that she has not done so and will not do so is not to be taken as an excuse for not helping. It is the strongest appeal that can be made to honest, loyal hearts for help. They were given a statement of the present position and it was placed up to the delegates of that Imperial Conference to consider the matter and, if they thought they would like to help, to state how far that help could go. What happened? The South African states continued their contribution at £85,000 per year; Australia continued hers at £200,000 per year and undertook home duties in addition; New Zealand continued her contribution, raising it from £40,000 to £100,000 per year. When it came to Canada's turn to speak she spoke through the mouth of her Minister of Marine and Fisheries and from his lips—I am not overstating it—there came not one sound, not one syllable of either grateful and appreciative estimate of what Great Britain had done for Canada or of promise as to what Canada would do in the future. There came only words of apology and the note of misrepresentation—the words of apology—that Canada could do nothing because she was operating a fisheries protection service which was fairly burdensome; she was instituting wireless stations which cost money; she was watching with eagle eye the development of the United States fleet on the lakes and feeling about as to what was necessary to protect Canada from menace and danger from that source. It was stated, which was not true, that she had made a beginning in instituting a naval cadet service. That was all Canada had to say at the conference of 1907, except that when near the close of the conference Mr. Smart moved his resolution tending to go so far at least as to pass a unanimous expression of opinion that in whatever way the legislature of any overseas dominion or state should think it well to assist by contribution, or by local defence, or in any way it pleased, they should at least come to a unanimous decision that they would all do something on these lines. Canada through the mouth of her Prime Minister said: no, we will not pledge ourselves, we do not propose to be led away from the exercise of our proper autonomy and responsibilities at home; we do not intend to throw ourselves into the maelstrom of European conflict.

Then came the resolution of 1909, and the resolution of 1909 as it passed this Parliament affirmed certain principles. It affirmed that it was becoming more and more the duty of Canada, as she increased in population and wealth, to assume some of the duties of national defence; it affirmed that regular and periodical contributions were not, as a system, the most satisfactory solution of the problem of defence; it declared that the speedy organization of a Canadian service, in co-operation with and in close relation to the Imperial navy, along lines suggested by the Admiralty, was the best method for strengthening the naval supremacy of the Empire; it declared that whenever need arises—and I would like the House to keep that

word in mind—that whenever need arises Canada would make any sacrifice to co-operate with the Imperial authorities in every movement to maintain the integrity and the honour of the Empire. But, that was not the form in which the original resolution came before this House; that was not the form of the amendment which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) then the leader of the Government moved. That was a resolution which was the result of concessions on both sides for the laudable purpose, without giving away any principle, of presenting to the country, to the Empire, and to the world, a unanimous voice from this Parliament. It has been suggested that gentlemen who voted for that resolution in 1909 are inconsistent now when they support the proposition of the Government as placed before the House, in that, the resolution cut out temporary or occasional contributions, and, in that, it declared that the policy was to build a Canadian naval service, and that the present policy of the Government contravenes both of those, and therefore that gentlemen who support the policy submitted to-day are inconsistent as compared with their action in 1909. The amendment which my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) moved had in it the words: 'The payment of any stated contribution;' these words were excised and the words that were put in were 'regular and periodical contributions,' differentiating absolutely between the time of need, the period of emergency, and the settled and normal policy which should rule. If that is borne in mind all alleged inconsistency disappears and the argument founded upon it falls to the ground. Is more proof needed? My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) voted for that resolution as it appears in our journals, but the other day my right hon. friend got up in this House and said: If there were an emergency, and I believe in that emergency, I would vote $35,000,000; yes, four times $35,000,000 as an emergency contribution. How could he, and be consistent, if that resolution forbids the vote of money for urgent need?

Then came the Imperial conference of 1909. At that Imperial conference its delegates from the different overseas dominions were met as before in exactly the same cordial, manly, British way. There was no suppliance, there was no plea for help; the circumstances of the Empire were laid before them; they were asked to consider these circumstances and to act as each thought best. But the Admiralty at that time, with the concurrence of the British Government, made a statement before the members of that Imperial conference. They outlined different methods of aid. They said that strategically considered the most effective aid that could be given was contribution of money from the overseas dominions placed in the hands of the old, the experienced Admiralty and naval authorities of Great Britain, with a thousand years of naval tradition behind them and hundreds of years accumulation of the best experience and naval science the world could produce. They said: if you will do that it will be the most effective way of making the Imperial fleet effective. But we know there are objections in the overseas dominions to this, and, leaving that aside, the next most effective thing to do is to build naval units. And they insisted as an absolute condition with reference to the different naval units that the various ovearseas dominions might build—because they felt that maybe insistence would be placed on local control—that there should be one single indivisible control when war and danger and peril came. The British government made a most generous and most effective proposition. They said: If Australia would build a unit and if New Zealand would do her part as she promised to do, Great Britain would add what was necessary to make up New Zealand's unit and also assist in making up a unit for China and India. Then, if Canada would add her unit, these four units —comprising fifty-four vessels, headed by four great fighting machines—would be allotted to the unprotected Pacific coast and thus aid the Imperial fleet to the greatest possible extent.

What happened? Australia said: Yes, we will do that. And they pledged themselves, there and then, to build, and, after they had built, to maintain their unit, and during the time that that unit was building, to keep up their contribution of £200,000 per year. New Zealand said: Yes, we will give a dreadnought, and we agree to the conditions. Great Britain of course was an assenting party to the other units. What did Canada say? Canada said: We cannot do any such thing; we will not do any such thing. Mr. Speaker, to my mind the opportunity was lost then of doing the biggest, the grandest, the most effective thing that up to that period could have been done—perhaps such an opportunity may not recur for many years —for the aid of British supremacy by sea, and for the protection and security of the hundreds of millions of people who live within the Empire. Then, said the Admiralty, if you are bent on having your local fleet, and will not join Great Britain and the others in common action, please build nothing less than a unit, for nothing less than a unit would be effective. Canada refused to build a unit. She went to the Admiralty and said: We can only expend £400,000 per year, or maybe £600,000 per year; tell us

what is most effective that can be got for that amount of money, and we will consider it. The Admiralty told them. They took part of the advice, and came back and instituted the policy of building four cruisers and six torpedoes, without a leading or dreadnought vessel—and so, short of the unit—and dividing that ineffective force between the east and west coasts of Canada; many thousands of miles separated from each other.

That was the result of the conference of 1909, and the Naval Service Bill embodied that result in legislation in 1910. This Act of 1910 went into force, and we are all acquainted with what has been done under it. It is not necessary for me to recount that part of the history. Suffice it to say that two vessels were bought, the Rainbow and the Niobe. They were filled with men who were not Canadians, hired by Canadian money. They have been on the coasts of Canada for now nearly two years. During that time not a Canadian has yet qualified to take service in these vessels. The number was not then, and is not now, by any means the full complement of the two vessels. It is about the same now—after some 271 desertions in that time—as it was when they came over to Canada. Nineteen young men have been passed one year through the naval college and are now being examined for midshipmen. Ten more are in the college at this date, and it is hoped that ten additional, making twenty in all, will be in the college on the 1st of January, 1913. Meanwhile, we have paid one and a third millions of good Canadian dollars as capital expense, and we have paid out seven hundred and eighty-eight thousand for upkeep. You have paid the money; you have the result; and you have the right to ask yourselves, what has this contributed to the defence of the Empire and how long would it be under such auspices and circumstances, before twenty-six warships could be manned by properly qualified Canadian seamen ?

Following that policy, as carried out by hon. gentlemen opposite, came the change of Government. New men came in with some new ideas as to what should be the proper and adequate policy for this country in the matter of naval defence. What is that policy? First, let me say this: The present leader of the Government when in opposition was asked what he would do if he were in power, and he made a statement as to what he would do, dividing it into two parts. First, he would find out as exactly as it was possible to do what were the conditions and the needs; and he would go to headquarters to find that out. He would not lie on the broad of his back and cogitate what was necessary, depending for information either on his party bias or on his imagination—he would go to headquarters, where alone that information could be got. And, if, after examination, he came to the conclusion that it was necessary that some quick and effective aid should be given, he would come down to the House and recommend a money vote for that purpose. There has been no variableness, neither shadow of turning in that respect, so far as the leader of this Government is concerned. His second course of action, as outlined, was this: That, in the meantime, as regards the permanent defence policy of this country—and I want my hon. friends to remember these two divisions and these two words, because they are inclined, in the ardour of debate, to shove one entirely out of view and to exalt the other as the only part of our policy—he would take it into most careful consideration. And he said he would link with it one other question, the importance of which and the necessity of settling which no man on that side of the House will deny, that is, if we are to embark upon a permanent policy of naval support for the supremacy of the Empire, some voice must be given to Canada as regards matters leading thereto, questions, that is, as to the foreign policy of the Empire. Does my right hon. friend disagree with that second condition? He has subscribed to it in this House; he is on record as subscribing to it, and I will produce that subscription and lay it before the House in the course of my remarks. The leader of the Opposition outlined a policy one part of which might result in a temporary contribution, and another part in a permanent plan being agreed upon, mutually cooperative and most effective, because it would be the result of careful inquiry and of the mutual mingling of wisdom and counsel. The late Administration went out of office, and my right hon. friend formed a government. When asked in the House what he proposed to do in reference to the policy of naval defence, he made exactly the same answer as he had made when leader of the Opposition. He said: I propose to go to Great Britain and ascertain, as nearly as I can, the exact state of affairs. If I find that there is a need or necessity, I will come back and ask this House for a money vote to meet that need. Then I will take up the question of permanent policy and thoroughly look into it. I will formulate that policy; but before it is made effective I will not let it lie in the mouth of any man to say that it passed the House, but that the country was not in favour of it. I will not let it lie in the mouth of any opponent outside the Empire to say we got a vote through Parliament, but the people were not in favour of it. I will take that mature and

permanent policy; I will lay it before the people, and if it is carried it will be Canada's policy, without question or without doubt. And has that been done? The answer is plainly written in the late history of Canada. My right hon. friend and members of his Cabinet went to Great Britain. They spent two months there, and they were not idle. They saw the officers and Lords of the Admiralty, the Premier and Cabinet of Britain, and the secret knowledge of the policy and condition of the Empire were laid before them. They not only had statistics and figures and expert advice, but, what is still more valuable, they drank in the atmosphere surrounding men whose whole lives and purpose were devoted to grave problems of Empire, its conditions and the conditions of other countries, which is more valuable than dry statements or tabulated figures. After going through this process, my right hon. friend came to the conclusion that there was a danger; that there was a need for immediate and effective help. He came back to this Parliament and laid before it all the proofs possible, and gave to the House his own conviction as leader of the Government. He could not lay more before the House, because it is not permitted; but let no man run away with the idea that the statements contained in the memorandum of the Lords of the Admiralty which has been prepared for publication, was all, or even the most important part, of the information obtained. But, Sir, from the memorandum of the British Government, and from these deeper and more intimate sources of information, he forms his conclusion, and says to this House and to the country: There is a need, and it is pressing. I recommend immediate and effective aid in the face of that need, and I do this knowing well the trust that is committed to me. I hold a little more than Canada's welfare in that trust; I hold some part of the welfare of the Empire. Whatever men say or whatever men may do, the destinies of Canada are absolutely and irrevocably bound up with the destinies of the Empire. On my knowledge as given to you, on my knowledge as possessed but which cannot be disclosed, in pursuance of the sacred trust of a privy councillor and the leader of the Government of the country, I ask Parliament to pass this vote. Has he been consistent? Has he been courageous? Has he been weighing small things in the balance, holding up the straw to see which way the wind is blowing; waving a feather to find if there is the slightest ruffle of political breeze? He marched straight to his object; he got the information, he hands the result to this Parliament and the country, and I have no doubt that this Parliament and the country will accept his version and will pass this measure.

Mr. FOSTER (N. Toronto).

Without going more into detail, that is the policy of the present Government. Let me, however, again call attention to the fact that, whether designedly or not, there is a disposition, upon which many individuals have already acted, to declare to the country that there is only one branch to the Government's defence policy; and that is the branch of contribution; that a permanent policy has been thrown to the winds, and there is to be no Canadian naval service. This is an absolute mis-statement of the Government's policy. When this measure is brought before the House, what do we find? We find hon. gentlemen opposite, as indeed is their absolute right, criticising it. We would not bring it before this House if we did not expect and invite criticism. It is the absolute right, as well as the absolute duty, of any hon. member of this House to criticise a policy brought down, and to amend it or to show wherein it can be amended, if this can be done in a fair and reasonable way. But it is also open to members on this side of the House and to the people of the country to sift and examine the objections which are made to this policy. One effect is already apparent, a very grateful effect, and if it is a permanent effect, one which is sufficient to justify the policy even though nothing else results from it. What is it? It is the abandonment of false positions and wrong opinions hitherto held by my right hon. friend and those who follow him. It is the elimination by the right hon. gentleman and those behind him of errors which they have tenaciously held for the last fifty years. Let me enumerate some of them. This policy has had the effect of eliciting from my right hon. friend an expression something like this:

> We are British subjects, we do not want to be anything else; and that settles the whole question.

Thank Heaven. The time was when I listened to other sentiments than that. I am glad they were only vagaries of a more youthful period, the wild oats sown by disappointed men wandering in opposition. But from this time out the sentiment is not independence, or young nations in alliance with Britain. It is nothing else than that we are British subjects and will always remain so. That settles the whole question.

Another statement that this policy has elicited from my right hon. friend is:

> When increased armaments are going on we cannot afford to be idle and rest upon our own security.

My right hon. friend uttered a great truth in that pregnant statement, but, Sir, from 1902 until 1912 he neither uttered nor

acted upon that sentiment. My right hon. friend said the other day that he knew every fact and figure that we know to-day—four years ago he knew it. During the last ten years a navy which, ten years ago, was absolutely negligible, has become the second great navy of the world and that navy is within twelve hours' steaming distance of Great Britain. My right hon. friend knew all those years of these increasing armaments and vast works, and launched dreadnoughts, and all the scientific improvements which make a machine terrible in naval warfare. He knew it, he had the facts, he had the figures, but, Sir, he gave no hint, he uttered no words, he did nothing. I am glad that the issuance of this new policy has brought him to his senses in that respect.

Then my right hon. friend the other day, in this House and in the face of his ex-Minister of Militia and Defence, denounced the Monroe Doctrine, and declared that we could not lean upon it in self-respect or in security. Thank Heaven, another mist has been cleared away. My right hon. friend said:

> Any thought of separation from Britain would be a folly and a crime.

Any thought of it? Go back to the market places of Boston and the New England States and not many years ago you saw there a figure, picturesque, younger than as we now see it, standing up in the market places and declaring that things could not go on as they were, that independence was the goal of Canada and that his only cherished hope was that when it came it might come without a wrench of birth, it might fall as the ripe apple from the tree. Gone are those haunting nightmares forever. Now any sort of separation would be a folly and a crime. Thank our policy for that conversion.

My right hon. friend absolutely refused one unit in 1910 when so advised by the Admiralty. In 1910, when it was not a proposition by the British Government or Admiralty, but was a matter for this House, he again refused it and substituted his four cruisers and his six torpedo boat destroyers. Now he is in favour of two units. Speculation is permissible as to why two units. Speculation is very soon satisfied when you think of the party prescience and wisdom of my right hon. friend. He had four cruisers and six torpedo boat destroyers, but the division of these between the two coasts would be such a small plateful that he was afraid neither would be grateful for the donation. Make it two units and give each a loaded basket. But I am happy to think that at last, under the pressure of this Bill, my right hon. friend stands to a certain extent with us on this side of the House and has pledged every man of his on that side that something will be done and that the adequacy of that something is not to be measured by four cruisers and six torpedo boat destroyers, but by something far larger.

But, giving my right hon. friend credit for all those things, let me proceed now to what is not so grateful, a criticism of some points that he took up in objection. I am sure my right hon. friend does not object to criticism. He deals it out fully and unsparingly and he is willing to take it in the same fashion and measure. But before I go to his objections I want to ask my right hon. friend what he had in mind in that little verbal, rhetorical, argumentative excursion that he took before he came to mention his objections to the Bill. What were they ? He declared that some one in Quebec said we owed nothing to England. Well, did he think it worth while discussing that himself? Why did he think it worth while, in discussing the policy of this Bill, to bring that in? Does anybody here say so? Does any one on this side of the House, does any party say so? Does it matter what some unnamed individual somewhere outside of this House says ?

An hon. MEMBER: Rot.

Mr. FOSTER: Rot, certainly rot. He took occasion to go back to the United States civil war, and, in this serious argument, to declare that some one said that we owe England nothing, because she did not intervene in the civil war in the United States and champion the cause of the South. He launched into a very eloquent rhetorical period or two as to why that could not and should not have been done. What relation had that to the matter before the House? Why did he take it up? Why? I cannot find a reason for it. Then he said that some declared that we owe England nothing because of her blundering ruinous diplomacy with reference to this country. One ear is a little dull, but I thought I gathered the sound, and I became sure afterwards in looking at 'Hansard' that I had. 'Some one said that we owe England nothing because of her blundering and ruinous diplomacy as regards Canada.' I remember one man who said that, my right hon. friend himself. I am glad again that he has found new light,——

Mr. MACDONALD: Don't you remember another, your former colleague, Mr. Monk?

Mr. FOSTER: I remember many other things, but if I were to unburden on this House all that I remember, the House would weary of it. So the best I can do is to cull the choicest bits.

Now, in the positions that have been taken up by the other side, there have been many voices; but, after all, the utterances have been along comparatively few lines,

and I think I can answer my right hon. friend and several others who have spoken on the other side of the House, without following individuals, and without taking up time with each one.

But I want to ask the House to consider one thing. You use, and we use the word 'emergency.' Where did we get it? It does not appear in the resolution passed by the House. The word is not 'emergency' the word is 'need'—n-e-e-d. Whenever the need arises it is the duty of this House, and of Canada, to do whatever is possible to be done to maintain the integrity and honour of the Empire. We have narrowed, and wrongfully narrowed the question by substituting the word 'emergency,' and arguing with reference to that. What is an emergency? An emergency may be the flash of lightning which precedes destruction and death by but a moment. It may be the sound of cannon which heralds a declaration of war made overnight and when the cannon are searching close for your positions. But it may mean something different. It may mean a condition which has developed because of the grouping of powers, the promulgation of new laws with reference to armies and navies. It may mean many things. But we are quit of all discussion on that when we keep to the word in the resolution, the word 'need,' and whenever the need is demonstrated we have the right and the power to act. Who is to be the judge of the need? There you come up against a practical question. My right hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition says there is no need, no emergency, no present or prospective danger. He says that. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister says there is a need, there is danger, there is apprehension; and to do Canada's part to relieve that I bring down this measure. Who has the right prima facie to be believed? Sitting with the members of the British Government, who are charged with the mighty possibilities of this great Empire, day after day counselling with them on the secret and intimate conditions that prevail, fortified by them in a memorandum which is one of the strongest that has ever been presented to any house of parliament, and backed by the conviction of duty inspired in one who for the time being is the responsible leader of this country, the Prime Minister, reaches one conclusion. Another gentleman who did not sit down with those ministers, who has not of late been in that intimate circle, who has not had the information and the means of knowledge of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister pronounces an opposite opinion. He states that four years ago he knew every fact and figure in that memorandum, but he must, I think, revise that statement when he remembers that in four years much has happened; and one thing that has happened has been the German fleet law of 1912, with its deep significance, its suggestions of perils, its terrible addition of striking force to a fleet already most formidable. So I say, prima facie, the people of this country will, I think, follow the judgment of my right hon. friend on this side of the House rather than the assertion of my right hon. friend on the other side.

My right hon. friend says further that this policy is a hybrid, bred of Tory jingoism and Nationalism. They have been together, and this is the result. I am puzzled. Suppose it was, does it make much matter if the rich fruit on the tree comes from one soil or another, is tended by one gardener or another, or by two, provided that the apple itself, in its flavour and quality, is all right? Had not my right hon. friend better savour the apple instead of chemically, or otherwise, analysing the soils out of which it has sprung? But, I am puzzled besides. He says that this is the result of an unholy alliance between the Tories and the Nationalists. Well, I come back to his speech, and what does he say? He says that immediately the resolution of 1909 was passed dissension broke out in the Liberal-Conservative party; there were two sections, one section wanted a contribution only and no Canadian navy, the other section wanted neither contribution nor navy. If there was a choice at all, the latter was for the Canadian service, while it utterly abhorred the contribution. If then this policy is the result of an unholy alliance between the Nationalists and the Liberal-Conservatives, after which parent does the child take its traits? Here is a measure which enacts contribution; the Nationalist damns contribution, will have none of it. How then does the right hon. gentleman argue it out that Nationalism has been triumphant when the very thing that the Nationalist abhors is embodied in the Bill and the only thing that he might look upon with favour—a Canadian service—is, he declares, not included in the Bill? If that is so, whatever the antecedents may have been, the Nationalist did not prevail. That is certain. My right hon. friend then goes on to say that the document shows that there is no emergency, that England is in no danger, immediate or prospective. Quoting from his own speech, he says the document shows that:

> As a result of the armaments which are now going on in Europe, England has been obliged to increase the margin of security which she relies on for her own defence, by reducing her naval forces in the outlying seas. Such is the condition.

I take issue with my right hon. friend. I beg to say to him that the document discloses more than that, that his is not a full statement of what the document does

disclose. Let us analyse the document. Criticism was directed, if not by my right hon. friend, then by some hon. gentleman on that side of the House, to the first clause of the document:

The Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada had invited His Majesty's Government through the Board of Admiralty to prepare a statement of the present and immediate prospective requirements of the naval defence of the Empire for presentation to the Canadian Parliament if the Dominion Cabinet deem it necessary.

That has been construed to mean, that my right hon. friend went to the Government of Great Britain and asked them for a document to suit his purpose. There is what he asked for and what else should he have asked for and what else, if he were honest, could he have asked for? He asked for a statement of the present and immediate prospective requirements of the naval defence of the Empire. Without that how could he make up his mind? To whom should he have gone? He went to the only proper source and he asked them the one straight question that he should have asked them. Why should any one cavil at that? Then:

The Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty are prepared to comply and to supplement, in a form which can be made public,——

That implies that they did not give all the information which is at their disposal.

—the confidential communications and conversations which have passed between the Admiralty and ministers of the Dominion Parliament during the recent visit to the United Kingdom.

That gives force to what I stated a little while ago. The British Government could not put before this or any other House the whole information they gave to the Canadian ministers. All they could do was to supplement, within the bounds of prudence and of statesmanship, the information which they had given by what might properly be made public. Now, what does the Admiralty say?

The Admiralty set the greatest store by the important material, and still more important moral, assistance which it is within the power of Canada to give to maintaining British naval supremacy on the high seas.

Does my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition intimate at all, insinuate in the least, that that was made to order? I know he would not. I know that he appraises too highly the character of a British Government to think that its leader or its members would, to the order of the overseas dominions, prepare information to suit their political policies. But, if my right hon. friend would not do that I am not so sure that all who support him are as punctilious in that regard.

The Admiralty therefore confine themselves in this statement exclusively to facts, and it is for the Dominion Government and Parliament to draw their own conclusions therefrom.

Is not that eminently just? It is the manly British way. We give you the facts, we make no plea, advance no argument; there are the facts, yours is the responsibility for acting or not upon these facts. The memorandum goes on to say:

The power of the British Empire to maintain the superiority on the sea, which is essential to its security, must obviously be measured from time to time by reference to the other naval forces of the world.

And so, without unfriendly intention, they have to speak of other powers and other groups of powers.

From this point of view the development of the German fleet during the last fifteen years is the most striking feature of the naval situation to-day.

There was no provocation—says the British Government, in this memorandum—to Germany to increase her fleet. On the other hand, there was an effort continued for years, to retard construction, and without an arrangement, Great Britain did retard construction for four consecutive years. There was no response, but rather the German Government accelerated their building. That is an important point to be kept in view. Listen to what the British Admiralty say of the striking power brought into effect by the new German naval law passed, not four years ago, but this year:

4. In the spring of the present year the fifth German navy law was assented to by the Reichstag. The main feature of that law is not the increase in the new construction of capital ships, though that is important, but rather the increase in the striking force of ships of all classes which will be immediately available at all seasons of the year.

A third squadron of 8 battleships will be created and maintained in full commission as part of the active battle fleet. Whereas, according to the unamended law, the active battle fleet consisted of 17 battleships, 4 battle or large armoured cruisers, and 12 small cruisers, it will in the near future consist of 25 battleships, 8 battle or large armoured cruisers, and 18 small cruisers; and whereas at present, owing to the system of recruitment which prevails in Germany, the German fleet is less fully mobile during the winter than during the summer months, it will, through the operation of this law, not only be increased in strength, but rendered much more readily available. Ninety-nine torpedo boat destroyers, instead of 66, will be maintained in full commission out of a total of 144; 72 new submarines will be built within the currency of the new law, and of these it is apparently proposed to maintain 54 with full permanent crews. Taking a general view, the effect of the law will be that nearly four-fifths of the entire German navy will be maintained in

full permanent commission; that is to say, instantly and constantly ready for war.

Is that not indicative of danger? Are submarines—just talk to your neighbour on the street about it—are submarines meant for far distant journeys across the ocean to foreign parts? Is the new machinery of torpedo boat destroyers meant to traverse the seas and to protect German commerce or German colonies. Read the whole of it from dreadnoughts down, and what man can fail to be struck with the fact that here—without any provocation on the part of the British Empire, it is provided in the twinkling of an eye, that four-fifths of the complete naval power of Germany is to be in a position to strike at the sound of the bell. Yet, my right hon. friend sees no danger, has no apprehensions, sees no emergency, and no need for any action. In the personnel of a navy, man-power counts, and the man-power of the German navy which it now 66,000 will, when this law has had its course, be 101,500. By 1920 under this law and preceding laws, the German fleet—and in this I make an unquestionable statement—will not be one whit inferior to what the British fleet is at this present moment.

Mr. BELAND: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend says: hear, hear, because I cannot make the statement that the German fleet would be superior to the British fleet then.

Mr. BELAND: No; I agree with my hon. friend when he stated that the German navy in 1920 might be equal to the British navy of to-day, but that is eight years away and the British navy will be doing something in the meantime.

Mr. FOSTER: It is a significant fact that in 1920 the German fleet will be equal to the present British fleet.

Then take another point. My right hon. friend knows, and so do all men, the disabilities under which an old railway with stock of various ages labours in competition with a new railway lately built and furnished with stock up to date and new. The very same thing takes place in regard to fleets. To-day, a portion of England's superiority in naval matters is due to the large number of pre-dreadnoughts which she possesses and which have not yet passed beyond the age for giving effectual service; but, by 1920, many of these will have become obsolete and ineffective. Britain has much to do between the present date and 1920, to replace these by new material and thus bring the fleet up to the required standard of effectiveness and power.

I do not think I need dwell on that memorandum further, except to say that whereas in the present year Great Britain possesses 18 battleships and battle cruisers of the Dreadnought class, against 19 of that class possessed by the other powers of Europe, and will possess in 1913, 24 to 21, the figures in 1914 will be 31 to 33 and in the year 1915 only 35 to 51. That introduces another element. The great European powers are building as well as Germany, and in the mutations of political power brought about by recurring influences and diplomatic alliances, who amongst the great powers knows whether his friend of to-day will not be the enemy of to-morrow; who knows to-day what possible combinations may be in store, within the next five, or six, or seven years? To-day the statesman who stands by the helm of the ship of state of this great and mighty Empire, and seeks to penetrate with what light he has the murky distant sea, is never free from the fear that a possible combination could be made within a day which would wipe out his superiority and confront him with fatal odds, in the last great struggle for the supremacy of the Empire. Any one who appreciates the position in which such a man stands; any man who values this Empire and is not utterly careless, must feel that the margin of safety must be maintained, for it is our life. And, Sir, if at any one unhappy moment, that superior combination prevails against us, all this mighty superstructure that a thousand years of blood, and brawn, and brain and soul have built up, might be shattered and the disjecta membra, picked up by the looters of the world who have not yet left its pathways.

Another thing is said,—and here I include my revered friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham), and my gallant friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark), with my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition,—and they will not object to that: they like his company, and he likes their company as well. The three of them unite in declaring: 'Yours is a money contribution, without body, blood or brains. England wants, not the money, but the hearts, the brains, the brawn of her subjects all over the world. Noble sentiment! They say we are giving three dreadnoughts, paid for by Canada, but to be equipped, maintained and manned by England. Scotchmen, and decendants of Scotchman, they ask, are you to be told that you are not to fight for the Empire? Frenchmen, and descendants of Frenchmen, in Canada, will you stand it to be told that you are not fit to send your body as sacrifice for a cause to which you give your money? Irishmen, and descendants of Irishmen, Dutchmen, and descendants of Dutchmen, we appeal to you to rise in your might and put down this iniquitous Government that imputes to you the wish to hire others to do your work.

O, ye Tory jingoes.' And thus they cry from the house tops.

But, now I ask my right hon. friend: suppose that, according to your belief to-day, an emergency, as you call it, existed, what would you do? The right hon. gentleman has said it: he would send $140,000,000 over to the British treasury. No blood, no bones, no brains. O, ye Liberal jingoes! We think that there is a need, we think that need cannot be quickly and efficiently met in any degree without a contribution. But at least we put our contribution in the form of fighting machines which represent Canada and which will be the finest in the Empire's fleet. Surely that is a little advance on the dollars without the machines. O, ye Liberal jingoes! During ten years of power and great revenue returns, you have sat in your seats and slept in your beds, and yet have sent neither money nor men. O, ye Liberal jingoes! In 1899 you permitted after sundry persuasions Canadian 'dreadnoughts' (à la my hon. friend from Edmonton), to go to South Africa. Did you give them rations? Did you supply them with ammunition? You sent our volunteers, our priceless Canadian 'dreadnoughts' to the veldts of South Africa without a ration to put in their mouths, without a round of ammunition to put in their belts. And they would have been met by the Boers, and, in the picturesque language of my hon. friend from South Renfrew, would have been 'lugged off' by the Boers, unless the British taxpayer had filled their stomachs and filled their ammunition pouches, yes, and paid their soldiers' allowances. O ye Liberal jingoes! To-day, you propose a divided force in home waters. No matter what happens in the European waters you will be absolutely unable within six years with your policy to add one single item to the force of the fleet that during that time may have to fight the supreme battle for the Empire. Oh ye Liberal jingoes!

Let us look at this, not in the heated atmosphere of party debate. Let us see it as it appears to us through other atmospheres. For how many years has the South African been sending his contribution to Great Britain—his money contribution? Did you ever hear it hinted anywhere that he was a coward and a do-nothing—that he saved his own precious body, but sent his money? For twenty years, Australia has been sending her £100,000 and £200,000 until she has sent more than £2,200,000 to the British Admiralty. Yet, we have never heard it said that the Australian was a cowardly man who desired to save his own skin. New Zealand sent her dreadnought, without a man in it, or a ration in it; and in the whole course of the discussion of this theme of Empire defence you have never heard the assertion made that the New Zealander is cowardly. Nor will they say of us, when they read that $35,000,000 is, at long last, put to some purpose for the use of the Empire in providing its defence, that these Canadians, though they give their money refuse their blood. After all, such argument is proof of one thing, and one thing only,—that the men who use it have not risen to the true conception of Empire. They tell us: It is England you are sending the money to, it is England, it is Downing Street, that is spending your money. That is not true. It is the best and most efficient machinery that the Empire has that is spending the money. And the Empire is all one family. Six children, grown up men, we will say, from eighteen to thirty years old, belong to one family. Two men are sent to the defence of their country; four remain at home. Do you say to the four who remain at home: You have no part or lot in this matter? One of those remaining at home provides a rifle, another a kit, another gives a bible—or perhaps, it is the mother that does that,—another gives his prayers his hopes, his good wishes. The whole family is in it—the whole family offers joint sacrifice for the country's safety.

The next assertion is that the Government's policy is one of contribution only; that we have abandoned the idea of a Canadian navy. We may call this a temporary policy, but that is not true. It is a permanent policy they say, contribution will recur and recur and eventually become permanent. The then leader of the Opposition before the election declared that his

> Whole policy was in two parts, and he explained what they were.

My right hon. friend in introducing his Bill said:

> My policy is in two parts, and I have explained them. This Bill is to cover one; the other part of my policy is to be matured and presented to the people.

In the face of all this, how can fair-minded men make the assertion, as though it were absolutely true, that the policy of the Government has nothing but a contribution policy? Does my right hon. friend still insist on that? Because if he does I must labour with him a little longer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I certainly concluded the policy of a Canadian navy had been abandoned by the present Administration, and that the law was to be repealed this present session.

Mr. FOSTER: My right hon. friend may be better informed than I am. I have not noticed him of late sitting in the Privy Council, although I have sometimes sat there myself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend can tell me whether I am right or wrong.

Mr. FOSTER: My right hon. friend is absolutely wrong when he conveys the impression that this contribution, made upon the existence of a pressing need, is the whole of the policy of the Government.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER: Judging by the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite, I am inclined to think they take my word for it.

Mr. MACDONALD: Tell us all about it.

Mr. GRAHAM: Is the hon. gentleman in favour of a Canadian navy as a permanent policy?

Mr. FOSTER: Does my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) expect me, as a member of the Government, when the Government comes down with its temporary policy, to answer the question as to what the permanent policy will be? It is the practice of hon. gentlemen opposite to befuddle the question under consideration. My hon. friend is a master of that art, but it does not count for anything in this House. If hon. gentlemen will hold themselves in patience for a while, they will find out first that there is to be a permanent policy, and in good time, they will find out what it is.

Mr. MACDONALD: Tell us what it is not.

Mr. FOSTER: My right hon. friend argues that there is to be no permanent policy because 'you are to have negotiations for a voice in the direction of foreign policy and that is to be made a part of the permanent defence policy itself and these negotiations will take a long time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I understood that the negotiations which were to take place with regard to Canada's having a voice in questions of peace and war was to be a question preceding any permanent policy.

Mr. FOSTER: Well, I will put it that way. My right hon. friend has argued that the fact that certain questions were to be negotiated before a permanent policy was introduced was to him a proof, owing to the difficulty of coming to a settlement in that regard, that a permanent policy had been indefinitely postponed. It has not, and in the meantime we do everything that can be done to make the fleet of the Empire strong; we do more than hon. gentlemen under their policy could do, or could approach doing, within six, eight, ten or more years. We do more than that; we wipe off a long dark stain and redeem our good Canadian name. I am not uttering this simply to use words. I have sat beside men from South Africa, from Australia, from New Zealand, from our overseas dominions and from our Empire, and I have been asked why it was, when small and comparatively poor parts of the dominions of the Empire gave aid towards the Imperial fleet, that rich and prosperous Canada did not do something as well, if for nothing else than to step by the side of the others and give encouragement. More than one wet blanket has been thrown on the hopes of the best friends of the British Empire in all parts of it by Canada's delay in this respect. I venture to say that nothing has happened in past years which has so lightened and strengthened and freshened the hearts and hopes and aspirations of Empire lovers than the announcement that at last Canada had decided to do something. I go further and say that the announcement which was flashed across the world that Canada was taking an equal stand with the other dominions in rendering assistance to the Empire, was read with interest in the chancellery of every great power in the wide world. Now you have Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Canada, and the Malayan States ranging themselves by the side of the Empire. What does the Chancellor say as he reads that news? He says: 'Here is a new departure. We are making fleets, forging our blood and brains into machinery for war. For what? To compete with a country which has no designs upon it, in the hope that we may catch her unawares and overpower her? Our man power is as great as or a little more than hers.' But look at this. South Africa with her two millions, New Zealand with her one million, Australia with her five millions, Canada with her eight millions, are ranging themselves alongside the Mother Country, and the time is not far distant when that fifteen millions will be fifty, and the time not far from that when the fifty will be one hundred millions. This vast man power will not be all in one mass—would that it were—but distributed in four great corners of the universe, a tower of British Imperial strength in every corner, to watch and guard and preserve their interests, and to present a firm, able, effective, and united front to all aggressors. Do you mean to say that this will not have an effect to discourage war and ensure peace? And this effect would have been greater if my right hon. friend could have fallen into line as in 1909 and given to this contribution his support and then fought, as well he knows how to fight, for the addition of a Canadian naval service as well.

Mr. GERMAN: Did the hon. gentleman say in 1900:

When we make our contribution in the way of a fixed sum and it goes from us and we are not responsible for it we have none of the inspiration arising from the growth and development of a system of future defence in our own country?

Mr. FOSTER: I am not at all sorry that my hon. friend read that. I wish he would read my whole speech. If he does so he will find that if ever there was a non-partisan, detached discussion of a subject in this House attempted by any one, I attempted it in that discussion. All through it I gave the objections that were raised. I gave the objections of others and I valued them, as I thought, at their worth. I disagreed with many. I agreed with others, but up to a few minutes of the conclusion of my speech, I was discussing one thing and one thing only, the permanent, normal policy of defence; and I said then, as I say now, that I was not in favour of a permanent system involving yearly contributions. I stated so plainly and I stated the reasons why. But in the last of my speech I took up the other part and I said that in view of what had taken place of late we were face to face with another phase of the question, other than the defence of our own shores, namely a sudden danger and peril to the Empire itself. I said, and my right hon. friend knows it well, that if my right hon. friend would come down to the House and ask for a vote of millions of money for the emergency he would find every member on my side of the House at his back.

I must now take up the argument of my hon. friends from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) and Red Deer (Mr. Clark), in conjunction with those of my right hon. friend. All of them declared that the contribution system was a cowardly one.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I must protest against that statement. I never used the word cowardly myself and never heard it used on this side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER: The word was not used, but they said that the contribution system was not the proper system because while it gave the money it did not give the man element, the blood, and brawn and brain, and therefore the imputation was that we paid our money to hire some one else to do what we were not brave enough to do. The member for South Renfrew certainly treated it as an imputation of cowardice. And now may I say that I have been awfully puzzled in dealing with the argument of that hon. member, to make up my mind as to where he was in earnest and where he was jollying.

Mr. GRAHAM: A good deal like my hon. friend to-day.

Mr. FOSTER: Some of his most earnest words were accompanied by such a quizzical look that I came to the conclusion it was not necessary to follow them out as part of a serious argument. One of his assertions was that our policy would reverse the constitutional relations between us and the Old Country and put them 70 years backward.

Mr. GRAHAM: Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER: He says that Downing Street would expend our money that the Admiralty would purchase our ships. He says: You tell young Canada to stand back, you shall not build ships; you shall not man them, you shall not equip them—stand back, this money is to be sent to the old land and they are to do it there. He says it interferes with responsible government. Now was he serious in making that statement?

Mr. GRAHAM: Yes, decidedly so.

Mr. FOSTER: Did he really fear that if this Bill went through and the money were expended as the Bill directs, responsible government and constitutional relations would be reversed and put back 70 or 50 years? I advise my good friend to be cautious in his answer because he will be judged by it. Was he really fearful of that or was it merely a stalking horse for the concessions? If it was not a stalking horse what about the proposal of his right hon. leader to send $140,000,000 over to Downing Street? Let us argue it out. If a $35,000,000 gift will put back constitutional relations 70 years, four times that gift will put it back 280 years. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) said in effect that this policy gives away self-government, gives away the power to spend our own money, gives up the control of expenditures. Why, he said, a king's head was cut off because he took money without the sanction of Parliament, 13 colonies left the British Empire once because of similar action. My hon. friend does not say that he did not use those expressions. He says the contribution is to be spent by the Admiralty. He also says that it is hazardous and dangerous to have Downing Street or people from Great Britain running the public works of Canada or the works of defence. Might I interpose here that for 100 years and more Downing Street and the Admiralty have been running the only works of naval defence this Dominion of Canada has had and doing it at their own cost and charges? But did my hon. friend ever study the Bill? He was asked by my right hon. leader if he had read the Bill. It was pointed out to him that he could hardly found his argument or assertions on the Bill as it was, but when he was cor-

nered he said: Oh well, I do not think that is much of a point. But I think it is a very great point. Let us see whether it is or not. Under this Bill, which the House is asked to pass, the authorizing is done by a Canadian Act, enacted by a Canadian Parliament. The vote is passed through its three stages and made law by the Canadian Parliament. The money that is voted is expended by the Governor in Council by order of the Canadian Parliament. The construction of the battleships is carried out and the purpose for which they are to be used is indicated by the Canadian Parliament. The ships are to be placed at the disposal of the Admiralty by order of the Canadian Parliament, and they are to be put there for the common defence of the Empire by Act of the Canadian Parliament. And the terms and conditions of their service are entrusted to the Government of this country in concurrence with the Government of Great Britain. Where are constitutional relations impinged upon by that enactment? Where is responsible government outraged by that enactment? But my hon. friend from Red Deer says, you are sending money over to Great Britain, Canadian money, to be spent there, and the contractors will take a slice of $3,500,000 a year out of our money. I do not place much store by that argument, and I do not think my hon. friend would have used it if he had thought about it a little longer. Wherever ships are built, companies build them and make their profit. If they did not there would be no ships at all in the world. But I think I have caught my hon. friend from Red Deer napping. Is he not a free trader?

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): May I point out to my hon. friend that what he has just quoted as mine is a quotation of what is being said in England about the scheme.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend then does not believe any of those things? I am entitled to finish my argument however, and here is where I think I caught him napping. Is he not a free trader, a disciple of Cobden, and is not the innermost principle of free trade to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend is a protectionist.

Mr. FOSTER: My hon. friend (Mr. Clark, Red Deer) denies to Canadians the right to spend their money in Britain. But my hon. friend knows that if we spend it over there we will get an effective fighting force for $12,000,000 less of Canadian money than if we built it here. Is he a protectionist? That is the costliest kind of protection, the bounty. Shades of Cobden! My free trade friend stands in this House of Parliament in the twentieth century and pleads to pay the twelve millions more, to give the work to the people of our own country, give them a bonus and give them a bounty, he will be protectionist enough for that. Just on that point I wish to say this, and I say it in all fairness; there are some things that we can do so as to help political and industrial conditions, but when it comes to the life of an Empire, and to the provision to be made for the vital defence of that Empire at a critical moment, it is next to criminal almost to divert any of the money, which is devoted ostensibly for that sacred purpose, into channels for the sake of industrial or other preference that you think would aid certain interests and thereby diminish the effective aid. Now, Sir, if that is true generally it is absolutely true in an emergency of this kind. Every cent of the money which is to be expended is to go to meet a pressing need, which, if not met, may end in disaster and destruction.

I do not know whether it is necessary to introduce two other arguments of my hon. friend from Red Deer. I shall mention them, however. He says, this contribution is unnecessary financially. Great Britain, he says, is a rich country. Great Britain, he says, has $2,000,000,000 invested in Canada, and we are sending her $80,000,000 of money each year as interest on that. Now, he says, is that not enough money to be sending her? Why should we be sending her $35,000,000 in addition? She is rich; and we are sending her money. Well, I did not know before that when one party paid the interest on his mortgage, the other was under a special obligation to him, and, therefore, ought to protect him, build his fleets for him and maintain his navies for him. It seems to me that each tub must stand on its own bottom. I wish also to say what I think of that argument. Great Britain is a rich country, she does not need your money, says my hon. friend. But who is it that keeps up the fleet and the army in Great Britain at tremendous cost to keep safe the Empire and to secure peace within the Empire even as far as Red Deer? It is the British taxpayer, rich and poor. It does not come out of the moneys of the banks, or of the rich man exclusively. Everything is paid out of revenue according to men's incomes, and according to their consumption of dutiable and excise goods. Well, the incomes of some of the richest men are smaller than the incomes of many of the only fairly well-to-do people. Anyway, it is the British taxpayer through and through, and I invite my hon. friend (Mr. Clark, Red Deer) to visit Great Britain and go through its crowded centres, its country and its cities,

its broad streets, and its purlieus, and then come back here and justify to his Canadian brother any shirking of a fair part of the defence of the Empire by throwing it on to the British taxpayer.

But my hon. friend from Red Deer says the contribution is a badge of inferiority, financially. I will not stand it, he says, neither will Red Deer stand it, nor my constituents, nor this country. He says you put a tag on me and you degrade me financially. You say I am worth only $4.50, whilst the British taxpayer is worth $5. He is taxed $5 in Great Britain, you only tax me $4.50, and only occasionally at that. I am as good and as able a man as he, says my hon. friend; it is a badge of inferiority and I will not stand it. Well, my hon. friend has been standing worse than that for some time. For the term of his life in this Dominion of Canada, his valuable life in Canada where he has done good work and good service both in and without Parliament—I willingly bear my testimony to that—for all that time he has been badged in another way. Nil. His brother whom he left on the other side has been worth $5 yearly to the upkeep of the fleet; Red Deer citizens have been worth nothing. Then he says it is a badge of inferiority morally not to consecrate that money with a drop of blood. I refuse, he says, I must have at least a little sprinkling of blood on that money, or else I am badged with moral inferiority.

I do not think I need labour that argument. Now, although there are others that I might mention, I am not going to pursue this side of the question any further. I want to come to something which I think is more important. I want to know whether I, as a citizen of Canada and of this Empire, fully size up the situation, and whether I am acting under full knowledge and comprehension of the great interests which are involved. I cannot do that unless I inquire and examine and think and reflect.

What is the situation? Britain is not an aggressive nation. I say that without fear of contradiction. Her hostages are such that she dare not be aggressive. Her possessions are so great that there is no will or wish to be aggressive. Her great problem is to organize, develop and maintain what she has got. She is a defensive, peaceful nation and must remain so. That weighs with me and I feel that it counts for much. More than that; let us not be misled by a play on the word 'emergency.' It is the condition of things that we want to understand. If the conditions imply danger, present or prospective, and if the danger is one that we, as part of the Empire, are called upon to face and to make provision for, the emergency can go to one side. It is the fact I am after, it is the condition that I want to ensure myself and the country against and that I would like to see the Empire insured against. What is the condition? There, you have Britain, the heart of the Empire, geographically placed in the North Sea, and you cannot take the heart of the Empire out of that place. You cannot change the geographical position. Great Britain today is the heart of the Empire. What does that mean? Stand at her ports and watch for a single month, a single year. Britain herself has only 121,000 square miles in an Empire which owns one quarter of the territory of the wide earth, 11,900,000 square miles. Britain has forty-five millions of people in an Empire which has 400 millions of people of every diversity of race, creed and class. Britain is diffused over the whole earth and the various parts of that Empire are thousands of miles distant from each other and from her. Dispersion adds to the difficulty of government, though it has advantages in some other respects. Now, watch at these ports. Everything that is eaten, that is consumed, beyond a certain amount, everything that is necessary for her great manufacturing industries, takes ship somewhere in distant lands, traverses the long line of the ocean waterways and finds its way into her ports to feed her industries, employ her people, and add to her wealth and help to make something for distribution again to the wide world. More than that; watch what goes out. More than 3,500 million pounds worth comes in every year; more than 2,000 million pounds worth goes out every year. What goes out? Stuff that has been made, products that are necessary to the subsistence of every quarter of the world. If, for one minute, the cotton trade between India and Great Britain were interrupted, Lancashire would go bankrupt. If, for a single season, the wools that come from abroad were to be kept from coming, what would become of the great woollen industries of Great Britain? If, for ten weeks, the food that comes in for her people were to be kept out, what would become of the forty-five million people of Great Britain? More than material things go out. Watch those coursing steamers, watch these channels of communication and you will see that something else is going out. The civilization of Britain, uplifting and making better those that need to be uplifted, the governmental policies, the law and justice, the moral, social and religious influences of Great Britain, everything that tends to uplift in the far distant regions of the world where her wards live, is carried far and wide on these lines of communication and, to and fro, the intercourse goes on. Suppose that for one single instant something happened. Rome had her great roads. The great roads of the British Empire are the pathless seas. If

the roads to Rome had been cut off that moment Rome would have fallen. If the waterways of the Empire are blocked that moment intercourse ceases, the arteries glow flaccid, the veins grow limp, the heart beats weaker until at last it stops.

I tell you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of this House, when we come to think of all that is involved in the maintenance of those little islands in the North sea for the Empire, and, measurably, for the whole world, we must see how imperative it is that we realize the gravity of this question. If, to-morrow morning, the news were to be flashed around the world that Britain's fleet had been wiped off the sea and that Britain's communications had been absolutely blocked, that moment disintegration, confusion would set in and the distant parts of the Empire and Canada would have no security, no confidence and no absolute lease of life. When I look at that I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it makes me feel that this is an awfully grave and important matter. When I look at it in that way I say: Put aside for Heaven's sake, these huckstering objections. Banish the baseless fear from your heart about responsible government going to pieces or about constitutional relations being put back. Britain's ideas do not run in that line at all. If they did, ours do not and would not admit of it. But, let us feel that on the one great matter of Imperial defence, we are not a federation, we are not mere allies, but that we are all members of the same body. Does the hand quarrel with the foot because it fears that the foot will endanger its autonomy? The eye and the ear have different functions. The one strains to focalize the lines of light, the other to group the waves of sound and enact the interpretation therefrom. All are members of the same body, each does its own work and the whole entity glorifies and ennobles God's greatest work in the universe. We need not fear any one if we are able to say: There are our forces standing side by side with those of the Empire. Do not cavil whether your battleship be in St. John harbour or on the Pacific coast when the Empire's interests are in danger. Remember, that where the enemy's ships are, there will the great battle be fought and there the fateful decision made. Away with this idea too long held and still held in some quarters, that Canada must do nothing, lest thereby she enters into the maelstrom of European strife. Sift that idea for a moment. From what quarter is England menaced? From Asia? No. From Africa? No. From America? No. Whence is her menace to-day? It is in Europe, and if combinations of powers, or if any one power in Europe aims a spear at her heart, that is where my shield and

helm should be to ward off the pointed dart and to prevent the death-dealing thrust. Britain is powerful to-day because of her European affiliations and her European influence; she could not be as powerful anywhere else. I saw when I was in London what was to me a most significant spectacle. It was in the fury and flame of the Balkan-Turkish war. There was a Guildhall banquet at which Prime Minister Asquith spoke; it was at a most critical time; the French Prime Minister had taken a leading part in peace negotiations; he had done all that his country could urge him to do and all that a man could do, but after all, there were cross-currents. Mr. Asquith rose in Guildhall; he spoke as Mr. Asquith, but he spoke for Britain; he spoke for the Empire; he spoke as the representative of a great power; what he said was calm and measured, counselling putting aside special questions until general questions had been settled, saying to the chancellories of Europe: let us keep our heads and keep our little differences back until we settle the main points. Next day, Sir, in every European country and all over the world the advice of Mr. Asquith was lauded, and more, it was taken, and a crisis was averted. Why had Mr. Asquith's words such power? It was because he was the head of a nation whose fleet was invincible as compared with any other. Great Britain's fleet could not make much headway against the interior of Germany or the interior of Austria, or the Himalayas—where a fleet gives a nation power is where it touches a nation which has maritime possessions and maritime commerce. There is the power of Britain's fleet, and to-day Britain is powerful there and through the world because of her fleet and because of that alone. But even her fleet is not sufficiently powerful to allow her to isolate herself from Europe; she must have friends in Europe, she must have allies, and she must work to keep these allies so that in all combinations of power she shall not be left to herself and to her own resources alone. And so, to the man who I think inadvisedly says to Canada: don't give your money because it may tend to drag you into the vortex of European militarism and contest; to him I say: it is in Europe that the strength of Britain lies, it is there at the present outlook where she floats or sinks, lives or dies, and where our fortunes as a nation within the Empire float or sink, live or die, with her. And, Sir, every dollar we can put into the centre of the conflict, that is the place we ought to put it at this particular time, and in such shape that it will be effective.

We have at the present moment two policies before this House; and I think I have pretty well outlined the policy of the

Government and what it means. What is the policy which the Liberal party in this House place against it, and to this I wish to ask the attention of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. My right hon. friend seems to have had two policies, one policy in his speech and another in his resolution. In his speech he declared that certain things were disclosed by the Admiralty memorandum, and he asked: What is the remedy, and he stated the remedy and he detailed it as follows: That every vessel withdrawn from outside seas to concentrate for defence in home waters, the overseas dominions should replace by another vessel, equally as strong or stronger. He has not included that in his resolution. Does he mean that that was mere verbiage and that the resolution really includes what he meant by that, namely the two units. That opens up a number of queries. If each younger nation is to replace that which is being drawn away or is to be drawn away for concentration purposes, Canada will have nothing to replace, because we have not had on the coasts of Canada for a long period of years a protective part of the British navy. Or, does he think that all of the outside dominions should pool their interests and divide the cost pro rata for filling up these outside vacancies made by withdrawing ships to the home centre. If he does that he will find that within a few years eighty vessels and more have been withdrawn, and that Canada's share of this would be about eight-fifteenths according to population, and that would oblige us to provide forty-six vessels of war somewhere around these seas. I think my right hon. friend saw how untenable that was and so in the resolution he substitutes the two units. There is no difference between us what we both agree upon is a temporary emergency. In that my right hon. friend would go as far, yes, four times as far as we are going now.

We come now to the permanent policy, and the amendment of my right hon. friend says: Any measure of Canadian aid to Imperial naval defence must be by ships owned, manned, maintained by Canada, to be constructed in Canada as soon as possible (that is somewhat indefinite); to be worked under the Naval Service Act of 1910 (that is divided control) to the extent of two fleet units, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, and thus shall greater mobility be restored to British squadrons.

Now, this is the question I ask—and it is not meant to be an impertinent question—Is this, on the part of my right hon. friend, a genuine policy? If so, St. Paul's conversion on his way down to Damascus was not a circumstance compared with the conversion of my right hon. friend on his way from his home to the Grit caucus. He refused any approach to aid in 1902, and in 1907. He turned down the one-unit proposal in 1909. He did not even award the contracts for the four cruisers and six torpedo boats. Yet my right hon. friend knew every fact and figure we now know, according to his own assertion. You knew the increase in armaments in your time,—in which Germany grew to be the great naval power she is to-day. And all these years you had full power and an overflowing treasury. Is this a death-bed repentance? Or is it a platform to get in on? My right hon. friend will forgive the average man if he sees in this a device to stop indefinitely all help to the Imperial treasury for the defence of the Empire. There is no doubt at all that if my right hon. friend attempted to carry out his policy of two fleet units to be constructed, manned and equipped by Canada, many, many years would pass over his head and ours before one single item of aid could be given to Imperial defence. Was it for that purpose, to hinder any effective co-operation and, if possible, make a platform upon which he could overthrow the present Government? I do not want to be uncharitable, but this has all the earmarks of a rather clumsily constructed platform to meet the other fellow, and if possible, make it appear to the country to be something better than the other had offered. Was it an emergency—a political emergency policy? My right hon. friend, I think, must take this as a not uncharitable deduction. It is when one is in power, and with full control, that he feels responsibility. But when a man is in the wide, roomy spaces of the Opposition, he can make platforms which he never intends to stand on, and he can formulate policies that he never expects to carry out.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend has had a rich experience in that.

Mr. FOSTER: I have not observed my right hon. friend from 1883 up to the present day without being cognizant of the rich fields of ready promises that he has tilled.

A Canadian navy first, and then 'all the ships will be built in Canada,' says my right hon. friend. What does that mean? Does it mean that the boy is to learn to swim before you will allow him to touch the water? Or must you have a Canadian navy first and afterwards have a complete plant in which you will build war vessels? If that is it, where are you going to build your Canadian navy? In the Old Country?—Built by Downing street and paid for with our money? That you object to on that side of the House. But, if you mean that there shall be no Canadian navy until you can build it in

this country, man and equip it in this country, then, I say that millenium is far off. Why, it is not possible; and no business man will say that it is possible within any reasonable period for speedy aid.

But, if it were possible how about its adequacy and effectiveness? You would have one fleet unit on the Pacific to protect the western sea routes and ports. Against whom would it protect you? You do not expect the Sandwich Islanders to invade Canada. New Zealand and Australia will certainly not attack you. If any one attacks you on that side, it will be one of the great naval powers. Will your one fleet unit be an effectual protection against such a power? Why, your fleet unit would be brown paper as against the impact of a rifle ball. You would have another fleet unit on the Atlantic to protect trade routes and ports on that side. Against whom ? The West Indies would not attack you, neither would any of the South American states. If any one interferes with you there it will be one of the great naval powers. It will be impossible for you by this means to protect yourselves against such an attack. Well, then, if you do not mean that, what do you mean? Do you mean that these two units, one on the Pacific and the other on the Atlantic, will go to the British fleet and fight at the central point of that fleet's operations as soon as the Order in Council issues ? If that is the idea, let me call my right hon. friend's attention to this point. Consider what a difference there is between wars by land and wars by sea. War by land is impossible without long advertising the commencement of it. But war by sea may be so secretly engineered may be so completely masked, that battle and the order for battle come within ten or twelve hours of each other. Then, for example, suppose that Germany with her mighty fleet, masked and protected as it is from aggression, backed by one of the greatest army powers of the world, a fleet ready for instant action—if such a fleet attacks Great Britain with a coast line of two thousand miles, and in twelve hours is at the point against which she directs its operations, where will your one Atlantic squadron be? What aid will your six-weeks-distant Pacific squadron give?

Brought down to the final analysis you should do one thing or the other: Either do what is absolutely necessary to make your ports defensible against any power; or if you are going to help the British navy and save the British Empire, put your force where the British Admiralty want it. They are the judges; they are the men whose views should guide us.

Mr. FOSTER (North Toronto).

There is another consideration, this: If you block this measure, what will happen? You cannot make your policy prevail short of a general election, and a reversal of the opinion of the people expressed on the 21st of September, 1911. That seems impossible. Hon. gentlemen may have powers which will enable them to do that, but much time will pass before anything definite can be accomplished. If that is done, and hon. gentlemen opposite come back with a majority in their party —which is not quite possible—then, the matter having been blocked for say two years, must begin anew. You make your fleet construction, tediously and lengthily, extending, certainly, over a period of six or seven years, finding it impossible sooner to obtain Canadian seamen to man it, because you have to train men as well as get them. In the event of such a contingency, and if the day of Armageddon came and caught us napping, I would like to have the consciousness that I am free from the remorse which would lie heavily upon me if I had been party to or contributed in that fatal delay.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (South Wellington): Before moving the adjournment of this debate, I have only one remark to make in regard to the observations of my friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. His preliminary remarks as to the calm, unprejudiced, non-partisan tone which his utterances on this occasion were to assume, have been carried out to the same extent as his promises and prophecies usually are when made before this hon. body. It took the hon. gentleman the first ten minutes of his speech to point out to this House the tremendous magnitude and importance of this proposal, and he also stated in the first of his remarks that if this measure was not passed by the House, it would be by this country, or words to that effect. But why not cut the Gordian knot? Why not accept the challenge of the hon. member for South Renfrew, bring in your Redistribution Bill—we will facilitate its passage—and then dissolve the House and go to the country ? This seems to me to be the simplest, and perhaps in the end the speediest and most satisfactory way of settling a question of such magnitude and importance. As hon. members are anxious at this stage, Mr. Speaker, to leave the House, I shall not make any further remarks on this occasion, and beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Borden, House adjourned at 5.15 p.m. to January 14, 1913.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 14, 1913.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ACTING SERGEANT-AT-ARMS.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that during the illness of the Sergeant-at-Arms, I have appointed Capt. H. W. Bowie, Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, to be Acting Sergeant-at-Arms; and have approved of the appointment by the Sergeant-at-Arms of John L. Godwin, Esquire, as a temporary Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, to assist the Acting Sergeant-at-Arms.

APPOINTMENT OF TRANSLATOR.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have directed the Clerk to lay upon the table the recommendation and other papers respecting the appointment of Mr. Louis Noailles as translator in the Translation Branch of the House.

PRIVATE BILLS.—FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 52, to incorporate the Bankers Trust Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 53, respecting Brazilian Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 54, respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 55, to incorporate the New Westminster Harbour Commissioners.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 56, respecting the Hull Electric Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill No. 57, respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill No. 58, to incorporate the Intercolonial Trust and Investment Company.—Mr. Barnard.

Bill No. 59, to incorporate the North Fraser Harbour Commissioners.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 60, respecting the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 61, respecting the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 62, to incorporate the Western Canada Mortgage Corporation.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 63, to incorporate the Wetaskiwin, Yellowhead and Revelstoke Railway Company.—Mr. Bennett (Calgary).

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Borden.

Report of the Militia Department for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Hughes (Victoria).

Copies of general orders from November 2, 1911, to October 18, 1912.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1912 (vol. 3).—Mr. White (Leeds).

Report of the Director of Experimental Farms for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Burrell.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

Mr. COCHRANE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 64, respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. He said: This is to provide for an extension of time. The contract was to have been completed on the 1st of December of last year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. COCHRANE moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 65, respecting the National Transcontinental Railway. He said: This Bill is to extend the time for completion.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SHIP REPAIRING PLANTS AND SHIPBUILDING AREAS.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries if he has laid upon the table of the House, or if he is prepared to have laid upon the table, the plans for the lay-out of the proposed ship-repairing plants and shipbuilding areas at Sydney, Cape Breton, Montreal and Esquimalt, B. C.; likewise the correspondence which has taken place between the Government and Vickers-Maxim, Limited, in regard to the construction of war vessels at Montreal. Before the recess the minister stated that there was no correspondence in his department, but that he would be good enough to communicate with the ministers of the other departments interested and see what correspondence there was, and if any have it laid on the table.

Mr. HAZEN: I explained to my hon. friend before the recess that all the plans in my department had been laid on the table of the House, and that the plans to which the hon. gentleman referred were probably in the possession of the Public Works Department to which application would have to be made in order to obtain them. My hon. friend did ask me if I could get the information for him, and I

think I promised to do so, but during the vacation the matter escaped my notice. If the hon. gentleman will give me a memorandum of what he wants, I shall be very glad to transmit it to the Public Works Department.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have already given my hon. friend a memorandum, but I shall be glad to give him another. It will be quite impossible, so far as I am concerned, and probably so far as other hon. members are concerned, to speak with any advantage on the naval question without having this material before the House.

Mr. HAZEN: If my hon. friend had taken the direct method of applying to the department under whose control the matter is, he would probably have had the information before this. The matter has escaped my attention, but I shall try to expedite it in every way I can.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Perhaps I may ask my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works to see if he has the plans in connection with the dry-docks and repairing plants at Montreal, at Esquimalt, in connection with the British Columbia Shipbuilding Company, and at Sydney in connection with the Canadian Shipbuilding Company. Then, my right hon. friend the Prime Minister will perhaps be good enough to submit the correspondence between the Government and Vickers-Maxim, Limited, in connection with the building of war vessels at Montreal.

Mr. BORDEN : I shall look and see if there is any.

QUEBEC AND SAGUENAY RAILWAY.

Mr. LEMIEUX : May I ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if he has received any report from the party of engineers sent before the recess to examine the Quebec & Saguenay Railway ?

Mr. COCHRANE : I have received a verbal report only.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of and concurrence in the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. HUGH GUTHRIE (North Wellington): Mr. Speaker, rising to continue the debate upon the resolution now before the House which outlines the Government's naval proposals, and which is a necessary preliminary under our form of procedure to the subsequent introduction by the Government of a Bill entitled, 'an Act to authorize measures for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire,' one can hardly refrain at the outset from remarking that after an adjournment of this House for a period of three weeks to enable hon. gentlemen to celebrate and to enjoy that particular period in the Christian calendar intimately connected with the spirit of peace on earth, good will toward men, it is hardly appropriate, indeed it is somewhat amiss, that at the first moment after the recess the House should again be plunged into the discussion of a measure so greatly removed from the spirit of the season through which we have, with much happiness to ourselves, and with many well-wishes to our friends and neighbours, so recently passed. It is, I repeat, somewhat amiss that we must turn from that season of peace and good will to consider the very grave proposals which at once rise before the minds and imaginations of hon. members, not scenes of peace and amity, but scenes of strife and tumult, scenes of conflict, possibly of war, war either of aggression or of defence, involving, should it unhappily occur, immeasurable sacrifices of blood and of treasure. It is not a happy or a peaceful scene for the contemplation of any mind or imagination at this particular moment, and it is one, Mr. Speaker, which is in strong contrast to those peaceful associations and happy surroundings which I am sure we all enjoyed but a brief fortnight ago.

The House rose on the 18th December last, and I have still vividly before my mind the eloquent speech delivered on the afternoon of that day by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, a speech which, if judged from the standpoint of oratorical effort, would rank high indeed among the many fine oratorical displays with which my hon. friend has favoured this House during a long and somewhat varied parliamentary career. I listened to that speech with some curiosity and with much interest. It had been currently rumored about the corridors of this House for some days prior to its delivery that my hon. friend would, on that particular afternoon and immediately preceding the adjournment of the House thereafter, have the last word and would assume the role of something in the nature of a political revivalist. It had been noticed, I think, by everyone that between the 5th of December, when this resolution was originally introduced, and the 18th December, when my right hon. friend addressed this House, there had been some lagging, some drooping, in the spirits of hon. gentleman opposite and it seemed quite evident to any calm observer that something in the nature of a stimulant would have to be administered. That stim-

ulant took the form of an oratorical display on the part of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. I must say that at the time I was considerably impressed by the eloquent diction, the eloquent phraseology and the vivid word pictures which my hon. friend seems at all times able to summon to his command. For example, his reference to the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom as to a man standing with his back to the wall, as a man whose glance penetrated the murky sea, and his reference to the last great struggle for the supremacy of the Empire, were indeed striking and vivid word pictures if not convincing or even weighty arguments. Since the delivery of that speech I have read it and reread it and, last night as I re-read it, the thought uppermost in my mind was rather one of wonder and surmise. I wondered just in my own mind if, perchance, the Minister had spoken immediately after, instead of immediately preceding the Christmas recess and if, in the interval he had experienced some slight touch, even the faintest, of that spirit of good will which is supposed to actuate mankind at this season and which that hon. gentleman is supposed to have an abundance hidden about his person somewhere, although he does not often show it—I wondered, if under such conditions my hon. friend could, by any effort of his will power, by any flight of his imagination, have given the House so dire, so dreadful a picture of impending conflict, indeed, I may say of impending calamity, as that which he portrayed in masterly style, in colors at times lurid and flaming and at other times murky and dull. He is certainly a master of the art of framing pictures in this House, be the occasion for such pictures great or small, and I particularly remember his intense attitude and his language during one portion of his speech, after solemnly reading to the House the preamble of the Germany Navy Bill, passed, I think, in the year 1900. I remember how his eyes seemed to flash, how his voice quivered under the strain of suppressed excitement, how his right hand waved and parried as he uttered those ominous,those terrible words about German submarines. Are these, he asked, for service in far distant waters? Well do I remember him as he spoke of German torpedo craft. Are these, he asked dramatically, intended to traverse far distant seas? Read it all, he exclaimed, from the dreadnoughts down, and you will find that four-fifths of the complete naval force of the German Empire is ready to strike at the sound of the bell. Rather strong language to indulge in in this chamber and, to my way of thinking, there is nothing very peaceful, nothing very amiable, about the shades or colors or lines of the picture.

I am well aware that it is somewhat invidious to make comparisons or to draw contrasts between the performances of hon. members upon different occasions, but I think that in this instance, I would be justified in asking any member of this House who has the time at his disposal just to compare the florid, over-done utterances of the Minister of Trade and Commerce with the statements and speeches of the ministers or members of the Imperial House, on either side, as we find these statements and speeches in the debates of the Imperial Parliament. I question if my hon. friend's warmest admirers—and he has many admirers on this side of the House—would have thought that in a contrast of that kind his eloquent utterances showed to advantage. The object, the motive, the incentive, which seems to guide both ministers and members of the Imperial House is an intense desire to examine the situation in the light of actual facts. You will search the British parliamentary debates and you will search them vainly for word pictures or oratorical displays. You will not find in those reports references to the disjecta membra after the final dissolution of the British Empire. You will find no reference to the murky sea, to the lightning flashes out of the dark sky or thunderbolts from the blue—nothing of the kind whatever. However, the Minister of Trade and Commerce likes to indulge in that kind of thing and I suppose it is nobody's business but his own if he does it to his heart's content. But what I do say is that the statesmen of the Motherland seek by their investigation and examination to afford a sense of security upon a plain, unvarnished statement of facts. Opinions in the Mother Country certainly differ and differ very widely, differ on questions of quality, quantity, method and on all questions of a like kind, but all the speakers whose speeches I have read in discussing naval affairs in the Imperial Parliament would seem to regard it as of the highest consequence to produce a sense of real security and my conclusion with regard to my hon. friend's utterances of the 18th December last is that his object was to produce in this country and in this House a sense of real insecurity or of impending calamity. What else could the language of my hon. friend mean? German torpedo boats, German submarines, German dreadnoughts within twelve hours steaming of Great Britain all ready to strike at the sound of the bell! Strong language that, pointed language that, ominous language that! I have very little doubt that the minister found it necessary to bolster up his case with something really spectacular on that occasion and that which came readiest to his hand, or to his tongue, was something in the nature of a general alarm.

But, Sir, does my hon. friend not realize that every word of his utterance, every phase of his argument, if argument it can be called, applies with greater force to Great Britain than to Germany? British dreadnoughts are far greater in number than are German dreadnoughts; British torpedo boats and British cruisers, far outnumber those of Germany, and are better equipped and more ready to strike at the sound of the bell.

I turn from the speech of my hon. friend to consider the utterances of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, delivered in the British House of Commons on the 22nd of July last. It is quite possible my hon. friend was present and heard the statement of Mr. Asquith, and the Prime Minister of Canada was possibly also there. What was the language of Mr. Asquith? Speaking at a time when he had before him the most recent German naval law, when he and his Government had considered that law, and understood every phrase of it, Mr. Asquith said (page 871 British 'Hansard'):

> There never has been a moment and there is not now when we have not been overwhelmingly superior in naval force against any combination which can reasonably be anticipated, but I entirely agree we must maintain that position and maintain it to the full.

Can we not take it for granted that Mr. Asquith understood the situation when he uttered these portentous words? The word pictures of my hon. friend seems to be in the nature of a two-piece canvas; he, for his own purpose, endeavours to magnify and exaggerate the lesser situation, the German portion of the canvas, and to ignore altogether the more prominent portion of it, which is the British situation in naval affairs to-day; and which has led Mr. Asquith to say that he considers the British navy to be overwhelmingly superior to any combination that can be brought against it. For my part, I belive there is only one deduction to be drawn from the speech delivered in this House by my hon. friend on the 18th of December last, and that is, his intense desire to create an unfounded alarm in this country and in this House, to destroy confidence and to establish a feeling of insecurity, solely and only to advance the passage of this measure which I am prepared to argue is by no means the best or most worthy method which Canada could adopt to meet the situation, whatever it may be.

I must turn now from what I may describe as the more or less unpleasant portion of my remarks to a more congenial atmosphere, and in doing so I wish to say a word in reference to the speech delivered on the 5th of December last by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. At the outset, I would hasten, were the right hon. gentleman here, to tender him my most earnest congratulations on the manner he adopted in presenting a measure of such magnitude to this Parliament. In my opinion, the right hon. gentleman presented it with a simplicity and a dignity quite in keeping with the importance of the measure and quite in keeping with his distinguished position in this country. I consider, of course, that speech to be more of a plain statement of facts than an argument. It is quite possible that such is what the right hon. gentleman intended it to be considered, and he left it to his more voluble and flighty colleagues in the Cabinet and his supporters in the House to draw such conclusions and offer such arguments and make such deductions as from time to time they might see fit. I find in the speech of the Prime Minister not very much that I would regard as argument in favour of his policy. He was very concise and very pointed in his statements, and his references to the more important parts of this discussion were few indeed. I commend him, however, for the absolute fairness which he displayed in the greater portion of his remarks. As I proceed I shall allude to one or two glaring omissions which I think were made not without intent. But on the whole, he made a concise statement of the facts upon which he founded this measure. While I can offer him genuine and hearty congratulations on his manner of delivering this policy to the House, I am sorry to say I can neither agree with him in his view of the situation, nor his proposed remedy to meet it.

In the first place, it would strike one who reads the speech of the Prime Minister, that he made no attempt to show anything in the nature of either peril or emergency. He did not disclose any unusual or any pressing necessity; his references in this respect were few and moderate in language. I assume, from the words of the Prime Minister, that he based his proposal entirely upon the memorandum of the Admiralty which has been laid on the Table of the House, and I note from 'Hansard' that he used this language:

> Upon the information which I have disclosed to the House, the situation is, in my opinion, sufficiently grave to demand immediate action.

I would ask the House for a moment to mark the precision of that language. All that the right hon. gentleman laid before the House in support of his proposal, I think I may fairly state was the memorandum of the Admiralty. He certainly gave us his views upon the great question of the supremacy of the British Empire, and on the duty and the right of Canada to participate in the maintenance of that supremacy. He made many statements which were cordially received on this side

of the House and to which we all readily subscribe.

But the only matter of substance which he placed before us in the course of his speech was the memorandum of the Admiralty, and I assumed from his own language he relies upon that to support this case. I want to be particular in regard to my statement upon this point, because my right hon. friend was particular to exclude from his remarks anything in the nature of confidential information which he had obtained during his recent visit to the Motherland. He made a very brief reference to confidential information. His language on that point is as follows:

> A portion of this is necessarily of a very confidential character and cannot be made public.

He also states that that confidential information was in regard to the foreign policy of England, and the secrets of Imperial defence. He states that the Government took him, and I assume his colleagues also, into their confidence to that extent. They let them understand what British foreign policy was, as far as it was possible for them to understand it in so brief a time. That is the confidential knowledge which the Prime Minister of this country obtained, and I congratulate and commend him that in his speech he made no reference to it more than what I have quoted, and no attempt to base any of his arguments upon any information which he had received in confidence. It was otherwise with my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). I believe that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, as he watched the situation shaping itself after the 5th of December last, when the measure was introduced by the Prime Minister into this Chamber, saw the weakness of the whole argument. He saw that the Admiralty's memorandum placed before this House would not support the contention of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. With his usual ingenuity, and with his propensity to magnify and exaggerate, he deliberately attempted to convince this House that there was more behind the scenes than had been disclosed by the Prime Minister, that the Government relied not only upon the memorandums of the Board of Admiralty, but upon the secret information locked in the breast of the Prime Minister, maintained there in absolute secrecy under his pledge of honour as Privy Councillor of the British Empire. Then the argument my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce made upon this question is this: The Prime Minister of this country knows the situation; the leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) does not know the situation; the Prime Minister of this country says that the situation is grave and demands instant aid, and the leader of the Opposition has not the knowledge to say that that is not the case. That was the comparison he made, and it was a striking one, if it could be maintained. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was guilty of gross impropriety in taking that stand. His own leader would not take that stand, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce took the stand and emphasized as much as he was able to emphasize, the secret information of which the House has no knowledge, because he knew in his heart that the memorandum of the Board of Admiralty did not support the contention of the Prime Minister himself in the proposal which he has brought down to this House. Now, my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce always goes one better than anybody else in debate in this House or in speaking outside of this Chamber. He has gone one further than the Prime Minister would go in regard to secret information, and he has gone him one better in information that was not secret, because he has told this House in two or three instances what the Prime Minister has said, and the Prime Minister did not say it. A close examination of the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce will disclose that. At page 1415 of 'Hansard,' the Minister of Trade and Commerce says that the Prime Minister said: 'If I find there is a need or a necessity, I will come back to ask this House for a money vote.' The Prime Minister in his speech did not say anything of the kind. At page 1416, the Minister of Trade and Commerce says: 'My right hon. friend came to the conclusion that there was a danger, that there was a need for immediate and effective help.' The Prime Minister never said a word of the kind in his remarks on the 5th of December last. Again, at page 1416, the Minister of Trade and Commerce says: 'The Prime Minister says there is a need and it is pressing.' The Prime Minister never said anything of the kind. I only mention these things to show that the statements made by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce cannot be relied on in this respect; and that he attempted to magnify the whole situation, to place emphasis where there was no need of emphasis, and if possible, to create a new situation in order to justify the proposal which the Government had brought down to this House. Before passing from that point, I want to make the same illustration as the Minister of Trade and Commerce did, but I want to make it in another way. He asked you, Mr. Speaker, to consider the Prime Minister with his conferences in England, with his secret information and with the recommendations of the Board of Admiralty before

him, on the one hand, and my right hon. leader's (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knowledge of the situation on the other. He said: Whose opinion should be taken? Who should be the guide in such matters? Of course, he declared unhesitatingly that the opinion of the Prime Minister should be taken.

Let me make another parallel. The opinion of the Prime Minister to-day, as he stated it in his speech, was as follows: At page 706 he says: 'There is, therefore, grave cause for consideration.' At page 707 he says: 'The real test of our action is the existence or non-existence of absolute security.' At page 711 he says: 'Upon the information which I have described to the House, the situation is, in our opinion, sufficiently grave to warrant immediate action' Well, let me place side by side with my right hon. friend the Prime Minister of this country with the right hon. gentleman who is Prime Minister of the Imperial House of Commons, Mr. Asquith. You will agree with me that Mr. Asquith, occupying the position he does, having had the experience he has had, possesses perhaps the largest amount of political knowledge that is to be found in one head in the British Empire to-day. He has had the experience and knows the practice also; he knows every move on the political chessboard of European politics, he has tested the naval question from top to bottom; he is in daily touch with the First Lord of the Admiralty; he has all the knowledge on the subject, domestic and foreign, which can be obtained. On the other hand we have the statement of the Prime Minister of this country, whose knowledge on the subject was obtained last year from Mr. Asquith and his colleagues during the brief period of his visit to England. Then I put a paralled case to that submitted to my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. Whose opinion will we accept, that of Mr. Asquith, or that of my hon. friend the Canadian Prime Minister? On the one hand we have the statement of the Prime Minister of this country to the effect that, in his opinion, the situation is sufficiently grave to demand immediate aid, and on the other hand we have the opinion of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom in these portentous words.

> There never has been a moment, and there is not now, when we have not been overwhelmingly superior in naval force against any combination which could reasonably be anticipated.

Make the comparison, Mr. Speaker, and make it calmly, as you would judge a business or any other proposal. Whose opinion is likely to be correct? What sane man believes that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister could in a few short weeks obtain that knowledge of Imperial affairs and foreign policy obtained by Mr. Asquith only after a long career of active participation? Does it seem reasonable that the Prime Minister of Canada has formed a correct estimate of the situation, and that Mr. Asquith's estimate is incorrect? I do not for a moment believe it, and in my opinion, the House will follow the proper course if, under these circumstances, it accepts the opinion of the man who should and does know, as against even that of the right hon. gentleman who occupies the distinguished position of Prime Minister of Canada.

That, I think, is one of the omissions made by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister in the speech he delivered in this House on the 5th of December last. In all fairness to the House, he should have given us the opinion of a man who should know the real situation. But he has not done so; he has consistently omitted to do so, and in this course he has been followed by those of his supporters who have since spoken. Surely it is of some consequence to hon. members to know what those who occupy distinguished Imperial positions really think of the situation. But, Sir, the reason for this course is plain to everyone. I believe the omission to give to the House the opinion of any statesman in Great Britain to-day, or of any man prominent in the Admiralty, is the most striking admission of weakness and the most convincing argument against the proposal that any hon. gentleman in this Chamber could make.

How then, does the matter stand? We have on the one hand Mr. Asquith's statement, asserting the overwhelming superiority of Great Britain in naval armaments. Mr. Asquith is a man who has a world-wide reputation as a master of concise and pointed expression; every word he uses has its own particular meaning, and his words on this occasion, 'overwhelming supremacy', mean all that they could possibly imply in regard to the present situation. This statement is corroborated by the opinion of the leader of the Opposition in the Imperial House of Commons, Mr. Bonar Law, who spoke on the matter on the 25th of July last. I would not be surprised if the right hon. the Prime Minister and his colleagues heard this statement; if they did they heard these words:

> But in spite of all that has been said, does the country—do the House of Commons do any of us—really believe that there is danger and vital danger? I confess that I have the greatest difficulty in believing it myself.

It is true that after making that statement, which evidently had been carefully prepared, the speaker did go on to argue that there never had been a time when England was so greatly imperilled, but as England has never been in very great peril—at least not for a number of cen-

turies—his argument upon that point did not seem to effect the question very materially. But his reasonable, calm conclusion was that there was no indication of peril, no cause for unrest; that he himself could not believe there was any foundation for the rumours and the unrest so plainly evident in some quarters. Then, take the position of Lord Crewe in the House of Lords, whose statement bears out the attitude of Mr. Asquith and Mr. Bonar Law. Take also the position of Mr. Balfour, a gentleman sitting on the Opposition benches, and occupying a prominent position in the Conservative party. His criticism, in a very few words, was that he thought the Government were perhaps drawing it too fine in regard to their naval preparation. But the point I make in regard to his utterance in the House of Commons—and it was a speech well worthy of the consideration of all those who take an interest in European affairs—is that he did not believe there was a possible combination in Europe which would strike against England, or perhaps against any other country; he did not believe that any such combination existed or could possibly exist under modern conditions. To that extent he certainly has cleared the atmosphere. Then we have Mr. Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, confirming these expressions in language which I need not now quote to the House, because I believe it is already on 'Hansard.'

As against the imputation of an impending peril, we have now produced at least four authorities of the very highest character. They appear to be satisfied not only that there is an overwhelming naval superiority, but that there is no cause for danger or for unrest. To complete my statement, and to give my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce all the consolation I can find for him in the Imperial debates, I may say the Lord Chancellor has suggested that the situation is grave, but he expresses at the same time the determination of the Government to meet the situation and retain the supremacy of which Mr. Asquith had spoken. That is the only utterance of such a character I have come across in the English parliamentary debates after a careful and thorough search. I ask my hon. friends opposite, or the hon. member who may follow me in the course of this debate, to give the House the benefit of some real authority on the situation differing from those which I have quoted—Mr. Asquith, Mr. Churchill, Mr. Bonar Law, Mr. Balfour, Lord Crewe and the Lord Chancellor. If anyone has such knowledge let him place the House in possession of it. If there be any man who can and will speak in the language of the right hon. the Prime Minister, that the situation is so grave that immediate aid is required from Canada or from any of the other colonies let him make his statement in this House.

I shall discuss for a moment the basis of the contention of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Mr. Borden) and the justification for the resolution which has been proposed. I commend the Prime Minister for his manly statement that he bases his argument and his proposal on what he has disclosed to the House, not on secret information. He disclosed to the House only his own general knowledge and the memorandum of the Board of Admiralty, which, by the way, is dated October 25, 1912, and I believe that if any hon. member will calmly go over that statement, without any prejudice or bias, the only conclusion to which he can come will be that that dispatch or memorandum bears out precisely what Mr. Asquith, Mr. Churchill and the others have contended for, namely, the overwhelming supremacy of Great Britain in naval armament.

What is there in that memorandum that causes alarm? Which are the causes to which hon. members refer when they speak of the dangers and the necessities? I have not been able to find them. I do find that the British fleet at the present time, or in, 1912, contains 18 dreadnoughts while Germany has only 10 and all the continental countries of Europe put together only 19. Do these figures cause alarm, do they cause misgiving? Do they not, on the contrary, satisfy any man with an open mind that Mr. Asquith's language was precise and correct when he said that the position of Great Britain was overwhelmingly supreme?

It is noticeable that the memorandum extends only to the year 1915 so far as British armament and construction are concerned, but extends to 1920 in relation to German armament and construction; and comparisons between the armament of Great Britain to-day or in 1915 with that of Germany in 1920 are distinctly unfair. I do not know what my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce meant when he announced with great assurance in this House that Germany in the year 1920 would have an armament equal to that of Great Britain to-day. What is Great Britain going to do in the meantime? Is she going to rest on her oars, is she going to pause and wait to see what Canada and the other colonies are going to do? No, in the language of Mr. Asquith, her present position of supremacy will be maintained, her shipbuilding programme is going forward. But the British Admiralty, for reasons which have been explained by Mr. Churchill and Mr. Asquith, will not make public what their proposals are further on than the

year 1915; but the British public and the British House of Commons have every confidence that when these figures are disclosed they will show the same overwhelming supremacy as exists to-day.

Why, may we ask, was this despatch ever sent to Canada and how did it happen that the Admiralty undertook to give us a memorandum on the subject? That, of course, is made plain by clause 1 of the memorandum itself. Clause 1 says:

1. The Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada has invited His Majesty's Government through the Board of Admiralty to prepare a statement of the present and immediately prospective requirements of the naval defence of the Empire for presentation to the Canadian Parliament if the Dominion Cabinet deem it necessary.

The Dominion Cabinet did deem it necessary, consequently it has been placed in our hands for consideration. There was a request from the Prime Minister of Canada to the Government of the Motherland asking for this document known as the memorandum. That request was evidently circumscribed, it was not a general request: What can we do for you? It was a request made with certain conditions attached to it. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister boldly proclaimed in Canada and in Greeat Britain, prior to the Admiralty's memorandum, that Canada would engage in no permanent naval policy until certain barriers, which he himself seems to have erected for his own purposes, had been removed. Canada would not construct a navy of her own until she was given a voice in the management of Imperial affairs. The Prime Minister made that abundantly plain in statements both in this country and in the Motherland and I have no doubt he brought it to the attention of the Board of Admiralty. He asks: Under these conditions what can we do for you? He has not left the Admiralty much to answer, has he? All the Admiralty could answer was: Give us money to build ships—and the answer of the Admiralty is certainly to be found in the concluding clause of the memorandum, clause 10, which reads:

The Prime Minister of the Dominion having inquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective, we have no hesitation in answering after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

Bear in mind the language:

The Prime Minister of the Dominion having inquired in what form any immediate aid Canada might give would be most effective.

Mr. GUTHRIE

That, I assume, is what the Prime Minister asked of the Admiralty when he went to them. He did not ask: What scheme would you recommend Canada to adopt, he merely asked, what kind of effective aid will be acceptable to you, and he got his answer in the language of his question. The aid referred to is certainly cash. It may include dreadnoughts or super-dreadnoughts but when you bring it down to its final analysis it means money because the dreadnoughts, if given, are to be constructed in Great Britain, Canada merely paying over the cash. So, look at it from whatever point you will, it is purely a gift or contribution of cash. The proposal is that Canada shall give sufficient money, $35,000,000, to construct three dreadnoughts.

Last summer, in the debates on the navy question in the Imperial House of Commons, Mr. Churchill said: 'This year we are laying down four ships.' In the House of Lords, Earl Selborne demanded that that year, that is, last year, they should lay down eight ships, four more than the Government's programme authorized. Mr. Churchill replied on the following day, saying in effect, 'We cannot lay down the additional ships asked for by Lord Selborne, because if we do, we cannot man or officer them unless we relegate to the scrap heap ships that are now good enough for the purpose for which they are used, take the crews and officers from those ships and put them on the additional dreadnoughts.- Language to this effect was used in the House of Commons on the 25th of July last. Might I ask then how the Government look at the question of three additional dreadnoughts instead of four? If the British Government say that they cannot conveniently man and officer the four extra dreadnoughts asked for by Earl Selborne, how are they going to man and officer the three extra dreadnoughts proposed to be given by the Government of this country? I do not believe that the Admiralty had a free hand in this matter at all. I believe, as I said in the first instance that they were fettered that they were circumscribed, and that they were not permitted by the nature of the request to say what they wanted most. Why do I say that? I have the very highest authority for the language I have used. Just eight weeks before the Prime Minister of Canada and his colleagues landed in the Old Country, eight or nine weeks at the most, Mr. Churchill made his important speech to the Shipwright Company in London. That, I believe, is an annual statement made by the First Lord of the Admiralty on the occasion of the banquet of the Shipwright Company.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: What month was that?

Mr. GUTHRIE: The first week in May or the last week in April, I am not sure which, eight or nine weeks at the most before the Prime Minister of Canada and his colleagues landed on the shores of Great Britain to discuss the naval situation with the authorities of Great Britain with a view to establishing some policy for Canada. While the most important parts of that speech are already on the pages of 'Hansard,' I may make one or two quotations from them. The points I shall quote are as follows:—

The British fleets are now practically concentrated. The recent great review before the King is only one proof of the quality of concentration which the Admiralty has lately brought to its final act, a policy of naval concentration which has given a real measure of security to the center and heart of the British Empire. But there is one aspect of naval concentration which requires the attention of thinking men here and elsewhere throughout the British Empire. The fact that our fleet is not only concentrated in the decisive theatre of European war, but must be kept concentrated, and in a certain sense, tied to that theatre, has been for some years creating a new want, a new need, a new opportunity for the great self-governing dominions of the Crown.

Later he proceeds:

At present, of course, and for some years to come, we are not only able to maintain a sufficient margin in home waters at the decisive points, but we could—by making special arrangements, by effecting partial mobilization we could if need arose—fit out and despatch strong squadrons to the aid of any of our colonies or dominions across the sea, whose vital interests were menaced or attacked.

I have quoted that paragraph for a purpose which I shall mention in a moment. Further on he says:

And here is a great opportunity—the great chance of the self-governing dominions—these strong young nations which have grown up all over the world under the shelter of the British flag and by the stimulus and protection of British institutions, and they have already begun to seize it; already we have seen the development in Australia of a strong modern fleet unit. New Zealand has contributed a noble ship to the general service of the British navy. And in Canada men of all parties and of both races are deeply stirred upon the problem and of the share which the great dominions should take in the means by which it and all the other parts of the British Empire are kept from harm. And we are soon to receive, I understand, representatives of the new Canadian Administration, who will come here to consult with the Government and the Admiralty upon the course of policy which should be adopted in the future.

Then he proceeds:

If the main development of the past ten years has been the concentration of the British fleet in decisive theatres it seems to me—and I dare say to you—not unlikely that the main naval development of the next ten years will be the growth of the effective naval forces in the great dominions overseas. Then we shall be able to make what I think will be found to be the true division of labour between the Mother Country and her daughter states—that we should maintain the sea supremacy against all comers at the decisive point, and that they should guard and patrol all the rest of the British Empire.

When the First Lord of the Admiralty made that speech he was looking forward to the arrival of the Canadian ministers in London. I suppose that at that time dates had been actually arranged. He knew the Canadian ministers were coming; he knew what force and effect would be given to his language; and, under all these circumstances he deliberately told a company of gentlemen, who, perhaps, know more about shipbuilding than any other company of gentlemen that could be got together in any other part of the world, what is the best policy both for the Empire and for the dominions beyond the seas. That policy is so plain that no one can misunderstand it. He says that the policy of the past ten years has been the withdrawal from all distant waters of the heavier ships, and the concentration of these ships at the decisive theatre of probable war in home waters. That is set out in the Admiralty's memorandum. He practically states that the greatest good the dominions can do, and this is their opportunity, is to see to it that colonial waters in distant parts of the world are properly patrolled and controlled, that the trade routes are kept open, and that British territory is protected, thus relieving the Motherland of that work, which might become necessary at any moment, and enabling her to concentrate her forces in the decisive theatre of war.

Mark again, Mr. Speaker, when that speech was delivered—eight or nine weeks before the Prime Minister reached London. Mark again that there is language in that speech which is copied almost verbatim et literatim in the Admiralty's report. That speech was one which in this country or in the United States would be called a keynote speech. It is the foundation, or a large portion of it is the foundation of the Admiralty's memorandum; but that portion of the speech to which we should pay most attention, the most important part of the speech as regards this Dominion, has been omitted from that memorandum. Why? Simply because the Prime Minister of Canada says: We shall not have a Canadian navy until certain obstacles which I have conjured up deliberately before my mind have been removed. Well, Mr. Speaker, in face of that document is it not

rather wonderful to suppose that Mr. Churchill changed his views during the eight or nine weeks which intervened between his speech and the arrival in London of the Canadian ministers? The German navy law for last year was promulgated last spring. I cannot tell the exact date of the promulgation but the German Navy law does not provide, as Mr. Churchill says, for any great increase in construction. It does increase the striking force of the German navy and that is the main feature of it. So, it cannot be urged that the promulgation of the German Navy law caused Mr. Churchill to change his opinion in the short interval of eight or nine weeks. The fact is beyond question that the opinion stated solemnly on that occasion before the Shipwrights Company was that of the First Lord of the Admiralty after consultation with the sea lords and officials of the Admiralty. It was not only his opinion but it was their opinion. After all the First Lord of the Admiralty is the mouthpiece of the Board of Admiralty and in parliament he brings down estimates signed by the sea lords and officials of the Admiralty and they are accepted, I believe, practically on all occasions, sometimes increased, but never rejected. Therefore, he is more or less a direct official of the Board of Admiralty himself and spoke as a representative of that board in the opinion which he expressed so shortly before the Prime Minister of Canada and his colleagues arrived.

Now, what do the people of Canada think as to the conditions under which the Canadian ministers made their offer to the Board of Admiralty? These ministers simply say: What effective aid can we give to meet your present and immediately prospective requirements? I am going, for a moment or two, to ask the indulgence of the House to discuss just that question of the immediate and prospective requirements because that is the only line in the whole Admiralty memorandum upon which hon. members opposite can hang an argument. They have requirements, yearly requirements and needs, and not only in Great Britain but in every country of Europe and naval requirements are on a progressive scale. Annually they are becoming greater and greater. Their requirements are just such requirements as those which we have in this country and in this very chamber. During this session the Finance Minister will come down with a statement of our requirements and it will be found that they will be greater this year than they were last year. Every municipality in the country has its requirements and for some reason or other they are all more or less upon a progressive scale. So it is with the British Admiralty and with every country in Europe. They require so much for maintenance and new construction each year and they are prepared to supply it, they are bound to meet it. Can anybody say, in the fair meaning of the word 'requirements' that it involves a necessity? I suppose it is a need, a need which they are prepared to meet, but is there anything in the meaning of the word 'requirements' which will impart to your mind the idea of a necessity or of an emergency? Nothing whatever. There will be this ordinary budget growing from year to year and the determination of the government of Great Britain to provide for it as the need arises. Is there a single line in this whole document which in any way intimates that England wants or asks for anything which implies that she needs anything? There is no such syllable in the whole document. I have heard it said that England has never asked her colonies for anything and I believe that to be true. But, I know that in the province of Manitoba, Sir Rodmond Roblin, Prime Minister of that province, has stated on the platform that England has come to her colonies begging on her knees, to show the extreme position in which she is. I know that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has said that England is making the strongest appeal for the help that loyal hearts could make. I deny the truth of that statement.

Mr. FOSTER: That could be made to loyal hearts.

Mr. GUTHRIE: That loyal hearts could make. I will read it as it appears in 'Hansard':

Mr. FOSTER: Just read the sentence preceding.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I will read the sentence that I have just quoted first.

Mr. FOSTER: It would be better to read the other one first.

Mr. GUTHRIE: (reading):

It is the strongest appeal that can be made with honest, loyal hearts for help.

The silence of Great Britain is an appeal for help.

Mr. FOSTER: It would be very much better if you would just read the other sentence.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, we will read the sentence.

England never has, never will, beg either her colonies or others for help,——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Wait a minute.

And the fact that she has not done so and will not do so is not to be taken as an excuse for not helping. It is the strongest appeal that can be made with honest, loyal hearts for help.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Now, read what Sir Rodmond Roblin says.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I know that the statement is true. I know that England is making no appeal for help. Yet we have Sir Rodmond Roblin saying that England is on her knees.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Will the hon. gentleman mind reading that statement?

Mr. GUTHRIE: It is well known. It will be found in the reading room or in the papers.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: That is your rendering of it and it will be very wrong.

Mr. GUTHRIE: There is another phase of the question which I would like to refer to for a few minutes and that is as to why the position was taken by the Prime Minister of Canada and his colleagues, which they certainly took both before and after they landed in Great Britain, during the past summer, that they would not establish a Canadian navy, or a permanent naval force, which ever you desire to call it. There was a time we all remember when this House was a unit in opinion in regard to what Canada could do and as to what she ought to do. That was as recently as March, 1909. We came to that unanimous conclusion under rather strange circumstances. Those of us who remember the debate on that occasion will remember also that there was something approaching a real panic, a real alarm, throughout the length and breadth of the British world, or throughout the whole world, one might say. That alarm was caused largely by a speech delivered in the House of Commons in England on the 16th of March by Mr. Arthur Balfour, at the time leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition in that Parliament. During the course of that speech Mr. Balfour stated that because the Government of that day had receded from what was known as the two power fleet construction and had dropped the building of about one ship a year Germany had taken advantage of that temporary cessation of shipbuilding in Great Britain and Germany had pressed forward and accelerated as rapidly as possible her shipbuilding programme and that as a result the time would come, probably within three years of the time of which Mr. Balfour spoke, when Germany would be equal if not superior to Great Britain in the North sea, that the time would come within a period of three years when British supremacy would be challenged in those waters. That speech caused a tremendous sensation throughout the world and throughout the British Empire in particular. Mr. Balfour's prediction, it is true, has not been anything like verified. His predictions were based on such accurate knowledge in regard to construction as he could reasonably find, but in every case these predictions were far in excess of what actually happened with regard to construction in Germany and far below the construction which has taken place in Great Britain. Mr. Balfour announced that the crucial point when the supremacy of Great Britain upon the seas might be successfully challenged by Germany would be the 1st of April, 1912, when Germany would probably have 21 dreadnoughts as against only 25 for Great Britain, but, as a matter of fact, on that date Great Britain had 18 dreadnoughts and Germany had only 10. However that may be, the statement made in March, 1909, caused general alarm. The atmosphere became highly electrified; Australia cabled an offer of one dreadnought, and a proposal to increase it to two; New Zealand cabled an offer of one dreadnought. We, in Canada were perhaps more calm than they were in the other colonies, but my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) in that excited time, rose to the occasion in his place in this House, and notwithstanding the electricity in the air, notwithstanding the strained condition throughout the Empire and throughout Europe, notwithstanding the offer of dreadnoughts by the other colonies; he delivered himself of what I think we all considered probably the ablest effort of his life. He spoke reasonably and calmly, reviewing the whole situation piece by piece with the object of ascertaining actual facts, and of seeing what Canada could and should do to relieve the situation. The hon. gentleman impressed the House greatly upon that occasion and as a result of his motion, after amendment, this House came to the unanimous conclusion that the maintenance of British supremacy was a positive necessity, not only for the British Empire, but to secure the peace of the world. The House also came to the conclusion that Canada could best do her share both for Canada and the Empire, by constructing a naval service of her own, in co-operation with the British Admiralty. The House also affirmed that a proposal for a regular periodical payment of contributions to Great Britain was not a proper one and:

The House expresses the firm conviction that whenever the need arises the Canadian people will be found ready and willing to make any sacrifice that is required to give to the Imperial authorities the most loyal and hearty co-operation in every movement for the maintenance of the integrity and honour of the Empire.

We all agreed to that resolution and there was great satisfaction expressed throughout the country. We did not offer dreadnoughts, we refused to give contributions, and everyone in Canada and probably in Great Britain approved the course we had taken. And the man who is probably most entitled to the credit for that situation, is the Minister of Trade and Commerce, so far at least as its initiation was concerned. The hon. gentleman on that occasion gave some pretty solid reasons for his argument against a regular or periodical contribution. He told us in his speech on the 18th of December last that there is a distinction between an isolated gift or contribution and a regular or periodical payment, and I agree with him that there is some distinction between the two. If a judge were asked to interpret the clause which I have just read about regular and periodical payments, as against a proposal to make an isolation contribution, I have no doubt whatever that the judge would hold that the hon. member is technically right in holding that there is a distinction. But the argument of the hon. gentleman so well put in this House in March 1909 applies with just the same force to a single contribution as to a regular contribution. What were the points he emphasized in that speech—and I give them from memory—he told the House that the idea of a money payment was not right, that it seemed to him like hiring somebody else to do the work that we should do ourselves, that it looked like hiring a man to protect your own family, and, if I remember correctly, another of his objections was that a money contribution smacked too much of tribute. The argument in that case is only relative; a single contribution may not smack of tribute while a periodical payment or forced payment might smack of tribute——

Mr. FOSTER: I do not suppose it is very important, but, as a matter of fact, I stated that contribution, as spoken of by some, smacks of tribute, but for myself I did not lay much stress on that argument.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Not much stress, but only a little stress.

Mr. FOSTER: I will allow my right hon. friend the comfort of taking his own meaning out of it.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The position then is, that that was mentioned as a reason against contribution, but that my hon. friend said he would not lay much stress upon it.

Mr. FOSTER: Because it was not forced.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Well, perhaps the point that the hon. gentleman laid most stress upon was the fact that a contribution was objectionable because it did not develop in Canada a naval sentiment, that the seed did not go into the ground, that nothing took root here, and that what we wanted in Canada was the development of a Canadian sentiment, and particularly something that would develop in Canada the defence of our ports, our harbours, and our trade routes. I remember his saying also that the question of trade and commerce and defence were inseparably bound together, and could not be disassociated, and he laid down the principle that it was the right and duty of Canada to take up the question of defence of her ports and harbours and trade routes. In this the whole House agreed with him, and speaking at this moment I think I may say Mr. Speaker, that sitting to your left in this House there is not a single member who does not stand strictly by the affirmation made by the hon. member in 1909.

If there has been any deviation, any backsliding, any repudiation, that is to be found among those who sit on the right side of the House, and sad to relate, in the very Cabinet itself. On this side, we believe in the maintenance of British supremacy, first, last, and all the time. We believe that Canada has not only a right but a positive duty imposed upon her, to do not only her fair and proper share but a generous share in maintaining that supremacy. We believe also, as expressed in that resolution, if the time come when there is need, that Canada will come to the front; and the policy on such an occasion was explained by my right hon. leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in the course of his speech that if need be, if emergency should arise, if danger should come, the policy of the Liberal party is not a contribution of $35,000,000 or even, as he stated, of four times $35,000,000, but the policy of those on this side of the House is a policy of the last dollar and the last man. That policy has been declared time and time again both in this House and out of it. I mention this because I think my hon. friend took about three-quarters of his speech to argue labouriously what we on this side consider axiomatic matters, matters beyond question, in regard to which not a syllable of argument was necessary. That was my hon. friend's opinion in 1909, and the opinion of his leader the Prime Minister. Following that resolution, this Government took action and sent its delegates. I think they were Mr. Justice Brodeur, at the present time, and Sir Frederick Borden, at that time Minister of Militia and Defence. My right hon. friend the present Prime Minister also went to London on that occasion, either on private business or for pleasure, and when he was there made a speech at an important banquet. The Dominion Day dinner in London is an important occasion, and speeches made there are reported throughout the

length and breadth of the British Empire. On Dominion Day 1909, the present Prime Minister made a statement strongly confirming the stand he had taken in this Parliament that the proper policy for Canada to pursue was the construction of a Canadian navy. Later on when he came back to this country after his visit to Great Britain, he was tendered a banquet by his admirers in Halifax, and at that banquet he made the matter very plain and very pointed. I am not going to read the references but will give the result of what he says, if not his exact language. He stated that there has not been for forty years any constitutional difficulty in establishing a Canadian navy. He said that the policy we adopted unanimously in Parliament last session was the best policy, but it might not commend itself to a certain wing of the Conservative party. I assume from that, he meant that wing of the party led by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk) and probably now led by the Postmaster General. He further stated that the Canadian navy should be built in this country and he gave as his reasons that we have the iron, the coal, the lumber and the men.

Mr. GRAHAM: And the nickel.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Now, I do not believe that he was fully aware at that time of the effect that his recent colleague, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had been producing in the province of Quebec, during the present Prime Minister's absence in England in the year 1909. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier seemed to be dissatisfied after the House rose, so he started a little propaganda of his own and went under the wing of certain other gentlemen, dissatisfied or dissentient Liberals, namely, Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Lavergne. They started to stir up in the province of Quebec quite a little trouble over this Canadian naval resolution. Mr. Borden, when he spoke in Halifax in the autumn of that year, did not know, I think, the state of matters in the province of Quebec, because in his speech there he reaffirmed his position on all points. Then the session following, the Government acted promptly and brought in the Canadian Naval Service Act. At the first reading on Jaunary 12, 1910, the present Prime Minister spoke on that question, and then for the first time did he let a word fall in regard to Canadian representation in Imperial affairs. When the second reading took place on February 3, 1910, he just made a reference to it; but when he opposed the second reading of the Bill in his amendment not a single reference did he make to that constitutional question of Canadian representation in Imperial affairs. He said that our policy was wrong, and he moved an alternative that we should give dreadnoughts. Another gentleman, that veteran statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, wrote a letter in terms very strong and very pointed; but that was disregarded and the second reading of the Bill was opposed. The Bill, however, carried and nothing very much transpired until the autumn of 1910. Then came about that now celebrated by-election in the county of Drummond and Arthabaska. It was not until then that anyone realized the strength of the movement headed by my hon. friend the member for Jacques Cartier, by Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Lavergne. The constituency of Drummond and Arthabaska, was a strong Liberal riding up to that time. The Government candidate supporting the Canadian navy was defeated by a man who called himself a Nationalist, a man who had been supported by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, until recently a member of the present Cabinet. The campaign on that occasion was most bitter. I do not believe the expressions used in that campaign, or the articles published in the daily press at that time, if published in Ontario or England, would have passed the Crown Attorney without a prosecution for sedition or something of that kind being instituted. The battle was fiercely waged, and the Government candidate was defeated by a man who would have nothing to do with Great Britain or navies or anything of the kind, and I believe that was the precise moment of time when the present Prime Minister deliberately made up his mind and so did the Minister of Trade and Commerce. They said: 'this is our chance, this is the thin edge of the wedge and we will drive it home.' A telegram came from Montreal to the Minister of Trade and Commerce shortly before that election in which the question was asked him as to what the electors should do. Although I have not the exact language before me, I know in a general way what was the telegram in reply. It said: 'Vote to turn out the Laurier admnistration,' which in practice and theory meant to vote for the Nationalist candidate as there was no Conservative. It was either the night of the election or the night after the election that my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce made a speech in Toronto and in the course of that speech he said: ' You must not be too hard on Mr. Bourassa. There is good stuff in Bourassa.'

Mr. FOSTER: So thought my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier.)

Mr. GUTHRIE: And I think that the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol) also delivered himself to the same effect on the same occasion. It was on that night in the autumn of 1910 that the future course of the Conservative party in regard to the navy took definite

form and shape. The House met in November, 1910, and on that occasion Mr. Monk, member for Jacques Cartier, moved an amendment to the speech from the Throne, the language of which can be found on the pages of 'Hansard.' The portion of that amendment to which I desire to call the attention of hon. members of this House was a statement of policy and principle upheld by the member for Jacques Cartier, and which seems to have appealed to the right hon. gentleman who is now Prime Minister, as he voted for the amendment. It was as follows :

This House regrets that the Speech from the Throne gives no indication whatever of the intention of the Government to consult the people on its naval policy, and the general question of the contribution of Canada to Imperial armaments.

As I have stated, that amendment was moved by the member for Jacques Cartier, at that time leader of the Nationalist Party in Quebec, and supported by the present Prime Minister and by nine of those gentlemen who sit in the Cabinet with him to-day. They understood the nature of the resolution; they knew for what they were voting. We assume that their votes were indicative of their opinions and convictions —and they deliberately voted that the question of naval policy should in the first instance be submitted to the people. After the introduction of the trade proposal between Canada and the United States in the month of January, 1911, and in the subsequent proceedings of that session of the House, the naval question dropped almost entirely out of sight. So far as eight of the provinces of Canada were concerned, there was little further discussion in regard to naval matters. In the province of Quebec, the discussion still went on, and increased in bitterness. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, in his speech upon this question on the 5th of December, told the House that his policy had been before the country for at least two years, as he had spoken in this Chamber in November, 1910, and had then enunciated his policy. But he never went to the people of the country upon that policy; at the general election of 1911 he made not a single appeal to the people based on the attitude of his party in the matter. The special manifesto issued by him at that time contains not one word of the policy he enunciated in this House in November, 1910. It is evident that on account of the alliance he had made with the Nationalists of Quebec he could not make public the policy he enunciated in 1910. The policy upon which he went to the country in 1911 was one to the effect that the Canadian Naval Service Act was of no practical use, and might cause much waste of money and much loss of property and life. Here is the wording of it :

Since the last general election the Government has entered upon a new line of policy in regard to naval affairs, which is of far-reaching importance. The policy adopted was not debated before the people during the election, and it bears all the earmarks of a hasty and ill-considered scheme. In my judgment our duty to the Empire cannot be properly or effectively fulfilled by such a measure. I hold that the plan of the Government contemplates the creation of a naval force that will be absolutely useless in time of war, and therefore of no practical benefit to Canada or to the Empire. It will cost immense sums of money to build, equip and maintain. It will probably result in time of war in the useless sacrifice of many valuable lives, and it will not add one iota to the fighting strength of the Empire. The more it is considered, the more does it become evident that the whole naval plan of the Government is an unfortunate blunder.

That is the statement made in the pre-election manifesto of my hon. friend the Prime Minister, and if he went before the electors with any naval policy at all, that was the one. I believe that in eight of the provinces of Canada not a single word was uttered by anybody during the election campaign, in regard to the naval policy. In the province of Quebec I will grant that it was the main issue, but do you see how skilfully my hon. friend's manifesto was prepared? He did not assert that he would go to England, ascertain the conditions, and then, if aid were needed, that he would grant it by contribution or otherwise. He did not say that after having settled certain constitutional questions, he would establish a permanent Canadian navy. The only inference that can be drawn from his manifesto is this: The navy of the Liberal administration is no good; they have committed a blunder, and if you give me a chance I will wipe it out. Why did he say this? Because that is the compact between the Conservative and the Nationalist parties! I wonder if in England they know of that compact? I wonder if the Lords of the Admiralty know why my hon. friend the Prime Minister could not establish a naval service? I venture the assertion that the Conservative party to-day is bound, not by any verbal pledge, but by a written document, to abolish the Canadian naval service, and that document is to-day in the hands of Nationalist leaders. Do not think for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that men like Henri Bourassa and Mr. Lavergne will take the word of the Conservatives of this country. We know of the case, in the good riding of Nipissing; of a gentleman now in the Upper House, occupying the position of a senator, who had a large number of French Canadians in his riding, and who sent to Mr. Bourassa a call for help. He got the help.

but he had to sign the document first! We know the experimence of a gentleman in East Algoma, who also had a large number of French Canadians voting in his riding—a good Scotchman too, and I am almost ashamed of him. He sent out to Bourassa the cry for help, and the help came—but not until the documents were signed. I believe the Conservative party in Canada to-day is just as effectually tied by the Nationalist pledge as any party can be, and that that pledge exists in the shape of a written document, and can be held over them as a menace to their existence during their whole administration. That is the reason they cannot have a permanent Canadian navy.

Sir, this constitutional objection is to me the most utter nonsense. What has the Canadian Naval Service to do with representation in the Imperial Parliament? We established in this country our own militia; did anyone doubt our right to do so? It was our primary right; we did not have to consult the people about it. I assume that the first duty of gentlemen elected to this House is to provide Supply for the King, and the second to provide necessary defence for the country. These are elementary duties and functions they are bound to perform without any mandate from the people. We established militia in this country on that basis; we proposed to establish and did establish a Canadian naval service upon that basis—we needed no mandate from anybody and there was no constitutional question involved. Possibly my hon. friend does not intend to establish a Canadian naval service, but to aid some portion or division of the Imperial service. I ask him now, and ask any hon. gentleman sitting around him, whether in fact there is any objection, constitutional or otherwise, to establishing on the seacoasts of Canada that degree of protection we established by our militia in the interior. Look at the clause in the Militia Act and the clause in the Canadian Naval Service Act, almost identical in terms.

Mr. LANCASTER: In answer to the hon. member I would point out that the British North America Act distinctly says that any navy of or in Canada shall be under the control of the King and this Act, which he is extolling, said it shall be under the control of the Governor in Council. There is that difference.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I read the Canadian Militia Act and I see that clause saying that if the Governor in Council see fit he can send the militia to any part of the world, and a similar clause in the Naval Service Act. The matter is not important and I do not propose to argue it, but if my hon. friend desires to satisfy himself he can go to the library and compare and examine both statutes.

Mr. LANCASTER: Read the British North America Act and you will understand.

Mr. GUTHRIE: My point is that there is nothing to prevent the establishment of a Canadian naval service now, no difficulty, constitutional or otherwise, and the only reason that a constitutional difficulty has been raised is to provide a barrier for members of this Government to enable them to carry out their pledge to the Nationalist party in Quebec and abolish the Canadian Naval Service altogether. Were it not for that I do not for a moment think that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister would come down to this House with this present proposal. I cannot believe in my heart, after hearing and reading his statement and considering it as seriously as I can, that the Prime Minister himself thinks there is the slightest warrant or authority for this proposal which he now makes for immediate aid to the British Empire. I do not believe that he considers there is danger; he has certainly made out no case, he has merely offered a subterfuge for the purpose of getting around a difficulty which he did not see when he spoke in Halifax in 1909, and said there was no constitutional difficulty. He is now trying to get around the difficulty to which his party committed him when they entered that abominable alliance with the Nationalist party in Quebec.

What is the proper course under the circumstances? Calmly as I can put it, what should Canada do if my contention is right? If Mr. Asquith's statement is correct, if Mr. Churchill's view is correct, what should Canada do—because we all agree she should do something? Should she not follow Mr. Churchill's advice given in his speech before the Shipwrights Company? I submit she should. Here we have an alternative policy which I know has been criticised at one time on the ground of expense and on another occasion on the ground that it will take too long to construct; various criticisms are offered on various occasions but are they real or substantial? Can we not construct dreadnoughts in this country? I would like any man to say we cannot. Suppose we take six, eight or ten years, is there any difficulty about that matter? Is there any danger threatening now? The policy of the Opposition upon this question is: Let us start and start now. If we take the advice of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, in these cases beginnings of necessity must be small. But it was not a small beginning, it was a substantial beginning which the previous Government sought to make, a beginning involving

about $13,000,000 for construction, and about $3,500,000 for maintenance, not a bad beginning in any way. What objection can be raised or should be raised to Canada making a beginning now even on a more extended scale than she proposed to make two years ago? The amendment of my hon. leader asks for a Canadian navy and the construction of two complete units—one on the Pacific and one on the Atlantic, and the only argument that I have heard advanced against this policy is that you cannot build it in this country, it would take too long. I can only say that if, after the recent change of Government, the present Government had taken hold of the matter as they should have, their shipyards would have been ready to start construction this spring. Instead of that, to carry out their Nationalist obligations, the Government returned the cheques and wiped off the tenders and did nothing. How the Minister of Trade and Commerce charged that the Liberal party lay on their beds and tossed and tumbled and did nothing! What have my hon. friends opposite been doing for the last fifteen months? Absolutely nothing except trying to get up some sort of policy which will satisfy the jingo end of their supporters and avoid entanglements with the Nationalists with whom they have entered into a solemn obligation. I was amused when the Minister of Trade and Commerce placed as an argument before this House that while the Canadian ministers were in London they were carried away with the situation. I think he said they drank deeply of the atmosphere. I can only say this, that there must be something in that atmosphere or these associations which is fatal to correct ideas on the naval question so far as Canada is concerned when we can see a pronounced Nationalist member of the Government who has been a few months in old London drinking in that atmosphere come back to this country and run a close second to the Minister of Defence as an advanced jingoist. I was surprised to hear the Postmaster General speak in this House of the loaded cannon of Germany pointed directly at England.

Mr. PELLETIER: I did not say that.

Mr. GUTHRIE: Or words to that effect.

Mr. PELLETIER: No.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not wish to prolong the discussion so I absolutely withdraw that statement. But I do know that there is another minister in that Cabinet, a personal friend of mine, who, in my judgment, has been guilty of very grievous impropriety—and he is a man who I thought would know better what was due to himself and to the country. But he, it seems, was so carried away with his jingo war-like ideas that he could not control even his own tongue under special circumstances. Speaking on a public occasion in British Columbia we have the spectacle of a minister of the Crown going around with a chip on his shoulder, as the small boys say, inviting somebody to knock it off, using language which should never have been used by a responsible minister, informing his audience that Germany must be taught a lesson. What sort of language is that for a minister of the Crown? When the best men in Great Britain, the best men in Germany, the best people the wide world over, are striving by every means in their power to bring about peace, the Minister of Defence in the Government of Canada is going about boasting that Germany must be taught a lesson. The spectacle is too absurd. Does he forget that in Ontario many of the best citizens, both in business and in agriculture, are men who have come to Canada from Germany? There are very few of them in my riding, I am sorry to say, but there are many in adjoining ridings, in the whole western peninsula and the plains of the great western provinces. The German population of Canada is by no means small. I know something of it and I say there are no more peaceful, no more pacific, no more intelligent, thrifty and industrious people than those who have settled in Canada from Germany and become loyal British subjects.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe): Hear, hear.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I am glad to hear the 'Hear, hears' from the opposite side of the House and I notice particularly from what quarter they come, but I urge on members opposite if they have any influence in the counsels of their own party, to rebuke the Minister of Militia and Defence for the unwarranted and insulting language he has used towards a large portion of the Canadian people.

The Admiralty dwells on one point which I would like to touch upon, and that is the question of moral support. I think, when all is said and done, that that is the most important question raised in the Admiralty's memorandum. It is important to Great Britain to know at the present moment, or in future years, that she has the absolute moral support of her colonies in regard not only to naval supremacy, but to other matters which pertain to international relationships throughout the world. I see the force of that, and every hon. member of this House must see the force of it. We cannot avoid it; we must meet it. I do not believe that there would be any moral support whatever if we were to go to Great Britain with our contribution of $35,000,000 and say that the contribution had disrupted our Cabinet and caused the resignation of one of our most

important ministers. I do not believe that there would be any moral support if the contribution went to England with a divided House of Commons, and there is certainly a strong feeling of division in this House at the present time.

Some hon. MEMBERS : Oh, oh.

Mr. GUTHRIE : Some hon. members laugh, but I am trying to be as serious as I can. They are always inclined to accept a serious statement as a joke, but I am trying to speak seriously, and if some of the hon. gentlemen who interrupted me would try to contribute something besides interruptions to the discussions in this House, I think it would help. What sort of picture would it be to England if we went there with a divided government, a divided House and behind it a divided people, the majority of whom, I honesty believe, are against this proposal. I think we would create a spectacle that would not help Great Britain, and would not help Canada, and if our action is to go to the chancellories of Europe, where indeed the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce has stated it has already gone, we are not going to improve the situation there. I make these preliminary observations for this purpose. I partly agree with the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce made on the 18th of December in opening his remarks. He enumerated the great questions that had been dealt with by the parliament of Canada. He said we had had the question of responsible government up in this Parliament, and we had settled that; that we had had the great question of Confederation up in this Parliament and we had settled that. Then he enumerated a great many other important questions that this Parliament had dealt with. Let me read the concluding words which are to be found in 'Hansard' in column 1408, and let me give my assent to the sentiments there expressed. He says:

> But I doubt if there has been any question during the whole history of legisaltion in what is now the Dominion of Canada which has been quite as important and freighted with quite as great results and consequences as the question we are debating at the present time in this House.

Later, in column 1409, he says :

> To-day it occupies the attention of the best statesmen in the Mother Country and it occupies the attention of the best statesmen and the most thoughtful citizens in every one of the colonies in the great Empire to which we belong.

I agree that it is one of the greatest questions that has ever been discussed in the Canadian Parliament and it is up here now for settlement. The line drawn between the parties is a well marked line of demarcation. Nobody can refuse to notice that. We must realize the circumstances under which we speak, and under which we act. If this matter is going to be a matter of moral support to Great Britain the only suggestion I can offer is that there ought to be, there must be, something in the nature of give and take. I have not consulted anybody, my leader or anyone else, on the question which I am now discussing. I believe that apart from matters of form, in matters of substance we are not very far apart. You propose a contribution to Great Britain, to send money to construct three dreadnoughts, these to be constructed in Great Britain. We, on the other hand, propose to enlarge the Canadian Naval Service Act by the establishment of two fleet units which will necessarily be headed by one dreadnought for each unit. Is there then a very great difference between us except in the matter of form? The British Admiralty has not asked for any specific number of dreadnoughts. The Government has fixed that of its own motion.' Might not that portion of the bill be modified to make it two dreadnoughts? Might not we on this side of the House modify our proposal a little and allow these dreadnoughts to be constructed in Great Britain? Then the rest of the fleet unit could certainly be constructed in Canada within a reasonable time. We could establish our navy yards and our construction plants and go on with the work. We would reach practically the same end as you do except that one dreadnought would be shorn from the British Admirality, and two fleet units, established in this country under our own laws, would take its place. No constitutional objection could arise because they would be under our own law and under our own control. We do not need to wait for a voice in Imperial affairs. I make this suggestion because I say there is a gulf between us and I believe the gulf can be bridged. I believe the gulf ought to be bridged. Therefore I suggest to my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) and to my right hon. leader that some give and take on the part of both sides of the House would be proper. I do not believe that this proposal in its present form meets with a very hearty reception in this country. I am not trying to boast, or to put a political cast on my language, but I have held five meetings during the recess and they were considered of sufficient importance to be attended and reported by three Toronto newspapermen. They were township and village meetings, but they were all capacity meetings in the way of not being able to accommodate the crowd save one, which took place on a stormy night. They were attended by men on the Liberal side and by men on the Conservative side, and I say what I actually

believe when I tell you that this proposal is not in favour in that portion of Ontario which I represent, and I state that apart from my political bias whatever. My plea is, and I hope it will not fall on deaf ears opposite, although I am afraid it will, that between the two parties some compromise should be made. My suggestion is that two dreadnoughts might go to Great Britain and be built in England, that our two fleet units should be proceeded with in Canada, leaving the Admiralty to concentrate its forces in the decisive theatre of probable war. We would have our Canadian naval service, and there would be no entanglements or constitutional questions to bother or annoy us. We could base our whole programme on the language of Mr. Churchill the First Lord of the Admiralty. No one knows so well as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister what Mr. Churchill's view is. He may have had secret information, but he has had the sense and good judgment not to refer to it in the House. But I cannot get out of my head that when Mr. Churchill spoke eight or nine weeks before the Prime Minister arrived in England and told the colonies to establish local navies to go on and protect the outlying portions of the Empire, allowing the British Admiralty to concentrate its forces in the decisive theater of war I believe he laid down a policy which is the best policy from a Canadian point of view, and is the one policy that the British Admiralty really wants. If my right hon friend the Prime Minister had gone to the Admiralty and given them a free hand I do not believe they would have handed us a memorandum telling us what we might do in the way of giving immediate effective aid. But that is a matter which I cannot settle. My voice may be powerless in the matter, probably will be powerless in the matter, but I think it is a matter which ought to be drawn very pointedly to the attention of the House. If our action is going to give any moral support to Great Britain or to the Empire it has to be on different lines from those we are now following.

If we can bridge the gulf, the chasm, by all means let us do so even if there be some sacrifice on both sides, both in regard to the Government's proposal and in regard to that of my right hon. friend upon the line that I have suggested as the only line that now occurs to me although there may be others.

If we cannot settle it in that way, there is another way and that is to appeal to the great and final tribunal of the people. I believe that, having regard to the magnitude of the question, as stated by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce and as stated by the right hon. Prime Minister, having regard to the fact that this question was never discussed, commented on or considered in eight provinces out of the nine in the Dominion of Canada and that in only one was it discussed, having regard to the fact that the policy laid down in this House two years ago, or in the month of November, 1910, by the leader of the then Government, was not the policy upon which he went to the country in the last general election, because his manifesto distinctly differed from his assertion in this House in 1910; if we cannot come to something like unanimity in this House, then, I say that the people have the right to pass upon this question. I would not say so if there was a question of need or emergency, need that was pressing. If the Empire was imperilled I would not say for one moment, appeal to the people, but, when there is a prospect of continued peace, when there is a prospect, according to Mr. Asquith, who ought to know and who does know, of overwhelming supremacy in Great Britain not only now but for the future and when all that we have before us is the requirements, now or prospective, of the British Admiralty, why not let the people decide this question? We know the situation as far as they have made it public and I certainly believe that this document is absolutely correct, that the statements there may be relied upon absolutely and that no information of a confidential or private nature which any member of the Government may have would alter or annul or change the contents of that memorandum which has been furnished to us by the British Admiralty. We are entitled to consider that absolutely correct, and in view of the statement of the Prime Minister of Great Britain, of Mr. Churchill and of other gentlemen high in political life in England, can any one say that there is danger, that there is incomplete security?

Why should we imagine there is when it is not so stated by the men who ought to know in England? I know there is a minority in England, among whom are a few very distinguished men, who do look upon the situation as grave and the security as somewhat doubtful. You will find that in every country, but the men who do know and who under the circumstances, ought to know best, state the contrary. Can we not reply upon them? They do so in England. Why cannot we do so here? If they say that there is a pacific feeling on both sides of the water, that there is a good feeling and that there are no indications of danger at the present time, why not take time to develop the policy which my right hon. leader has asked the House to adopt or, if not that let the people come forward and pronounce on this policy. Let them say which policy they think is proper. Observe the distinction I make between the hour of peril and the hour of security.

The position I take is the same as that which was taken by my right hon. leader in 1909. In the hour of peril we need no mandate; then, ours is the policy of the last man and the last dollar. That is our duty, but here in the hour of security on so great a question involving so many considerations, a question fraught with such great possibilities, having regard to the mutual support between the Motherland and her colonies or dominions beyond the seas---in this moment of peace, security and overwhelming supremacy, why not let the people have something to say in regard to this proposal? That is the last observation, the last suggestion that I have to make and I must thank the House for listening to me so long.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey): Mr. Speaker, while I agree with the observations very largely of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) who has just taken his seat, that it is to be regretted that both political parties in Canada do not see eye-to-eye on this great question of naval defence, especially in view of the tremendous and salutary moral effect such an agreement would produce in Europe. Nevertheless the most gratifying and outstanding feature of this whole debate is that, whatever differences we may have as to its application, we are all united and agreed that a sum of $35,000,000 should now be granted for naval defence.

That being the one and practically the only point upon which we are agreed, I have endeavoured to analyze the various speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen opposite in this House, including the eloquent speech of the hon. member for South Wellington, because I have had the privilege of reading the reports of his speeches delivered during the Christmas holidays, with a view of codifying if possible the main differences between the two great political parties on this question, and I find that the line of argument running through all their speeches, with probably the one exception of the speech delivered by the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) has been directed with a view and purpose of inculcating into the public mind of the Canadian people, a belief in the following statements and propositions which they affirm to be true and which we deny:

1. That there is no emergency or need of immediate and effective aid to the naval forces of the Empire—or any impending or threatened danger thereto.

2. That the grant of this $35,000,000 for these three dreadnoughts is the beginning of this Government's permanent contribution or permanent naval policy of Canada.

3. That the gift of these three ships in some way endangers, invades, or even reverses, the principles of our free constitutional Government and Canadian autonomy.

4. That the memorandum prepared by the British Admiralty last November and presented to this House by the Premier does not disclose any emergency or 'any immediate or prospective danger,' or need of naval assistance, nor warrant the grant of said three dreadnoughts and that the British Government does not even desire the same.

5. That Canada can now best contribute to the naval defence of itself and of Great Britain and the Empire by the construction of a separate and independent navy along the lines of the Naval Service Act of 1910 passed by the late Government, and though they now profess to find no fault with the grant of $35,000,000 or even more for naval defence, they say it should be applied and used in the construction of two complete fleet units, to be built, manned and maintained by Canada, but engrafted on the Naval Service Act of the late Government which was passed as the permanent policy of Canada and was not intended to meet but denied any emergency or assistance, as such, to the Imperial navy.

I have endeavoured to codify the differences and I think I am fair in saying that these are practically the only differences, unless it be that with reference to the question of a permanent representative at the Imperial Council Board, and I have not included that for the simple reason that I do not know what attitude the right hon. leader of the Opposition takes on the question. The right hon. gentleman, in the early Imperial conferences, took the ground that we should not be called upon to contribute to Imperial defence because we were not represented. Later on, when it was suggested to him that the British Government were willing to give us representation, he took the ground that we did not want representation because it would imply a corresponding liability. The right hon. gentleman, in his speech delivered in this House on the 12th of December, failed to declare his stand upon that question. He has not included that in the contest between the two great political parties. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Guthrie) has thrown down a challenge to me to give the evidence upon which I believe there is urgent need for granting aid to the Imperial navy, and I accept his challenge. I shall first start out by defining what I believe to be the meaning of an emergency, and I may say here that we have been very unfortunate in the use of that word, because it does not convey to the minds of the people the condition of things about which we are talking. I had occasion to

speak upon this great naval question some three years ago, and I attempted then to define what I thought was an emergency. With the permission of the House, I shall repeat my statement on that occasion, because I have had no reason to change my opinion with regard to it since. I would point out that in the unanimous resolution passed by the House in 1909, there was no reference to the word 'emergency,' and that the only word mentioned, which was intended to cover the condition of things as they exist to-day, was the word 'need.' In a previous speech of mine in this House I described an emergency as follows:

> By an emergency I do not mean a present actual crisis. I mean a condition of things which, if allowed to proceed in the manner determined upon, will eventually and inevitably lead to the destruction of that which is all-essential, both to ourselves and to the British Empire, the supremacy of the British navy. If we find a condition of things existing to-day which, if allowed to continue, will bring us to that culmination, I call that an emergency.

And, it is in that view of the subject that I purpose discussing the question of emergency as suggested by the hon. member for South Wellington. First of all, let me read the words of Mr. Churchill, delivered in the House of Commons on July 12, last year, and let me point out that the statements of Mr. Churchill, which my hon. friend has been quoting for the purpose of proving there is no emergency, were statements made by Mr. Churchill before he became aware of the details of the amendment to the German naval law passed in the year 1912. On the other hand, the statements of Mr. Churchill which I shall cite, are statements which Mr. Churchill made in the House of Commons after the German amendment became known to him. When Mr. Churchill became aware of the conditions of the German Bill of 1912, accelerating the construction and increasing of the personnel of the German navy, in the House of Commons on the 22nd of July last he used these words:

> We have to face the simultaneous building by many nations of great modern ships of war. . . Well do we understand the truth of Mr. Borden's words: The day of peril is too late for preparation.

Well do they understand the truth of Mr. Borden's words that 'The day of peril is too late for preparation,' and in my opinion, the converse of that constitutes an emergency; 'the need of preparation for the hour of peril.' I say that the hour of peril has arrived now and that we have reached a condition of emergency. Well do we understand the truth of Mr. Borden's words that the day of peril is too late for preparation; well does the Turkish nation understand to-day that the day of peril is too late for preparation; well did the Russian nation understand after the war with Japan that the day of peril was too late for preparation; well did the Spanish nation understand, after the American war, that the day of peril was too late for preparation; well did France in 1870 understand that the day of peril was too late for preparation, and because she did not prepare for the peril which came upon her, Alsace and Lorraine are to-day two provinces of the German Empire.

What is the cause of the present emergency? My hon. friend is unlike the First Lord of the Admiralty, who declared that he was going to speak fairly, plainly, and openly on the naval programme of the German nation, and the First Lord of the Admiralty added that he did not think the German people could find any fault with him for doing so. I say right here, if I were an ambitious subject of the German Empire I would do to-day as the German Empire is doing, for we must remember that the Germans are an ambitious and progressive people. I do not wish to speak disrespectfully of the German people; they are doing what they consider best in the interests of the German Empire, and surely they cannot find fault with us if we do what we consider best in the interests of the British Empire. It is the amazing and abnormal growth of the great fighting engines and the increased personnel of the German navy in recent years that has been the cause of the general nervousness and the present crisis. The German navy was a nonentity in 1896 and to-day it is the second strongest navy in the world. The German navy has risen from 12 battleships and cruisers in 1908 to 61 projected in 1920; the German navy had as its personnel in 1908 but 25,000 men at a yearly cost of $30,000,000, but it has risen to 66,000 men in 1912 at a yearly cost of $76,000,000, and, according to their present naval programme, even if there is no acceleration of that programme—and there has been five accelerations since 1900—the personnel of the German navy will be increased to 101,000 men in 1920, at an annual cost of $115,000,000. Germany's annual expenditure in 1908 was $68,000,000, and to-day the cost has risen to $114,000,000 per annum. In these figures alone it seems to me there are evidences of a culminating emergency. And, let us look at some other facts which I propose to give for the purpose of proving this same condition. There are two ways in which a nation endeavours to accomplish some paramount ultimate object, and the paramount ultimate object of the German people is, in my opinion, to become on sea, as they are on land to-day, absolutely the predominant nation of Europe.

That predominance may be brought about either secretly or openly, and the German people have taken the course of doing it, with respect to the navy, in an open manner, and they have done that for the purpose of disarming all suspicion. When they first began to launch out as a great naval power, they set apart one thousand million dollars for the purpose of starting their navy, and they said openly and above board right in the preamble of their legislation, that this navy must be so strong that the strongest naval power in Europe dare not attack them. They might just as well have said that their navy shall be so strong that Great Britain dare not attack them. Then it must be remembered that the German Empire has a comparatively small coast line, a coast line protected by nature by sands and shallows and further protected by magnificent fortifications. The German people know as well as we do that their navy is not essential for their national existence. Even if Germany lost her navy to-morrow she would still be the dominant nation in Europe whereas if the navy of Britain were lost, our supremacy and our national existence would be gone. With Britain, the navy is a case of absolute life and death; with Germany, such a navy is more or less a luxury unless it be for colonial expansion, and the comparatively insignificant colonies of the German Empire to-day do not warrant the number of huge war leviathans they are constructing to control the seas. The ships they are building are not of a kind that are intended to be used for colonial expansion at long distance; they are of a type to be used in the North Sea, close to the shores of Great Britain, and close to the shores of Germany. I have seen it suggested that this was a proper time for arbitration, with respect to this matter; I have seen somewhere that the grain growers of the North-west made a suggestion that we should not do anything with respect to this question of naval defence, and that by doing nothing we would show the powers of Europe that we are in favour of international arbitration as the final arbiter. I want to point out that in the year 1905, Great Britain conceived the idea of some policy looking to the curtailment of naval armaments; in that year she was building four ships and Germany was building two. The Liberal Government was in power then, and they conceived the idea with a view, if possible, of checking the naval armaments of Europe, and concluded they would throw out an olive branch to Germany and try to get her to check her expenditure and England would do the same. In 1905, Great Britain was building four capital ships, in the same year Germany was building two. That is a natural status, because Great Britain has maintained for years a two-power standard. She threw out the olive branch and said: 'Let us stop building naval armaments.' The next year she reduced her building programme from four to three; Germany replied by increasing hers from two to three. The next year Great Britain said: 'We will still not build any more than last year.' She built only three; the answer of Germany was three. In the following year, still trying to induce the German nation to restrict her naval armaments, Great Britain dropped hers back from three to two, and the answer of Germany was four. The result was that during that time, while Great Britain cut her naval armaments in two, Germany doubled hers. We, therefore, gave a bonafide practical expression of our desire to curtail naval armaments, and the result was the doubling of the naval armaments of Germany. This was the condition of things in 1909, which caused the great nervous unrest in Europe, which caused the introduction in this House of the resolution which was passed unanimously by this Chamber in that year, and which was the cause of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition introducing his Naval Service Act of 1910. There is no doubt about that. It was the existing state of feeling as to naval armaments in Great Britain and Canada which induced my right hon. friend to bring in his Bill. Yet when he brought in his Bill, he totally ignored the question of emergency or any immediate aid to the Imperial navy. In the year 1909, the year of the Canadian Press Conference, we had the opinions of some of the most influential men in England, that there was a crisis on at that time. I have the speech of Lord Rosebery before me which I will quote because it affects the question. It is as follows:

> In June, 1909, there never was, in the history of the world, so threatening and overpowering a preparation for war. That is the sign which I regard as most ominous. For forty years it has been a platitude to say that all Europe is an armed camp, and for forty years it has been true that all the nations have been facing each other armed to the teeth, and that has been, in some respects, a guarantee of peace. And now what do we see? And now, without any tangible reason, we see the nations preparing new armaments. They cannot, indeed, arm any more men upon land, so they have to seek new armaments upon the sea, piling up enormous preparation, as if for some approaching Armageddon. I admit there are features of this general preparation for war which must cause special anxiety to the friends of Great Britain and of the British Empire.
>
> When I see one country alone asking for 25 millions of extra taxation for warlike preparations; when I see the unprecedented sacrifices; which are asked from us on the same grounds, I do begin to feel uneasy as to

the outcome of it all, and to wonder where it will stop.

The Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, speaking on the same occasion, gave the same opinion. Mr. McKenna, First Lord of the Admiralty, and Hon. Alfred Lyttleton, ex-Colonial Secretary, speaking at the same conference, expressed the same views. In the year 1909, the British Government saw that their 'olive branch policy' had been a failure; they had given Germany the opportunity of curtailment by their own actual demonstration, and the reply was to double their armaments. In the year 1909, therefore, Great Britain's programme jumped up again from two capital ships to four. Australia gave one, New Zealand gave one. The First Lord of the Admiralty said: 'I am going to make provision for four more capital ships, making ten in all, but I will not build these four conditional ships until I see if Germany continues her aggressive naval policy.' That was in March, 1909. In July, 1909, Mr. McKenna got up in the British House of Commons and he used these words :

After very anxious and careful examination of the conditions of shipbuilding in foreign countries, the Government have come to the conclusion that it is desirable to take all necessary steps to ensure that the second four ships referred to in the programme shall be completed by March, 1912.

And so it was in consequence of the emergency that the British Government built the dreadnoughts, the Thunderer, the Conqueror, the Monarch and the Princess Royal. If it had not been for that emergency year, we would have had only sixteen dreadnoughts in commission as compared with Germany's thirteen; but it cost Great Britain $50,000,000 capital money to build those ships, and will cost from fourteen to fifteen million dollars a year to maintain them. Yet my hon. friend will say that there was no emergency even then; and my right hon. friend when he introduced his Bill paid no attention at all to that aspect of the case. When my right hon. friend brought in his Bill, we took the same attitude then as we are taking to-day. We moved the amendment that in order to satisfy the then existing emergency, we should give $25,000,000 for the purpose of building two ships for Great Britain. We said as to that part of our policy that we did not ask you to go to the people, that we did not think it necessary for you to go to the people, but as to the permanent naval policy of the country, which was the policy then being introduced by the Canadian Naval Service Act, we said that you should have gone to the country. We take the same position to-day as to this emergency contribution and as to our permanent policy. Give us the grant; send it to the old country where it can be effectively used at a psychological moment. As to the permanent policy we are willing to discuss it one, two or three years hence, and we will bring it down and discuss it in Parliament and before the people; and before we ask you to sanction that permanent policy, we will go to the people upon it, and abide by their decision.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 31, to consolidate and amend the Acts relating to the Guarantee Company of North America.—Mr. Baker.

Bill No. 37, respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company.—Mr. Clark (Red Deer).

Bill No. 38, respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company. — Mr. Buchanan.

Bill No. 39, respecting the Algoma Eastern Railway Company.—Mr. Smyth.

Bill No. 40, respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 41, respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Smith.

Bill No. 42, respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 43, respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 44, respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cash.

Bill No. 45, respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. White (Renfrew).

Bill No. 46, to incorporate the Northwest Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company.—Mr. McKay.

Bill No. 47, respecting the Ottawa Electric Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 48, respecting the Ottawa Gas Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 49, respecting the Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: When the House rose at six o'clock I was discussing the many evidences which I considered went to prove an emergency with respect to the naval situation in Great Britain. I had pointed out, among other things, that with a view of partially relieving or making provisions to cope with an emergency in 1909, Great Britain had placed four ships upon the conditional dreadnought list, to be built should Germany continue her aggressive

naval policy. These ships were afterwards built, because Germany had progressed in her naval armament policy, and one of the best evidences we have as to the most effective means of meeting an emergency is the action of the British Admiralty in 1909, when, in order to meet the emergency that then existed, they proceeded to build four dreadnoughts, just as is suggested in the recent Admiralty memorandum. If we desire to render effective aid to Imperial naval armament, the best way of doing so is by the construction of modern dreadnoughts. In addition to the evidences I have given, there now comes, with relentless dogged persistency, the German Navy Act of 1912, the fifth amendment to this great German Naval Act passed in 1900, which, as I said, originally set aside a thousand million dollars for the purpose of starting that navy. These amendments have set aside more than $500,000,000 more. The seriousness of the amendment of the present year consists not so much in the augmentation or increase in the number of ships to be built, but in the increase of personnel in the navy; and its greatest seriousness consists in the fact that whereas, prior to that amendment, only one-third of the ships of the German navy were on the active list, this amendment changes that proposition, and places four-fifths of the entire German navy on an active striking basis. That fact alone, the difference made in the organization of the German navy by that amendment, is to my mind sufficient to constitute a crisis or emergency for which we are justified in making the provision embodied in the present Bill. Recent developments in central Europe have shown beyond a doubt that, even in the case of a military war, with the notice of preparation inseparable from military war—because you cannot make preparations for a military war with the same celerity or secrecy as for a naval war—the whole map of Europe may be changed within a few weeks, such is the celerity of military war to-day. But in the case of naval war, so far as your ships are on active service and on an active fighting basis, no notice whatever need be given; you have simply to slip your cables and there is no indication as to whether your intentions are peaceful or warlike until the blow is struck. So I say that the changing of the proportion of the German navy that is on a fighting basis from one-third to four-fifths, places four-fifths of that navy in such a position that it may slip its cables, as it has a right to do, without any notice or without the knowledge of Great Britain or any other nation, and we cannot tell whether her intentions are warlike or peaceful until the delivery of the fatal blow at the point intended. From that standpoint the amendment of 1912 to the German Naval Law constitutes a sufficient emergency, a sufficient change in naval conditions of the foremost naval power in Europe, to justify and warrant the Bill of the right hon. the leader of the House, granting $35,000,000 for these three ships.

The hon. member for South Wellington has fairly said that the Prime Minister in introducing the Bill gave a very fair and impartial review of the whole naval situation, and he was also complimented by the Leader of the Opposition on the fair method in which he presented that measure to the House. We will all agree that the Prime Minister would be the last man to introduce politics into the question of the naval defence of the Empire, and I think that until my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) held his caucus, and until the Liberal party decided to bring in their amendment, the people of this country were practically a unit in the belief that the Borden policy was the proper policy for this country at this psychological moment. To show that this was the attitude of the Opposition I shall quote from the Toronto Globe as late as March 24, last, before the Globe knew the intention or policy of the leader of the Opposition. The Globe, as we all know, is the leading Liberal organ in Ontario and speaks on behalf of the Liberal party, at least in that province. This is what it says:

> There is not another nation in Europe which would impotently stand by and see an instrument forged for its destruction. They would seize the reptile while it was still weak and strangle it.
>
> But that is not the British way. They have instead endeavoured to keep pace with German activity in augmenting naval power. The contest has become a desperate one. It is a contest between a nation of 65,000,000, and constantly growing, with a nation of 42,000,000, from which its sons swarm across the seas year in and year out. War is deprecated, but, as a matter of fact war is in progress. The contest in shipbuilding is war. If the Mother Country were engaged in a deadly conflict, Canadians could not get across the ocean fast enough to the aid of the Motherland. The Canadian exchequer would be open to the last dollar in such a cause. But we must recognize that our aid is as much needed now as if a physical war, instead of a war of shipbuilding were on. Germany appreciates that if ever she is to challenge British supremacy and break up the British Empire, now is the time.

That was the feeling among the Liberal party, almost the unanimous feeling in this country, until the right hon. the leader of the Opposition introduced his party amendment into this House. My hon. friend from South Renfrew, and very many other hon. members for this House, have been quoting from speeches alleged to have been made by the First Lord of the British Admiralty, to prove that there

is no desire, and no necessity, on the part of the British Admiralty for the assistance we propose to give. Do they expect that the British First Lord of the Admiralty is going to proclaim from the house tops to the nations of the world that they are in need of assistance from any one? Do they not remember that right in the Admiralty report of last November they say: 'We do not desire in any manner to put pressure upon public opinion in Canada.' If there was anything of that kind in the Admiralty report you would find some hon. gentlemen opposite jumping up and in a fit of acute autonomitis protesting against anything of the kind. We would find the hon. member for Rouville going to his Webster's dictionary to find out what an emergency was and becoming afflicted with an acute attack of Websteritis trying to prove that there was no emergency.

All the quotations that have been made by the hon. member for South Wellington, all of the quotations made by the Hon. Mackenzie King, former Minister of Labour, in his speeches throughout this country have been from speeches delivered by Mr. Churchill, the First Lord of the Admiralty before he became aware of the contents of the German Naval Bill of 1912. And my hon. friend from South Wellington asks why were not some of the quotations which he made from speeches made by Mr. Churchill at a certain banquet, incorporated into the Admiralty memorandum of 1912? I will tell him why, because Mr. Churchill knew that the statements which he made earlier in the year, before he knew the contents of the German Navy Bill, would not be true if delivered after he knew the contents of the German Navy Bill. I will now quote from his statements made after the German Navy Bill was known to him—statements which were incorporated in the memorandum. On July 22, in the British House of Commons, he said:

The main feature of the law is not the increase in the new construction of capital ships, though that is an important feature. The main feature is the increase in the striking force of ships of all classes which will be available, immediately available, at all seasons of the year.

That is in the Admiralty report.

The next statement in his speech was:

Whereas according to the unamended law, the active battle fleet consisted of 17 battleships, 4 battle or large armoured cruisers, and 12 small cruisers, in the near future the active fleet will consist of 25 battleships, 8 battle or large armoured cruisers and 18 small cruisers; and whereas at present, owing to the system of recruitment which prevails in Germany, the German fleet is less fully mobile during the winter than during the summer months, it will, through the operation of this law, not only be increased in strength, but rendered much more readily available.

That statement was also contained in the Admiralty memorandum.

The next statement in his speech of July last is this:

Taking a general view, the effect of the law will be that nearly four-fifths of the entire German navy will be maintained in full permanent commission—that is to say, instantly and constantly ready for war. Such a proportion is remarkable, and, so far as I am aware, finds no example in the previous practice of modern naval powers.

Is there no suggestion of an emergency in that, and that speech was delivered after the speech from which my hon. friend from South Wellington has quoted. Further he said.

The new law adds a total of 15,000 officers and men, and makes the total in 1920 of 101,500.

Again he says:

The cost of these increases in men and in material during the next six years is estimated at £10,500,000, above the previous estimate spread over that period. I should like to point out to the committee that this is a cumulative increase which follows upon other increases of a very important character. The law of 1898 was practically doubled by the law of 1900, and if the expenditure contemplated by the law of 1900 had been followed the German estimates of to-day would be about £11,000,000. But, owing to the amendments of 1906 and 1908, and now of 1912, that expenditure is very nearly £23,000,000.

Then he goes on to say:

The number of battleships and large armoured cruisers alone which will be kept constantly ready and in full commission will be raised by the law from twenty-one, the present figure, to thirty-three—that is to say, an addition of twelve or an increase of about fifty-seven per cent.

Will any man say that the German naval policy of 1912 which was not passed when the speech quoted by my hon. friend was delivered, and which increased the strength by fifty-seven per cent, does not constitute some element of emergency for which we should make some provision? I think it does. Then he goes on to say:

The new fleet will in the beginning include about twenty battleships and large cruisers of the older type, but, gradually as new vessels are built, the fighting power of the fleet will rise until in the end it will consist completely of modern vessels. This new scale of the German fleet—organized in five battle squadrons, each attended by a battle or armoured cruiser squadron, complete with small cruisers and auxiliaries of all kinds, and accompanied by numerous flotillas of destroyers and submarines, more than three-fourths, nearly four-fifths, maintained in full permanent commission—the aspect and scale of this fleet is, I say, extremely formidable.

Then he wound up by saying:

It remains to be noted that this new law is the fifth in fourteen years of the large successive increases made in German naval strength, that it encountered no effective opposition in its passage through the Reichstag, and that, though it has been severely criticised in Germany since its passage, the criticisms have been directed towards its inadequacy.

I say that those provisions were not known to the First Lord of the Admiralty when he made the speech from which quotations have been made by my hon. friend from South Wellington.

Now then, let us come to British public opinion, and I am going to give quotations from five of the leading journals in England, two from the Liberal side and three from the Conservative side, one from the official Liberal organ of the Liberal administration, the most respectable organ published in Great Britain to-day, another from the Manchester Guardian, the most respected and widely circulated newspaper in the cotton district in the north of England, and the three others from Conservative newspapers. I want to be fair. Let us see what public opinion is in England to-day outside of the view of the Admiralty of which we have evidence in the present memorandum. The first that I will quote from is the Conservative newspaper, the London Telegraph. In its issue of July 12, 1912, it said:

It is the good fortune of the British Empire that just at the very moment when she is confronted with a rivalry such as she has not had to face since the great war of a century ago, the Dominions Overseas, which have grown to greatness under her safe and sure protection, are ready to share the responsibilities of Empire.

The next I will quote from is a Liberal newspaper, the Westminster Gazette, the official organ of the Liberal party in England. In its issue of July 19, 1912, it said:

We do not want to force this movement (Colonial aid) or to urge upon any of the Dominions the taking of any step for which its own opinion is not ripe, but naturally we welcome it as affording proof that British unity is a reality with which the world will have to reckon, and as promising us in the future that essential assistance without which our burden might become insupportable.

When that newspaper published that article it knew that my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was proposing some immediate and effective aid to the British Empire. It said we welcome it because we cannot always bear the burden under which we are now groaning. And yet hon. members on the other side say that Great Britain does not need it, that she does not even want it. Now let me take another Liberal journal, the Manchester Guardian of July 26, 1912, the Liberal organ in the cotton district in the north of England. What did it say when it learned that the Prime Minister proposed some immediate and substantial aid to the British navy? Did it take the position which hon. members opposite take, namely, that we do not need it, that we do not want your money, that it is not even necessary; do not give it. That is the position taken by hon. members opposite, but what did the Manchester Guardian say:

We should indeed be guilty of wilful blindness if we were not to recognize once and for all that these preparations—which for the matter of that, Germany is perfectly entitled to make—are aimed directly and immediately at Great Britain and at Great Britain only * * * If the dominions are ready and willing to help us—and it is almost vital to them that they should be—then help will be received with gratitude.

Now, I will give a quotation from a Conservative newspaper, the Morning Post. I am quoting only from the most influential journals. In its issue of July 18, 1912, the Morning Post said:

By herself the United Kingdom cannot hope to cope forever in men or resources with her greatest rivals. But in co-operation with the younger nations she will be able to guard the common heritage of all against attack.

The final quotations which I will give is from the London Standard of August 22, 1912, when that paper said:

The British Empire stands in real need to-day of active, definite co-operation and participation of and by its great self-governing dominions, in its defence, control and administration. We believe that under the guidance of Mr. Borden and his colleagues the people of the premier Dominion will shortly give a fine inspiring lead to their kinsmen in every other part of the Empire in the direction of this most important and desirable consummation.

Now, that is the opinion of the most respectable journals in Great Britain, and I would like to ask hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House how they can contend first that aid is not necessary, and secondly that it is not even desirable.

My next proof that there is an emergency will be taken from the speech of the hon. member for Edmonton in the course of this very debate. The hon. member for Edmonton when he rose to speak said very frankly that he differed materially from his colleagues on this question of emergency. I propose to read what he said. He has the courage of his convictions, we all know that. I say he was absolutely right as to the question of emergency, but when he came to the remedy, I claim that he was

absolutely wrong. What did the hon. member for Edmonton say?

I say we are face to face to-day with proposals to enter actively, seriously, and expensively into a question of Imperial naval defence—a condition essentially different from that which prevailed two or three years ago.

Mark these words,

—a condition essentially different from that which prevailed two or three years ago.

Other gentlemen on the other side of the House have been telling us that there is no difference. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, when the right hon. the Prime Minister presented his proposals said:

I know all about what you tell me; I knew four years ago ever item and every word and every figure in the Admiralty memorandum; nothing you have told tells me anything new.

And yet his ex-Minister of the Interior gets up soon afterwards and says the conditions are essentially different from what they were two or three years ago, which was the very time when the leader of the Opposition introduced his Naval Service Bill in this House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not wish to interrupt my hon. friend but I desire to understand rightly the reference he makes to the hon. member for Edmonton's speech. It seems to me that the phrase which has been quoted does not imply that there is a difference between the condition of things existing in 1909 and that of 1912. The member for Edmonton simply said that the two policies were different.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LEMIEUX: If my hon. friend will read his words he will see that that is what he said. I may be wrong, but that is what I inferred.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I will read the whole quotation.

I say we are face to face to-day with proposals to enter actively, seriously, and expensively into the question of Imperial naval defence——

Mr. LEMIEUX: Proposals.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO (reading):

—proposals to enter actively, seriously, and expensively into the question of Imperial naval defence—a condition essentially different from that which prevailed two or three years ago, and the members of this Parliament will have to justify to the people of this country the position we take in asking for such large appropriations, and incurring such large future or prospective obligations.

I am here, Mr. Speaker, to absolutely justify the position that we have taken, both as to the amount of the present appropriation and as to the fulfilment of future obligations imposed thereby, and the consequences thereof. I am aware that the position I take is somewhat different from that hitherto adopted in the course of this debate, and to-day we are face to face with new conditions regarding military and naval matters such as the world has never before seen.

Then he goes on to describe what these conditions are and no one has proved the emergency in a more forcible manner than the hon. member for Edmonton.

For many years the British Islands were protected by the narrow seas and the British dominions were protected by the width of the ocean but to-day we must recognize the fact that it is merely a matter of time when the millions of men who are or who can be placed under arms in Europe at practically a moment's notice can be transported over sea as quickly and as certainly as may be necessary to carry out the will of the nation to which they belong. There is no purpose in Canada ignoring this condition of affairs. Let me suggest to this House that a fleet that can sail across the North Sea can sail across the Atlantic ocean, can sail around the world, and that Canada has no guarantee of immunity from the presence of such fleets or of individual members of such fleets and that our fair provinces by the sea, including the one which my hon. friend represents——

Referring to my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier).

—stands in just as much danger as the British Islands themselves in case of any outbreak of war in which the British Empire is involved.

So, I say that the hon. member for Edmonton proves conclusively the changed conditions that constitute the emergency and I give him credit for coming out plainly on this subject. Were you sitting in the house at the time he delivered this speech? Did you notice the face on the hon. member for South Renfrew and that of the right hon. leader of the Opposition? If you had done so it would not have been necessary to have read this quotation. If you had seen the shadow of consternation and bewilderment that passed over their countenances as they realized how completely he was demolishing the arguments of the speakers on that side of the House, who had claimed that there was no emergency, you would have noticed that there was something wrong and how this was followed by the sunshine of joy and relief when that hon. gentleman, after proving the existence of the emergency, turned around and said that the only remedy for that condition was the amendment proposed by the leader of the Opposition.

Let me examine the speech of the right hon. leader of the Opposition upon the

issue as to the question of an emergency. What did he say?

There is no emergency, there is no immediate danger, there is no prospective danger.

I would like hon. members to mark well these words.

There is no emergency——

Says the leader of the Opposition.

—there is no immediate danger, there is no prospective danger.

I want to read you from a speech delivered by an hon. gentleman in this House on the same subject in which he says, speaking of this Bill introduced by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister.

We have the question of defence to deal with. When we have to deal with the danger of an enemy rushing upon us, whom we must stop, are we to fold our arms and do nothing until we have settled the question as to whether or not we shall have a voice in all matters of war or peace?

Referring to my right hon. friend the Premier.

—is like the Emperor of Constantinople, who went to Italy to discuss questions of theology, when his city was being assaulted by the Turks, who finally captured it.

The one says there is no danger, the other says that my right hon friend is like the Emperor who went from Constantinople to Italy to discuss theology when his citadel was being attacked, and he asks: Are you going to fold your arms, stand still and do nothing? Mr. Speaker and hon gentlemen, I want to tell you that these two speeches were made by the same man, in the same house, on the same day, in the same half hour and in the same debate and they were made by the right hon. leader of the Opposition. The man who says there is no danger, that there is no emergency, says that Mr. Borden, like the man who was going away from his own city when it was being assailed. Surely if we are being actually assaulted there must be some emergency. The truth bubbled out in the last instance because he was not on guard and the right hon. gentleman told what he thought and what the people thought before the question of politics had been introduced into the subject.

I have only another observation to make on this question of emergency and that is if any further evidence is necessary to prove an emergency, or need, or changed conditions, I think it is afforded by the amendment of the right hon. gentleman himself. What do we find? In 1910 the present leader of the Opposition brought down a Bill on this question authorizing the purchase of the 'Niobe' and the 'Rainbow.' Subsquently thereto, and under the provisions of the Bill, he called for tenders for four cruisers of the Bristol type to cost something like $10,000,000. He did not go ahead with the construction of those cruisers. True, he called for tenders but when he left office, on October 7, 1911, all he had done, under the provisions of the Naval Service Act, was to purchase these two insignificant coast defence vessels, and we have the right to assume that the Bill which he introduced in 1910 and which was in force when he left power embodied a policy considered by him to be satisfactory and sufficient to answer all the needs of the naval defence of Canada and the Empire. That is fair, I think. Then, I ask the hon. member for South Renfrew, who is now leading the Opposition, if there is no emergency, if there is no need, if their policy was sufficient for all defence purposes, if, as they say, there has been no change and if, as the hon. member for South Renfrew says, there is no danger, why have they jumped from their policy of 1910 to a policy calling for two complete fleet units, from a policy involving the actual expenditure of a million and a third and a contemplated expenditure of $10,000,000 to a policy which will cost $50,000,000, because, according to the Admiralty report of 1909, which I have in my hands, two complete fleet units consists of two dreadnoughts, six armoured cruisers, twelve destroyers, six sub-marines and depot and store ships and will cost, according to the English price, $37,000,000 and, with the Canadian price added, $50,000,000. According to the same official report, to maintain these fleet units, it will cost $6,000,000 at the English price and, from $8,000,000 to $9,000,000 at the Canadian price. What I want to say to my hon. friend is this: Tell the conditions or circumstances which have caused you to jump from your own policy of a million and a half dollars for these two boats and a prospective expenditure of $10,000,000 for four Bristol cruisers, to a policy of two complete fleet units to cost $50,000,000 together with an annual expenditure of $8,000,000 or $9,000,000, and I will tell you what the emergency is. You are forced into this position if you have moved your amendment in good faith. You have either got to say that there is an emergency or something which caused you to do that, in which case you admit our contention, or you are fooling the people and your amendment is simply for obstructive purposes. If there is no danger to Great Britain, why are you building the two fleet units? Is the danger from any other source than Germany, and, if so, from what source? Is it from the United States? Is it because you fear the United States that you have jumped from an expenditure of one and a third million dol-

lars on your navy proposition to fifty million dollars? Do you fear aggression from Japan, now an ally of Great Britain? Do you fear aggression from Japan, a nation which in 1905 sat down at the conference table and said to Great Britain: We have sufficient confidence in your integrity and justice that we will say now that for the next ten years we will trust you, and if you become involved in any war we will go to your assistance and we will conduct the war in common and we will agree to peace in common, as anyone will find who looks at the terms of the British-Japanese Treaty. Is it from Japan you fear aggression, a nation which put more confidence and trust and faith in Great Britain than you did when you introduced your Naval Service Act of 1910 and said you would not trust the Mother Country—not until a war arose, and then you required an Order in Council? Whence may come the menace that you fear? It must be from Europe, and, if so, from what nation in Europe? Argue around in a circle as you like, and you have come back and admit that the danger is from Germany. And, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House say that the danger is in the North Sea, and when the Armageddon arises we want our ships to be there to defend the heart of the Empire and to keep the Empire whole and intact. Another proof that there is something wrong is to be found in the fact that for centuries past, so long as Great Britain was beyond peradventure dominant upon the seas, we have enjoyed abiding peace and prosperity. It is only just so soon as the navy of some other nation or a combination of navies begin to rival that of Great Britain, that upon the horizon appears a cloud and there are rumours of war and world-wide nervousness. That Sir, I say, is another proof that there is something wrong and that Great Britain has not to-day that domination of the seas, she used to have in the olden days. So much for the question of emergency.

The next point I will touch upon is the claim of these gentlemen opposite that this $35,000,000 for three dreadnoughts is the beginning of a permanent contribution to Great Britain, or the beginning of the permanent naval policy of this Government. I do not think that any member of this House believes that, but I notice that the Liberal newspapers throughout the country are endeavouring to make the people believe it, and even the speech of the hon. member would indicate that he is trying to spread the idea that this contribution is not simply a temporary grant by Canada, but that it is to be the inauguration of our permanent naval policy as well. Let me point out that when the Liberal Government brought in their naval policy in 1910, the Conservative party moved an amendment that there be given two dreadnoughts, that $25,000,000 be expended to satisfy the emergency at once, and that the then Government should go to the country with their permanent naval policy which was the Naval Service Act of 1910. We are consistent to-day; we say that so far as this temporary isolated grant of $35,000,000 is concerned, we do not think we should go to the people, because indeed we set out that principle in our policy as announced in this House in the resolution of 1909, that position we stand by to-day, and as to our permanent policy we are still willing to go to the people of the country on it. Now, Sir, let us see what the British people think about this matter; let us see whether they think it is or is not the permanent policy of Canada. The British people thoroughly understand that this grant of three dreadnoughts is no part of the permanent naval policy of Canada; they know it is simply an isolated spontaneous gift of the Canadian people, prompted as much in the desire for our own preservation of the Empire, as our desire to preserve our own dignity and self-respect. Mr. Churchill said in the British House of Commons: We thoroughly understand the offer of Canada; we thoroughly understand that it is not the permanent policy of Mr. Borden, we thoroughly understand that Canada is simply making a grant to us for the purpose of assisting the naval forces of the Empire, and we thoroughly understand, as Mr. Borden has told us, that as to the permanent naval policy, it will require a great deal more consideration and no doubt will have to be submitted to the Canadian Parliament and to the people of Canada. And yet, in the face of this, hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to make the people believe that this is the permanent naval policy of the Conservative party.

Now, Sir, I want to say a word with reference to the constitutionality of this question, and I may preface my remark by saying that the weakest argument presented by hon. gentlemen opposite was their attack upon the constitutionality of the proposal now before Parliament. We have been told by these gentlemen opposite that the gift of these three ships in some way invades, or even reverses, the principles of our free constitutional government and of Canadian autonomy. My hon. friend from South Renfrew used these words:

> Now let me point out something else. I take a somewhat, I was going to say wider view, but I should not use that word; I wish to present this view to the House and I do so without any hesitation; that the return to a system of contribution by the people of Canada, is looking towards the reversal of the constitutional relations existing between the British Empire and her dominions over

the seas, and is a step backwards of seventy years.

You will find that the hon. member devoted six columns of 'Hansard' to prove that a free, isolated, untrammelled, voluntary gift by the Canadian people, actuated by a desire for their self-preservation within the Empire and to maintain their self-respect, was an unconstitutional thing to do. What on earth a spontaneous gift to the Mother Country by the people of Canada has to do with invading the autonomy of the Dominion, or its contribution, is something that no sane man can understand. The hon. member was a little more unfortunate in his reference to the cause of the American Revolution. He told us that taxation was the cause of the American Revolution, and I suppose he cited that for the purpose of proving that this free gift by the people of Canada was a tax forced upon the people of Canada by the British Empire. But, let us see how the idea propounded by the hon. member would apply. The cause of the American Revolution was the imposition of a tax against the will of the American people, a compulsory tax which they did not wish to pay, but the present contribution is a voluntary contribution by Canada to the Motherland, and if we were to believe hon. gentlemen opposite, the Motherland does not even want it. Therefore, the hon. member has proved, by his citation, the very reverse of the case which he started out to sustain. As has been pointed out very cogently by my hon. friend from North Toronto, if it is unconstitutional to grant $35,000,000, the mere fact that there is an emergency does not make any difference in the constitutional aspect of it, and yet the leader of the Opposition said that if there was an emergency, he would grant four times $35,000,000, by which process of course my hon. friend from Renfrew would have shifted himself back into the Middle Ages on his constitutional theory. I want to point out, and it ought to be unnecessary to do so, that there never has been in the last thirty years any demand in any manner, shape or form from England that we should take any particular action with reference to any particular thing in Empire matters, and yet these hon. gentlemen opposite are trying to make the people of Canada believe that there is a demand from Great Britain that we shall give them this $35,000,000. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has helped to contribute to that impression in this country. I have here a speech which was made in Montreal upon this naval question in the year 1910 in which he used these words as reported in the Toronto Globe:

> At the same time the Secretary of State for the Marine demanded that the same powers should contribute a sum of money annually for the maintenance of an Imperial fleet. There, indeed, was the entrance to militarism. But the Canadian ministers who were at London—and I was one of them—opposed this demand of the Imperial Government in a categorical refusal, a refusal respectful in form, but absolute in meaning.

I challenge any member on that side of the House who has read the reports of the Imperial Conference to show me one single sentence in which the British Government at those conferences has demanded anything. The whole business of those conferences has been conducted on the basis that no resolution is forced upon any colony, no resolution is passed there against the wish of any colony. Anything done there is passed unanimously, and if it cannot be passed unanimously it is withdrawn. As an illustration of what I mean here is a resolution introduced in the conference of 1909 by Dr. Smartt, one of the representatives of South Africa at that conference. That resolution said in effect that the overseas dominions should take some part and bear some burden in Imperial naval defence, but it said that we leave it to the legislatures of the various colonies to say in what way that contribution or that assistance shall be given. Absolutely open to the colonies to do what they like! Sir Wilfrid Laurier, notwithstanding that every other Dominion represented at that conference was willing to pass that resolution, said, 'No, if you press the resolution I will be forced to vote against it.' They did not press the resolution because he said he would vote against it. Mr. Smartt, after Sir Wilfrid Laurier took that attitude, said, 'We have been passing pious resolutions long enough and it is at this conference and it is time we began to do something in reality.' My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has disparaged the effects of British diplomacy upon the various treaties that have been entered into between Canada and the United States, where the negotiations have been conducted by Great Britain. I do not know whether my hon. friend from South Renfrew has ever taken that stand, but Sir Wilfrid Laurier has taken that stand. In this House on the 12th December last in this debate, he took occasion to say that in his opinion British diplomacy had not been beneficial in any treaty negotiated by Great Britain in the interests of Canada. Why was it necessary for him to make such a declaration as that on a question of this kind? It is not germane to the subject. What has the question of British diplomacy to do with the free and voluntary gift by Canada to Great Britain to relieve her in the present naval distress? It was just volunteered by him and indicates his repugnance to

give any assistance to the British navy. What are the facts? Here are his own words:

We have recently heard throughout the province of Quebec that we owe nothing to England, because in the long chapter of our history she has sacrificed our interests in the adjustment of the boundary between ourselves and our neighbours to the south. For my part I have often stated that in such questions British diplomacy has not shown itself to advantage.

And then he goes on to say:

The fact is undeniable that, practically ever since we have had in our hands the conduct of our diplomatic relations, Canada has suffered no sacrifice. In the last dispute we had with our neighbours, on the question of the Atlantic fisheries, not only did we not suffer any sacrifice, but we obtained recognition of rights which had been long denied.

What was the last dispute? The North Atlantic Coast Fisheries question, and my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition was very very unfortunate in citing that illustration to prove his case that British diplomacy had never been conducted in the interests of Canada. Whom did he send as the representative of Canada upon that question?—Sir Allen Aylesworth, his Minister of Justice, one of the brightest minds in the late administration, I say without the slightest hesitation, a man whose legal acumen was equal to that of probably any man in Canada. We all admit that though we may not agree with his views. He sent him as the representative of Canada on that arbitration. Sir Allen Aylesworth spent months and months in delving into the old treaties between Great Britain and Canada, and he came back after the arbitration was over, and we thank him for his testimony, he stood up in this House and gave a resume and a review of all that had taken place at those arbitration proceedings, and of his research into many treaties, and he said, repudiating the former sentiments of the right hon. leader of the Opposition entirely:

I would wish only to say this further, not with reference to that particular treaty alone, but with general reference to all the various international arrangements and agreements which, during the last 130 years, have been entered into between the statesmen of Great Britain and those of the United States, that while it seems to be rather the fashion—

The fashion of whom? Not the fashion of gentlemen on this side of the House, the fashion of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, so much the fashion that he could not help repeating it in the present naval debate. Sir Allen Aylesworth the man whom he sent across there to negotiate that treaty further said:

—or to have been rather the fashion, in this country to take the view that in the greater number, if not in all, of those international arrangements the United States has succeeded in getting the better of it, and that there has been, in perhaps most instances, on the part of British statesmen, some sacrifice, or some failure to recognize sufficiently the rights and interests of the British colonies in North America, I, for my part, speaking, certainly after considerable study of the matter, and with some knowledge of it, do not in the least degree share those views. I think it is no more than simple justice that I should say with respect to the arrangements which, from time to time, have been entered into with regard to the various matters of difficulty which have arisen between the United States and Great Britain, that the general interests of the Empire at large have been well conserved by the representatives of the British Crown in those negotiations.

The man whom the right hon. leader of the Opposition sent over and who had such sufficient and complete knowledge of the subject and who had gone thoroughly into these treaties, comes back and says that although it is the fashion in this country to deprecate the advantages of British diplomacy, nevertheless says that it is not justifiable to do so and that during the last 130 years the general interests of the Empire at large have been well conserved by the representative of the British Crown in all those negotiations.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Sir John Macdonald did not say that. He started the fashion.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The next difference between the two parties is this: Our opponents claim that the memorandum prepared by the British Admiralty last November and laid on the table of the House by the Prime Minister does not disclose any emergency or any immediate or prospective danger or need of naval assistance to warrant the giving of these three dreadnoughts, and that the British Government does not desire the same. I can only say that after a perusal of the speech of Mr. Churchill delivered in the House on the 22nd of July last, and after a perusal of that memorandum by any man who is not biased in his opinions, and after reading the statement of the report itself that they do not wish to put any pressure upon public opinion in Canada, and the natural repugnance of Great Britain to suggest the way in which the assistance should be given, after reading that and after having the Prime Minister's own confidential statement delivered to him, because the Admiralty report states that this report is only supplemental to the confidential statements that they have given to the Prime Minister, and after the Prime Minister's statement in this House that the circumstances are such as to justify him in bringing down the present Bill and giving

$35,000,000 for the construction of three dreadnoughts, the man who will still ignore all such evidence of an emergency is to say the least derelict in his duty to Canada and the Empire at large.

Referring to the memorandum itself, I find in it this clause:

> Anything which increases our margin in the newest ships diminishes the strain and augments our security and our chance of being left unmolested.

Then Mr. Borden asked, as stated in the memorandum, in what form any immediate aid Canada might give would be most effective. The Admiralty answered:

> We have no hesitation in answering, after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances, that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

'That it is desirable' means 'we desire.' What? That such aid should include provision for a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply. I want to ask my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) this question: If, as he maintains, these ships are neither necessary nor desirable, would not the British Admiralty have said so when the Prime Minister stated he proposed to give certain immediate and effective aid, and inquired as to the best manner in which to give that aid? Would not the British Admiralty, in a straight-forward manner, have said: We do not need that kind of aid—we do not need any aid at all. To let him take the course they knew he intended to take, would be obtaining ships under false pretenses. The attitude of hon. gentlemen on the other side is simply this: They practically say to Great Britain: You are taking from us $35,000,000 when you neither need nor desire it. Is there any man in this House who will deliberately say that Great Britain, knowing what we are going to do, would recommend that we give so and so, and take it when they neither need nor desire it? That is an accusation altogether unreasonable and unfounded, I am sure it could not be said that the British Admiralty had any such thought or intention in respect to the naval defence of the Empire.

I have observed that one of the reasons why the hon. member for South Wellington contended we should not give three dreadnoughts to Great Britain was that Great Britain did not want them, and one of his strongest arguments was that these vessels would in a very short time become obsolete. I would like to ask him if vessels built by the British Admiralty—built in the very shortest time—become so quickly obsolete, in what condition would the two dreadnoughts proposed to be built by my hon. friend be before they are finished? They can be built in Great Britain in two or three years; it would take ten or fifteen years for my right hon. friend to complete his fleet units here. My right hon. friend shakes his head, but in the contract he had with respect to the building of these four Bristols, what was the term of years provided for their completion? Three years for the first little Bristol to be completed, and six years for the other threee! If it takes six years to build four little Bristols how long would it take to get your plant, docks and shipyard ready, and to build the two complete fleet units he proposes? Fifteen years at least; and if ours become obsolete in three, I cannot vouch for the condition those of hon. gentlemen opposite will be in at the end of fifteen.

The hon. member for South Renfrew appeared to wax righteously indignant, because, forsooth, this Government was giving three dreadnoughts to Great Britain without manning them. The first answer to that is, we are giving what we have been asked to give; we are giving that which England said would be the most effective aid that could be rendered to the British Empire. We are giving that which the British Government in 1909 considered the best means of meeting the then emergency. Is it not inconsistent for the hon. member for South Renfrew to find fault with us for not manning these three ships and sending them to Great Britain as an emergency contribution when he himself will not vote even for the contribution of the three ships? With respect to the manning of the ships, I would remind hon. gentlemen that there is an old adage regarding people who live in glass houses. It does not do to become too righteously indignant, because the house is very transparent, and one can see through it very clearly; nor should they attempt to throw stones from the vicinity of such an unstable and flimsy structure.

Let us see what success hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House had with reference to their measure for a naval policy for this country. In 1909 my right hon. friend brought down a Bill under which he purchased the Niobe and the Rainbow at a cost of one and a third millions of dollars. The cost of maintenance last year of that insignificant portion of a local navy was $784,000, the annual maintenance being over 50 per cent of the original cost. On the same basis, it would take $17,500,000 a year to man and maintain the three dreadnoughts which we propose to give, and would take $26,000,000 to man and maintain two fleet units which my right hon. friend would give. I am not now saying that if we had the two fleet units it would cost that much, I simply make these statements upon the records

placed before us, and as taken from the naval report for the year ended March 31, 1912.

With respect to our ability to man the three proposed dreadnoughts, I may say that the desertions from the Niobe and Rainbow as shown by this report for the year ending 31st March, 1912, were 149, and the number of recruits taken during the year 126, the desertions during the year being 23 in excess of the recruits. Here is a mathematical problem for my right hon. friend. If during the course of the year the deserters from a little navy costing a million and a half are 23 in excess of the recruits, how long would it take to man three dreadnoughts costing $35,000,000?

Mr. PUGSLEY : Will my hon. friend be good enough to read the statement of Admiral Kingsmill giving his reasons for the desertions ?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO : When the Niobe and the Rainbow came out from the old country, they were manned to the teeth with British seamen. They started off with a full complement, and notwithstanding that the men placed on these ships were not recruited from Canada, this is the record we have of the desertions which have since taken place.

Mr. PUGSLEY : What does Admiral Kingsmill say ?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO : I am quoting the facts as given in the report of the Naval Department for the year ending the 31st of March, 1912. I wish to quote something else from the same report, and perhaps this is what my hon. friend wants to know :

> The large number of desertions is attributable to the fact that the greater number of recruits are entered from places remote from the sea, and find sea life distasteful. They are totally unacquainted with the conditions of life in a ship, which differ much from what they have been accustomed to. A large number of men on board the Niobe are pensioners from the Imperial service.

The report goes on to say :

> On July 30, 1911, the Niobe went on the rocks. H.M.S Cornwall came to her assistance, towed her to Halifax. Her repairs are expected to be completed July, 1912, one year afterwards.

So that for a whole year the Niobe was under repairs at Halifax. She cost $1,000,000, her maintenance was $500,000, and her recruits during the year were 26 less than her desertions. That is the history of the navy as far as we have got it. In the face of all that, my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) attempts to poke fun at this Government for not attempting to man three dreadnoughts, three of the most powerful ships of the British navy completely, and to have sailors and officers trained in three years when, from the Admiralty report, we see that it takes at least six years to train men for this purpose. Perhaps the British Admiralty got a glance at this report and concluded that it was no use asking Canada for men if these were the conditions of recruiting in this country. We cannot get away from the fact, and it is useless to try to make political capital out of it, that we have not the merchant marine here to supply the sailors needed at this time. Great Britain has been the supreme maritime shipping nation for hundreds of years. Her men have been trained to sea generation after generation and a large proportion of them are maritime. They have a huge population in a small area, we have a large area with a small population. These facts will make it impossible at least for a long time to recruit in Canada. I am not saying it will be forever impossible but it will take a long time and greatly increased pay will be needed to induce the people of Canada to leave the very lucrative occupations they find here. In England there is a great population, many of whom are idle and are willing to accept less pay, while they are more capable of fulfilling the duties of sailors on these great men-of-war

What did the Globe say before this matter was thrown into the political arena? On March 29 again the Globe said:

> There can be no resisting the conviction, in view of these facts, that the Mother Country will accept the aid of her colonies at this time of crisis with thankful enthusiasm.

Just think of that, and hon. gentlemen argue hour after hour that she does not want them and will not accept the gift.

> Nothing is so likely to bring the mad competition to a stop as a conviction on the part of Germany that it is hopeless. In such case the colonies will be conferring a boon on the German taxpayers as well as on the British.

I come now to the last point of difference between the great political parties and that is: Our opponents contend that Canada can best contribute to the naval defence of Great Britain and the Empire by the construction of a separate and independent navy along the line of the Naval Service Act of 1910 passed by the late Government and although they now profess to find no fault with the granting of a sum of $35,000,000 or even more for naval purposes, it should, they say, be applied and used in the construction of two complete fleet units to be built, manned and maintained by Canada, and engrafted on their naval policy of 1910 which they passed as a permanent naval policy of Canada and with-

out reference to but denying any emergency or urgent need of assistance as such to the Imperial Government. They propose to engraft the two fleet units upon the Naval Service Act of 1910. We opposed the Naval Service Act of 1910 and we oppose it now because of the manner of the organization of that navy, because of its inconsistency, its imperial inconsistency, because it claims that this Government has the right to say when Great Britain became involved in war that they would go to the assistance of Great Britain. That involved the right to say that they would not go to the assistance of Great Britain. If they did not go to the assistance of Great Britain and war came on, then, according to international law, the belligerent foe would have the right to come to our coasts, to destroy our cities, towns and coast lines and possibly capture Canada. According to international law he would be perfectly justified in doing so. You cannot maintain a neutral position, you have got to be part of the Empire or not. If you are part of the Empire you must have some different constitution for your navy than that of a separate and independent country and the Bill brought down in 1910 made the navy of Canada separate and independent from the navy of Great Britain because the navy of Canada could not move one foot, could not do an aggressive act until the Governor in Council said it should do so.

I ask my right hon. friend in all fairness what difference there is between that and the navy of any other independent nation? If there should be a war to-morrow between Germany and England what would France do? The cabinet of that country would meet and decide whether they would come to the assistance of either power or remain neutral. There is no distinction between the organization of the Canadian navy, so far as going to war is concerned, and that of any other nation in the world. Let me illustrate this in another way. Japan is Britain's ally. Japan said ten years ago: I will trust you for ten years; to that extent I will bind my navy to you. I have sufficient confidence in your integrity, in your honour, in the justice of your wars, that I will bind myself to you for ten years. She did this through her cabinet, it was an executive act. My right hon. friend, when I put the question to him three years ago and asked him whether by his Bill he would bind himself for any particular time to come to the assistance of Great Britain, said: No, not for one moment, we will wait until the war arises, until the time comes, and then decide whether or not we will come to the assistance of Great Britain. Just to the extent of ten years my right hon. friend's policy was less loyal, less patriotic, displayed less faith in Britain's justice and wars than the Government of Japan which said: For ten years we are willing to bind ourselves now to you and to come to your aid, if you become involved in war from any cause.

Our hon. friends find fault with us because they say in bringing in the present measure we are not carrying out the provisions of the resolution of 1909. Let us examine this and see whether or not the resolution of 1909 was based on an emergency. What does it say?

> The House will cordially approve of any necessary expenditure designed to promote the speedy organization of a Canadian naval service in co-operation with, and in close relation to, the Imperial navy along the lines suggested by the Admiralty at the last Imperial Conference, and in full sympathy with the view that the naval supremacy of Britain is essential to the security of commerce, the safety of the Empire, and the peace of the world.

And then it said that whenever the 'need' arose Canada would make any sacrifice in the interest and for the honour and the integrity of the British Empire.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My hon. friend over there says 'Hear, hear.' I would say 'Hear, hear' if you had gone over to Great Britain and had done as that resolution says you are to do. I would have no fault to find with what you did. But the resolution says further that whatever you do, whatever service you organize, if you inaugurate a Canadian naval service it must be first of all in close co-operation with the British Admiralty. Under your policy there was no co-operation as I have pointed out.

In the next place it must be in close relation, which means practically the same thing. In the next place it had to be along the lines suggested by the Admiralty. Now let us see what the lines suggested by the Admiralty were. Let us face this thing fairly and squarely, and see whether or not we are entitled to the criticisms that hon. gentlemen opposite have made. The first suggestion of the British Admiralty was that if you want to do that which we consider most effective for the maintenance of the central navy, give us a periodical cash contribution. Now, we said in that resolution that we were against regular or periodical cash contributions and therefore we found no fault with the right hon. the leader of the Opposition for not consenting to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Is the hon. gentleman in favour of any regular contribution?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: The next point was this, that it must be along lines suggested by the Admiralty. What were the lines suggested by the Admiralty? I have the Admiralty report here and it said first:

It has been recognized by the colonial governments that in time of war the local naval forces should come under the general directions of the Admiralty.

The Bill brought down by the leader of the Opposition made no such provision. Canada was absolutely free and independent to do what it liked as the Governor in Council thought wise. That was the first, the next was:

In the opinion of the Admiralty, a dominion government desirous of creating a navy should aim at forming a distinct fleet unit——

You did not form a distinct fleet unit. Then the Admiralty report goes on:

—and the smallest unit is one which, while manageable in time of peace, is capable of being used in its component parts in time of war. The fleet unit to be aimed at should, therefore, in the opinion of the Admiralty, consist at least of the following:—

One armoured cruiser (new Indomitable class, which is of the dreadnought type.

You did not do that. You refused to do it. The next was:

Three unarmoured cruisers (Bristol class).

You did provide for that subsequently, but never even let the contract for them. Next:

Six destroyers. Three submarines.

And the last was:

As the armoured cruiser is the essential part of the fleet unit, it is important that an Indomitable of the dreadnought type should be the first vessel to be built in commencing the formation of a fleet unit.

You ignored every one of those Admiralty recommendations, and we sent you over there to follow them. That was where the point came in; you ignored every recommendation in the resolution which said that whenever the need arose Canada would be willing to make any sacrifice. You came back and paid no attention whatever to the emergency but passed your permanent policy. You came back with an article entirely different from what we sent you over there to get, and you refused to go to the people and forced it through this House. And yet you come here to-day and ask us to go to the people when we are following faithfully the recommendation in that resolution, namely, that whenever the need arises Canada will make any sacrifice. We did not ask you to go to the people on that resolution. If you had followed that resolution you need not have gone to the people at all. That resolution said that whenever the need arose we would make any sacrifice necessary. The need has arisen now, we are making the sacrifice, and we do not propose to go to the people on this emergency policy.

Mr. PUGSLEY: For the very best of reasons.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: But so far as the permanent policy was concerned, we said then and we say now that we are willing and we will go to the people upon the permanent naval policy of this country when the time comes.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is that policy?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: My hon. friend does not need to walk over his political grave before he gets there. He will get there soon enough. Let me quote again from this Admiralty memorandum which hon. members opposite say does not justify the action of the present Government. What does the memorandum say in clause 7:

Naval supremacy is of two kinds: general and local. General naval supremacy consists in the power to defeat in battle and drive from the seas the strongest hostile navy or combination of hostile navies wherever they may be found. It is the general naval supremacy of Great Britain which is the primary safeguard of the security and interests of the great dominions of the Crown and which for all these years has been the deterrent upon any possible designs prejudicial to or inconsiderate of their policy and safety. Local superiority consists in the power to send in good time to, or maintain permanently in some distant theatre forces adequate to defeat the enemy or hold him in check until the main decision has been obtained in the decisive theatre.

I point out these words:

—until the main decision has been obtained in the decisive theatre.

That is what a local force is for, simply to hold the enemy in check until the main decision has been obtained in the decisive theatre, and the decisive theatre is the North Sea.

Now I want to use the speech of my hon. friend from Edmonton once more, because that speech affords the clearest illustration of the fundamental difference of principle in the policies of the two great political parties in Canada. My hon. friend from Edmonton in his speech used these words:

We will assume that there is a great combination of European powers, that they are able to give more or less successful battle on the North sea and on the North Atlantic to the British navy. In the meantime, it has been possible for this combination of powers, by the use of a trifling number of warships, to absolutely blockade the seaports of Canada, to practically control Canada, to land men in Canada, to occupy Canada, to take Quebec and Montreal. Supposing that the

prospective battle in the North Sea resulted unfavourably to the British navy, and supposing there was a settlement of the terms as between Great Britain and that combination of European powers, I ask my hon. friends what would likely take place? I ask them if they realize just how much interest Canada would have in that transaction? I ask our anti-militarist friends in Canada if it is not an absolute certainty that under such conditions, Canada would pass from the control of the British Empire to the control of the successful one of those European powers? Do they think that Germany, if she should happen to be in that combination that I have supposed was successful against Britain and her fleet, would not wish to become owner and control this Dominion of Canada? Do they think that because they happen to belong to another race that they would not fall under German dominion, supposing such a thing took place? If they have any ideas on this subject, let them recall Alsace and Lorraine, the prize of a successful war, and let them figure to themselves whether Canada would not be just as fair a prize, or whether Canada would not, in absolute fact, be the prize for which those fleets would contend in the North sea if ever such a terrible event should take place.

My hon. friend starts by saying, supposing the British navy is defeated. He starts with the supposition of that state of things which it is the very object of this Bill to help to prevent. My hon. friend's proposition is a selfish, misconceived, and mistaken policy looking to the interests of Canada after the British navy has been defeated, while ours is a policy looking to the preservation of the British navy and to the prevention of its defeat for the simple reason that if the British navy is defeated your little local coast defence vessels will be absolutely useless against the navy which has just defeated that of Great Britain. That is the fundamental distinction betweeen the policies of the two parties. My hon. friend from Edmonton says: I believe we should have this little local navy. Why? Because we will be able to retain our territory and prevent the other nation from occupying Canada. Occupation can only happen if Great Britain is not successful, and if Great Britain is not successful then Canada is at the mercy of the other nation anyway. But if you give assistance to the original central point of danger if you can preserve your front at the point of danger by assisting the central navy in the North sea when the Armageddon comes you are safe in every part of the Empire. If you do not help the central fleet Canada may become the Alsace-Lorraine of Germany a few years hence. My hon. friend says that Alsace and Lorraine went to Germany. Why did it go to Germany? Because France did not appreciate my right hon. friend's maxim that 'The hour of peril is too late for preparations.' That is the fundamental difference between the policies of the two parties. You cannot get away from it. You may argue as you like but you come back to the same proposition that has been stated by the British Admiralty that the safety of every portion of the Empire depends on the maintenance of the supremacy of the central fleet of the Empire in the North sea.

Now, in conclusion, I want to make an appeal to the right hon. leader of the Opposition. He has before him all these evidences which, I think, justify the assumption that there is some emergency. I do not propose to enumerate them all again but I want to say that surely all these evidences must produce some reasonable doubt in his mind that there is a condition of things, as the hon. member for Edmonton has said, different from that which existed two years ago. He has said that if he thought there was any danger, immediate or prospective, or even if Great Britain were on trial, he would not hesitate to give my right hon. friend the leader of the Government assistance, to give him $35,000,000, yes, four times $35,000,000. I ask my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, does he not think that the evidence has been adduced by various speakers in this House, by the Admiralty memorandum, by the amendment to the German naval law of 1912, by the fact that the German navy is not essential to her actual existence whilst the English navy is, ought to be sufficient to create some reasonable doubt in his mind that England is at least on trial? If he comes to that conclusion he should give the person on trial the same chance, the same opportunity that British jurisprudence gives to any man on trial in England namely the benefit of the doubt and if he does he must give him the benefit of the doubt, join hands with us and make this a unanimous grant to the Old Land. The right hon. gentleman will not be inconsistent with his policy of 1910 because that policy was passed not as a temporary one but as the permanent policy of the Government, he would not be acting inconsistently with the resolution of 1909 because that resolution said that whenever the need arose Canada was prepared to make any sacrifice in the interest of the Empire. He could therefore be perfectly consistent with his policy of the past.

And, finally, if the right hon. gentleman is still unconvinced as to the emergency or need of present assistance to the Imperial navy he will always have the consciousness that he has erred in the right direction and will have in some small degree attempted to express to the Old Land the gratitude and appreciation of the Canadian people for the manifold favours and blessings, to say nothing of the millions in money, she has heaped upon us in the centuries past, and he will have helped us to maintain in some measure our dignity and

self respect as the foremost dominion in the mightiest empire and the greatest agency for secular good within the records of humanity.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (North Oxford): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House on the motion and the amendment, I do not purpose specifically answering the arguments of my hon. friend who has just sat down (Mr. Middlebro) except as I may allude to them in the few remarks that I have to make upon this subject. I suppose that both sides of the House have made up their minds that Canada should do something towards naval expenditure. I think that the great mass of the people throughout the country have made up their minds that we should do something towards naval expenditure. There are some people in this country, outside the province of Quebec, some people in the good old province of Ontario, who still think that we should not do anything towards naval expenditure. They are as loyal as any of us here. Canada is the country in which they are living and Canada is the country that they think they should be loyal to. I have no fault to find with that type of people. But, if the mass of the people have made up their minds that we should do something towards naval expenditure, I presume the question is: What? Our hon. friends on the other side of the House claim that there is an emergency. The hon. member for North Grey says that that is an improper word to use, that we should use the words 'immediate need.' There is not very much distinction between 'immediate need' and 'emergency.' If we are going to commit ourselves to a naval expenditure, as we, in fact, did some time ago, what is the object to be attained? Any remarks I have to make are purely personal. I am neither the head of the Government nor of the Opposition, nor do I claim to have any influence with any other member of the House, so that what I have to say is purely personal and is the result of my own reading and consideration of the subject.

If we are going to seek to do something what should we do? What is the object? The object, from my standpoint, is, first, the protection of our own shores and of our own trade routes; secondly, to relieve the Mother Country and the taxpayer of the Mother Country of some of the burthens that they have been bearing for the past hundred years. Our friends on the other side of the House say most distinctly—the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) told us so—that this must be in no way considered as a permanent policy, but as simply a contribution on account of an emergency. Therefore, I take it that I have the right to look into the question as to whether or not an emergency exists. The hon. member for North Grey quotes from a number of newspapers in England saying that they think that there is an emergency. My hon. friend from South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) quotes also from a number of British newspapers saying that they do not think there is any emergency. At what conclusion do we arrive? It just shows that, as in a great many cases, there is an argument on each side. The best proof that we can bring to our aid on occasions of this kind is that afforded by the information that we can gather as we go along, like the information and the experience that we accumulate throughout our lives. Years ago, long before I came to Parliament, I studied the navy question of the Empire as well as I could from constant reading of English newspapers and the speeches of British statesmen, and so, whatever ideas I have formed on the matter have largely been on information acquired from British sources. Someone, I do not know to whom I am indebted for the kindness, very recently sent me the Hansard of the British House of Commons and House of Lords, and I read the speeches of the Lords and the Commoners, mostly delivered by Unionists, and I could find nothing in these speeches to show that there was nearly so great an emergency at the present time as there was in 1909. In 1909 there was a fear that the Empire was in danger, and this House then passed the celebrated resolution of which we have heard so much. The speeches of the Unionist members of the Lords and Commons of England, show that there is no emergency, but, underlying all is to be found the idea that there is an aggressive campaign throughout Europe for naval expenditure and construction. There can be no doubt in the mind of any man who studies the question, but that there is an aggressive policy of shipbuilding, not only in Germany but throughout Europe. The Germans say they have to augment their navy to protect them from the aggression of England, and perhaps from their standpoint they say it just as truthfully as we say the reverse. The proposition of this Government is to contribute $35,000,000 for the purpose of building three dreadnoughts to be manned and maintained by England. As was pointed out by the hon. member for South Wellington, the First Lord of the Admiralty stated, not in March but in July—although some say the navy yards are occupied to their limit at the present time—that the trouble was not in building the ships but in manning the ships when built. If we give these three dreadnoughts to the British

Government, we must see that the British government will have to man and maintain them and if they find it difficult now to provide men and officers for the ships already in commission, how much more difficult will it be to man the three extra ships which we propose to give them. In addition to that, the proposition of this Government means, if it means anything, that it is a contribution pure and simple. They say they do not propose to make it a periodical contribution, but how can we tell when they give us no idea as to what their permanent naval policy will be? My argument is, that when it comes to the vital question, if this $35,000,000 is only a temporary contribution, and if there is no emergency—and nothing that we have heard or read shows us that there is an emergency—then $35,000,000 is too much for this country to give as a contribution unless it is expended on a permanent navy for Canada. It about equals the amount we propose to expend on two fleet units. And when we do contribute this $35,000,000 what have we got for it? Nothing. On the other hand, what have we got when we spend $35,000,000 in building a Canadian navy? We have a navy that will protect our own shores and protect our own trade routes; we have a navy that belongs to Canada; we have a navy that will create a Canadian sentiment, a national sentiment, in Canada; we have something worth working for and of which we can be proud; we have something worth paying taxes for, and it is to be built by taxes no matter what form they take. I disagree with my hon. friend when he says that if the English navy were destroyed—and there he conjures up something in his imagination that is not humanly probable—our navy is not worth a tinker's fiddle, by which, I suppose, he meant to use the common expression, that our navy was not worth a tinker's damn. Is that any way to speak of a Canadian navy; is that any way to speak of Canadianism?

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is the Tory way.

Mr. NESBITT: That may be the Tory way, but is that the kind of spirit we should cultivate in this country? If it is, I am sorry for Canada. I am a pure bred Canadian and I am proud of it, and I want to say if England can build a navy, if Japan can build a navy and she has, if Russia can build a navy, and if Germany can build a navy, surely Canada can build a navy. And Sir, not only can we build a navy, but we can man and maintain that navy. The whole thing, in my judgment, comes down to the question: Is there an emergency, or, as my hon. friend says: Is there an immediate need? I should like to say that in 1909, when this proposition of the naval expenditure came actively before the country it was introduced first by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I was a very young member of this House then, I mean young in service. I listened carefully and attentively to my hon. friend's speech---a marvelous speech. To me it carried conviction. I must say when he was through his speech I remember saying to my deskmate:

'That rings true, that sounds right to me.'

I had been thinking for a long time, as I told you in starting, that Canada should do something towards naval expenses, that Canada should take some share towards assisting the Mother Country on the seas, from a naval standpoint as well as she did from a land standpoint or a militia standpoint. I had been wondering what was the best course to pursue. When I listened to that wonderful speech, I made up my mind that was the true course, and I voted at that time with very great pleasure for the resolution which has been so often quoted to this House. Now, when our ministers, including the right hon. the former Premier of this country, went to England and consulted with the Admiralty, the Admiralty recommended the establishment of a fleet unit on the Pacific to consist of an armoured cruiser, of the new Indomitable class, which is of the dreadnought type, three unarmoured cruisers, Bristol class, six destroyers and three submarines. What position did we find ourselves in? Let us be absolutely honest in this matter. At that time, that was the first public naval discussion in this country, and a great many people in this country, not only in the province of Quebec, but in the province of Ontario, in the good old county of Oxford that I have the honour of trying to represent, who thought we should not go into any naval expenditure. Now, as a matter of fact, we, the Liberal party, had to educate the people of this country to a very great extent as regards naval expenditure of any kind whatever. At that time the former Minister of Finance told this House, when we introduced our Naval Bill, that we did not propose to incur any naval expenditure except what could be paid out of revenue. If a vote had been taken then I do not believe that the people of this country would have been willing that we should incur any naval expenditure that could not be paid out of revenue. I think we were representing properly the views of the great mass of the people when we decided to that effect. Why did we cut down our naval expenditure to what our friends on the other side of the House call a 'tin-pot navy,' the Bristols and swift cruisers and torpedo boat destroyers? We did so because at that time, we had very

great and heavy expenditure in regard to the National Transcontinental railway and other things that were being introduced, and if we were going to confine our naval expenditure to revenue, it was absolutely necessary that we should go as reasonably as we could. Now my hon. friend, who has just sat down, challenges us by saying that we did not observe the Admiralty's recommendation. We did observe it, just as far as it was possible and consistent that we should do so. I am not saying this for any possible excuse. We stood for our naval policy then. We stand for it now. The fact is that the increase of our naval policy is absolutely justified by the present revenues of the country. Our naval policy is precisely the same in 1912 and 1913 as it was in 1909 and 1910, when the Naval Bill was introduced, only that the country is capable in our judgment of bearing a heavier expenditure. We knew then, as we know now, that the Admiralty had recommended a fleet unit on the Pacific. They did not recommend a fleet unit for the Atlantic, but we think that a fleet unit for the Atlantic is just as necessary as it is for the Pacific, and we hope that there will be two fleet units headed by an armoured cruiser as good as money will buy or science build. That is our present proposition.

In the Imperial Conference of 1909, I have no doubt that my right hon. friend the present leader of the Opposition had the confidence of the British Government, just as much as my hon. friends who went to England last year had the confidence of the British Government. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition should know whether he was given any secrets at that time which he could not give to the world and he does not seem to believe, as held by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), that any secrets were given to our hon. friends who went to England last year any more than there were at that time. He does not seem to believe and we do not believe that there are any secrets that would lead us to consider that there is an emergency now any more than there was in 1909. If there was any emergency in 1909 and there certainly was a greater feeling throughout Canada that there was an emergency then than there is now, what do we see now at the present time? We see Germany and Great Britain joining together, trying to settle the Balkan dispute. We see Germany and Great Britain more friendly probably than we have ever seen them for the last number of years. So far as my slight knowledge is concerned, and so far as any speeches which have been made on this question in this House, are concerned, I see no possible chance of any more of an emergency or any more of an immediate need—to use the words of my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro)—than there was in 1909. Therefore the question to me is, if we are going to do something, and we have all agreed that we will do something, then which of the two plans is the best under the circumstances?

Now, we will come to the speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce in the House on the 18th day of December. Again that wonderful eloquence, again that wonderful word-painting, but one cannot help but think, and I imagine most of the members on this side of the House could not help but think, that that eloquent voice, that wonderful word-painting could be used just as well on the other side as it could be on the side he is on at present. He reminds me of a great advocate who was prepared at any time to advocate the cause that he was engaged to advocate. There was another thought that passed through my mind after listening to him, because I have a great deal of pride in my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I, as a Canadian, have a great deal of admiration for my hon. friend. I always have had, because I think he is wonderfully gifted so far as oratory is concerned. Now, I could not help but remember an old adage attributed to a great man, Abraham Lincoln. You can fool some of the people all the time, but I am one of those you cannot fool all the time. My hon. friend certainly took me into camp in 1909, on March the 29th, but he did not affect me a bit on the 18th of December.

My hon. friend in 1909, as the member for South Wellington has told us, did not want a contribution; neither did my hon. friend the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister was especially strong in speaking to that resolution. The hon. member for South Wellington quoted the resolution this afternoon, and quoted it properly, and while I do not intend to indulge in needless repetition, I wish to again quote some statements to which I particularly wish to call attention. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, when he was in opposition, said:

> So that the policy of Australia at the present time is to build up a flotilla of submarines and torpedo boats which in case of war would co-operate with the armed cruisers and battleships of the British navy.

My hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce made this statement:

> The first and greatest objection which I have to a fixed money contribution is that it bears the aspect of hiring somebody else to do what we ourselves ought to do as though a man, the father of a family, in lusty health and strength, should pay his neighbour something per month for looking after the welfare

and safety of his home instead of doing that duty himself. That seems to me, when you work it out, to be a basic objection to this form of aid.

It goes still further than that. Suppose you contribute this year your sum, and next year an equal sum and thereafter year after year. After ten or twelve, or twenty, or thirty years you will have paid out an immense amount of money. You will have been protected in the meantime but in Canada itself there will be no roots struck; there will be no residue left, there will be no preparation of the soil, or beginning of the growth of the product of defence. Yet some time or other, no one can doubt that with resources and with the population constantly increasing we must and will have in this country a naval force of our own for our coast and home defence.

From a literary point of view, Mr. Speaker, this passage is well worth quoting. The language is beautiful, and I only wish I could myself employ such rhetoric without quoting from my hon. friend. Hon. members opposite say they are not prepared to announce their permanent policy; therefore we do not know what their permanent policy is, and as we have nothing to prove to the contrary, we are perfectly justified in taking it for granted that as they have commenced making contributions they will continue doing so.

In reading the speeches made in the House of Lords and House of Commons in England, I noticed there was not so much criticism by the members of the Opposition regarding the allegation that England was in danger as there was on the naval strategy of the First Lord of the Admiralty. I noticed particularly that in dealing with that naval strategy, they criticised his taking certain ships away from the Mediterranean and placing them in the North Sea, and condemned very severely his withdrawal of ships from the distant seas. Everything I have read in this matter leads me to the belief that the proposition to build our own fleet units is wiser than a contribution. The First Lord of the Admiralty, even after the recent German Naval Bill came before him, stated in the House that on account of the movement on the part of Germany and other European powers, as was pointed out by the hon. member for South Wellington this afternoon, to increase the striking power of their navies, it was necessary, from the very existence of this fact, for him to withdraw the ships from the distant seas, and concentrate his navy in the home waters. If that is true, it accentuates the reasons why we should commence at once to build two fleet units, to protect our own shores and our own trade routes. I now quote an extract from a London cable :

Lord Charles Beresford apparently has foreseen grave danger in the Borden idea, and says in the Daily Express this morning:

What I recommended that the dominions do was to defend their end of the trade routes with strong naval bases, mines, torpedo boat destroyers, and light cruisers. The trade routes are unprotected, and now our danger is starvation, not invasion.

The country was deceived and fooled by statements regarding the dreadnoughts of other nations. We were insulted by being told a dreadnought could sink their whole fleets. The people speak of nothing but dreadnoughts, quite forgetting that a fleet is composed of a variety of units, any one of which being defective or short jeopardizes the whole.

So far as I am personally concerned, I do not know much about ships, and I am only taking my information from those more capable of judging the matter than I am. That brings me to the only suggestion the right hon. the Prime Minister made as to a permanent policy, when he said in his speech introducing this resolution :

During my recent visit to the British Islands I ventured on many public occasions to propound the principle that the great dominions, sharing in the defence of the Empire upon the high seas, must necessarily be entitled to share also in the responsibility for and in the control of foreign policy.

In other words he contended throughout his speech that before adopting any permanent naval policy it would be desirable to have representation on the Naval Defence Committee. We have, I understand, every four years, a meeting of what is called the Imperial Conference. I am not touching on this because I have consulted with any of my colleagues on this side of the House as to their views. Once more I would like to say I am giving my own views only, but they are very strong on this question. There is a vast difference in my judgment between the Imperial conference every four years and the proposal of a representative on the Imperial Defence Committee. The Imperial conference consists of premiers absolutely equal, the British Premier is no more than the Canadian Premier or the Australian Premier. Six premiers, or whatever their number may be, absolutely equal and conferring together for the good of the Empire. The Imperial Defence Committee is an advisory committee. To whom? To the British Cabinet and, so far as foreign relations are concerned, to the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. Suppose we demand a representative on the Imperial Defence Committee, on what basis shall our demand be? We must have some basis to make that demand. If it is a basis of population and we consider only the British Isles we would have a voice of one in six perhaps. If we consider the rest of the Dominions, which we must do, we would probably have a voice of one in ten. If we consider the rest of the Domin-

ions and the Crown colonies and India, I have not calculated it, but we would have a voice of probably one in fifty. What good would such a voice be? Would it not be a great danger? Could any position be more dangerous to the love and sympathy that we now have with Great Britain? What type of a man might we have there to represent us? Whom would we have to represent us? Suppose we had some gentleman who when he got into that atmosphere which the hon. member for Wellington described this afternoon, would forget in six months that he was a Canadian, and in a year that there was such a place as Canada. We have had such cases. Suppose he was not that type but a gentleman more or less stubborn? Would he not be likely to disagree with the rest of his colleagues on that Imperial Defence Committee and would not that likely cause a clash and would we not as Canadians likely take his part? That is a dangerous position to take.

At the conference of 1911 Mr. Asquith in welcoming the various premiers said in part:

There are two things in the self-governing British Empire which are unique in the history of great political agitations. The first is the reign of law: wherever the King's writ runs it is the symbol and messenger, not of an arbitrary authority but of rights shared by every citizen and capable of being asserted and made effective by the tribunals of the land. The second is the combination of local autonomy—absolute, unfettered, complete—with loyalty to a common head co-operation, spontaneous and unforced for common interests and purposes, and, I may add, a common trusteeship whether it be in India or in the Crown colonies or in the Protectorates or within our own borders, of the interests and fortunes of fellow subjects who have not yet attained, perhaps in some cases may never attain to the full stature of self-government.

He goes on:

In the early Victorian era there were two rough and ready solutions for what was regarded, with some impatience, by the British statesmen of that day, as the 'colonial problem.' The one was centralization, the government, that is except in relatively trivial matters of all the outlying parts of the Empire from an office in Downing street. The other was disintegration—the acquiescence in, perhaps the encouragement of, a process of successive 'hivings of' by which, without the hazards or embitterments of coercion, each community as it grew to political manhood, would follow the example of the American colonies, and start an independent and sovereign existence of its own. After 70 years' experience of Imperial evolution, it may be said with confidence that neither of these theories commands the faintest support today, either at home, or in any part of our self-governing Empire. We were saved from their adoption—some people would say by the favour of Providence—or (to adopt a more flattering hypothesis) by the political instinct of our race. And just in proportion as centralization was seen to be increasingly absurd, so has disintegration been felt to be increasingly impossible. Whether in this United Kingdom, or in any one of the great communities which you represent, we, each of us are, and we, each of us, intend to remain, master in our own household. This is, here at home and throughout the dominions, the lifeblood of our policy.

Then he says further:

There are sitting at this table to-day six Prime Ministers, all holding their commissions from the same King, and all deriving their title to its exercise from the voice and vote of a free democracy. We are all of us, I suppose, in our own parliaments, party leaders, holding and using power by virtue of the confidence of a party majority. But each of us when he entered this room left his party prepossessions outside the door.

I read that to show you what Mr. Asquith thought in 1911, and although Mr. Asquith may be a Liberal in England he is the foremost statesman in that country to-day and one of the foremost, if not the foremost statesmen, in the world.

At that same Imperial Conference Sir Joseph Ward of New Zealand made a two or three days' speech on the question of an Imperial Parliament. Sir Joseph Ward had been advocating an Imperial Parliament as we hear it advocated a great deal. Mr. Asquith said:

It would impair, if not altogether destroy, the authority of the Government of the United Kingdom in such grave matters as the conduct of foreign policy, the conclusion of treaties, the declaration of maintenance of peace, the declaration of war and, indeed, all those relations with foreign powers, necessarily of the most delicate character, which are now in the hands of the Imperial Government, subject to its responsibility to the Imperial Parliament. That authority cannot be shared.

I quote that because our hon. friends on the other side of the House say that the Premier of Canada said in introducing this resolution that before bringing down a permanent policy they must have a voice on the Imperial Defence Committee. Mr. Asquith at that time said that that responsibility could not be shared. I point this out as a danger point, but that is not what is worrying me. In the last few years we have heard a great many people say that the only difference between the two parties was the difference of the outs and the ins. When a great occasion of this kind arises it shows, after all, the true difference between the Liberal and the Conservative policy, the absolutely true difference. For many years the Liberal party fought for the management of Canadian affairs both in the provinces and in the Dominion. I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that when

the history of Canada comes to be written you will find that during the 15 years that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and his Government were in power, Canadians advanced more in the management of their own affairs than they had in the 30 years previous. When my hon. friends on the other side of the House propose, as they do, judging from my right hon. friend (Mr. Borden's) speech, to have a voice in the management of Imperial affairs, and when they propose this contribution of $35,000,000, they are going back as Conservatism will go back to centralization. That is what I am more afraid of than anything else in this proposition. I am opposed to the contribution because it is a contribution, because to that extent we lose the control of the money which we take from the people, and because the $35,000,000 proposed to be given as a contribution would go a great way towards building a Canadian navy while the money would largely be spent in this country.

Coming to another phase of this question, Mr. Speaker, our hon. friends opposite say that if there is not an emergency there is an immediate need; that in 1915 the navies of the rest of Europe will be greater, so far as armed cruisers and dreadnoughts are concerned, than the navy of Great Britain. Can anyone imagine the whole of Europe attacking Great Britain? It requires a powerful imagination and great ability in word painting to picture such a thing. I have no fear of such an amalgamation. I have no fear of such an attack, but if those powers did attack Britain we propose to establish two fleet units to be headed by the two best ships that science can invent and money can buy. We would have our two ships built, manned and maintained by Canada. Before 1915, if that is the time when there is going to be an emergency, we should have our ships built just as well as my hon. friend's three ships which they propose to give to Great Britain. We propose that our dreadnoughts should form the head of two fleet units. We know very well owing largely to our hon. friend's actions since they came into power, that it would be absolutely impossible for us to build those ships immediately in this country. They should have had the shipyards established here by this time. They would have been established here by this time if we had remained in power, but my hon. friends opposite say we cannot build a navy inside of twenty years. Some say ten years, some say twenty-five years. Then what has become of my hon. friend's advocacy of the policy of Canada for Canadians? My hon. friends on the other side have been for years, throughout the country and in this House, the greatest advocates of the policy of Canada for Canadians. They have advocated that if Canada is to spend money that money should be spent in Canada. What was the policy advocated in the fall of 1911, if it was not that we should have nothing to do with Americans and that we should build up industries in this country? When they say that we cannot build ships in this country they forget that during the last ten years we have established dozens, yes, hundreds of industries in this country, that we had no workmen in this country to carry them on, and that they had to be imported into Canada. They forget that we had no intention of doing what my right hon. friend says the First Lord of the Admiralty is going to ask Canada to do. I need not read the clause. The First Lord, it seems, is going to ask tenders from Canadian shipyards for building auxiliaries in the form of coaling ships and oil tanks. They pretend, at least one would be led to believe they pretend, that that is what we intended to build in Canada. They know very well that we had no intention of asking tenders from the present shipyards in Canada. They know very well that we intended to ask and did obtain tenders from some of the largest shipyards in England. Those people would not need to be taught how to build ships. They would bring their men and their machinery to Canada when they established the shipyards here. They would be ready to build the ships in Canada just as well as they could in England. When those men came here they would be in exactly the same position as the men imported to carry on the industries I have spoken of. We have imported men from the United States, from Switzerland, and from all parts of the earth. These men are not Swiss when they come here; they are not Englishmen; they are not Yankees, they are Canadians. That is what we are advocating for this country. That is the way we have built up this country. When we bring these men in they become citizens, just as the men from the English shipyards that we might establish would become Canadians who would help to build up this country. I am sorry for the man in this House who has so little pride in his country and in Canadianism that he can say that it will take 10 years to establish shipyards in Canada and to build ships in this country. I, for my part, think that we should have established those shipyards by this time, and they would have been established if the hon. members of the Government had gone on with the proposition which was given to them. I believe that they could have been building those swift cruisers now that they have the money and three years from now, or five years from now, they could have all those ships built if they had not delayed carrying out our policy as it was handed to them. I want to emphasize this fact Mr. Speaker, that no man who has the pride in Canada that he should have can safely

say that it would take 10 years or 6 years to build those cruisers in this country. Under the policy that we advocated we say that the ships should be built in Canada as far as possible. We recognize the fact that until we get these shipyards established, until we get them going properly, we shall probably have to build some of the ships in England. We recognize that fact, at least I do, but we also recognize that we can establish these yards here, that we have the material, and that we can soon get the men. My hon. friend says that the desertions from the Canadian ships were twenty-six more than the recruits. What wonder? The whole thing was a blank so far as I can see.

Ever since my hon. friends came into power have they done anything to try to maintain those men? Have they done anything to build up that navy or have they done everything that they could to discredit it? There is a vast difference between doing what you can to build up a thing and doing what you can to pull it down. I do not accuse my hon. friends of purposely—yes, I do—pardon me, I take that back, Mr. Speaker, I do accuse my hon. friends of purposely discrediting the navy. They have always called it a tin-pot navy, and, as a matter of fact, these two ships we bought, one for the Atlantic and one for the Pacific, were just as good to train men on as $5,000,000 or $10,000,000 ships would be. It was good policy for us to buy ships of that sort and we could have had the naval schools established by this time and doing the work for which they were designed. You cannot tell me that along the shores of Nova Scotia, Newfoundland, and the Maritime provinces generally, there is not just as good material for naval cadets and sea fighting men as that which is to be found in England or any other country. It was only last fall that I read the report of the secretary of the navy of the United States and it was wonderful to me to find how many men there were in that navy who came from inland points. Men who had practically never seen the sea before, in a few years, were just as efficient as those who had been brought up on the seashore. I was talking to a young man the other evening from Nova Scotia and he told me that there were quite a number of men in that province who could be trained in a very short time, if they were required for the navy, and who would be perfectly capable of performing that service. I do not know anything about that part of the question but I do know that there is not a man in the manufacturing business in Canada who will not tell you that the native-born can beat any other man that he can put in his factory. As far as my experience is concerned, I do not know of a man who can beat the native-born, and I believe there are no men who can learn to build ships quicker than Canadians. I agree with my hon. friends on this side of the House who, for a number of years, have been asserting that the money we put into the navy should be spent in Canada. Every dollar of it should be spent in Canada and I believe that that is the policy the people will endorse. Our hon. friends on the other side of the House should accept the proposal of my hon. friend from South Wellington. I do not know that anybody else on this side of the House would endorse my hon. friend's proposal, but, as he said, rather than see this question discussed for a length of time in this House, and rather than see any disagreement, as far as I am personally concerned, I would be willing to give and take.

The policy which has been placed before the House by hon. gentlemen opposite is an emergency policy, with all due deference to my hon. friend from North Grey who says that it is a policy providing for an immediate need. It is an emergency policy; otherwise there is no person, I am quite sure in this House, that could endorse a contribution. We Canadians got a little beyond the contribution stage many years ago, and I do not wish to see Canada go back in that regard. I object to a contribution and I object to the centralization of power. As Mr. Asquith says, we have practically been given the absolute management of our own affairs. Therefore, we can make no possible excuse to the people of the country if we shall give $35,000,000 as a contribution, no matter what it may be called and no matter how just the cause. But, as my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition says, if there were an emergency, a necessity, any proof whatever either in the speeches of hon. members on both sides of the House of Parliament in England, or in the leading journals of England, or in the speeches of my hon. friends on the other side of the House since this question came up, the situation would have a different aspect. But, there has not been one word of proof from any of these sources any more than there was in the speech of the hon. member for North Grey. There has been nothing but the assertion that there is an emergency. Everything points throughout Europe at the present day to greater friendship than there was in 1909.

Now then, let us drop this discussion and go on and build a navy such as we would be proud of in this country, a navy that would protect our own shores and, by pro-

tecting our own shores, relieve Great Britain to that extent. It would be a great relief and especially a relief to the British taxpayer.

The hon. member for North Grey showed that in July, when the new German proposition came in, the First Lord of the Admiralty had to increase his naval proposition. We all know that England had to increase her naval proposition. We know that since the members of the English House of Commons and House of Lords have read the new proposition of Germany everyone has stated that he is willing to increase the appropriation so as to maintain the same proportion of naval strength between the two countries. My hon. friend from South Wellington this afternoon showed that the despatch which has been placed before the House only went to 1915. He also showed by a speech of the First Lord of the Admiralty that they did not propose for strategic considerations, to disclose their intentions further than 1915. We can easily understand that, but do not be alarmed that England is going to allow the Germans, or any other European nation in the future, to be ahead of her from 1915 to 1920 any more than she is from 1912 to 1915. Mr. Churchill, the First Lord of the Admiralty, in answering a question recently in the House of Commons in England, stated definitely that they did not propose to reduce their naval expenditure on account of this proposed contribution by the Canadian people. If one of the main objects to be arrived at by this contribution is to assist Great Britain, to relieve her to a certain extent from taxation, do we relieve her any? Not according to the First Lord of the Admiralty. Therefore, why a contribution? Why not go on with our permanent naval policy?

Let us come for a moment to the question of a contribution from the money standpoint. We are told by some that England requires the money to help her build these dreadnoughts but let me point out that last year the imports and exports of Great Britain were nearly $100,000,000 greater than ever they were before; they were nearly as great as those of the United States and Germany combined, the United States with its 100,000,000 people and Germany with its 65,000,000. During the last five years, Great Britain has not only kept up her naval expenditure, but she has paid $275,000,000 off her public debt. And still we are told that we have to contribute $35,000,000 to help Great Britain bear the burden. I contend, Sir, that everything points to the conclusion that the naval policy of the Liberal party, to build a navy in Canada and to man it and maintain it by Canadians, is the proper policy. It may not be possible for us to get enough men to man our ships in two or three years, but we can man them as Great Britain mans her war vessels. There are a great many in the British navy who are not English, Irish or Scotch, and there would be many in our navy who would not be Canadians but they would be Canadians to all intents and purposes, and they would be at least paid by Canada. Are we to put off building a navy until we can get representation on the Imperial Defence Committee, which I think will be the greatest mistake Canada has ever made? If we are so loyal to Great Britain as we pretend to be, especially those after-dinner loyalists, surely we can depend on her to manage the foreign affairs of the Empire.

My hon friend said that the Liberal navy would be a Canadian navy subject to the orders of the Governor General in Council. The proposal is to manage our navy in connection with the Imperial navy so that the same training will be maintained, and then in case of trouble both navies could unite. That is the rule we apply to our land forces, and why cannot it be applied to the navy? If it is to be a Canadian navy whose control should it be under but Canadian control; whose control should it be under but the control of the Canadian people who are paying for it? There is no Liberal in this House, there is no Liberal in the land who thinks that if England were in danger, and if we had a Canadian navy, it would not be instantly sent to the assistance of the motherland. No Liberal who ever breathed the air of Liberalism would for a minute hesitate to send the Canadian navy, if we had such, to the assistance of the Old Country, in case of peril. My position is, that no Canadian policy can be expected to be permanently satisfactory or enduring that does not provide for these things, at least: The building of the ships in Canada, or, at the very least the beginning of preparations for the building of the ships in Canada. The objections to the Borden proposal in this connection are that it is unworthy of Canada, that it is unfair to Great Britain, and that it is calculated to produce complications later on. The control of the fleet must rest with the power that creates it. Canada can no more escape responsibility for the use that is made of a Canadian fleet than an individual could escape responsibility for his conduct by hiring somebody else to do his fighting. In a word, no permanent policy will be acceptable to Canada that is not a Canadian policy. No policy can be properly called a Canadian policy that does not fully recognize the responsibility of Canada, not only for the construction and maintenance, but for the control of the fleet created by Canada.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, that the despatch from the Colonial Secretary does

not ask for a contribution from Canada, and the last clause of it, which has been much commented on, says:

The Prime Minister of the Dominion having inquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective, we have no hesitation in answering, after prolonged consideration of all the circumstances, that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

Well, Sir, the Liberal policy is to have these ships built in Canada and placed at the head of a Canadian fleet on the Atlantic and on the Pacific; we propose that we shall protect our own shores and our own trade routes. In my view, the day we obtained Canadian autonomy we should have commenced a Canadian navy, and, Sir, we cannot make any mistake in making that start now. We did make a start in 1910; we did it advisedly, we did it as economically as we thought proper in the interests of the country, and I believe the people thought so too. Now, that we have a greater revenue, the Liberals propose to enlarge on that scheme, and we propose to have the ships built by Canadian workmen. The money expended would go into the pockets of Canadian workmen and from the pockets of Canadian workmen into the pockets of the Canadian agriculturist, the Canadian miner, the Canadian manufacturer; in other words, back into the pockets of the Canadian people. We believe that in defending our own shores, we will relieve the Mother Country, not only of a great burden of taxation, but of great anxiety as to the defence of her dominions. That is what we propose and we will stand loyally by it. If there is any doubt in the minds of hon. getlemen opposite as to whether their policy or our policy is more satisfactory to the people of this country, I do not say what my hon. friend from South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) said, to pass the Redistribution Bill; I say: Never mind the Redistribution Bill, go to the country now and ask the people what they want. I firmly believe that there are few Canadians in this country of ours, from Halifax to Vancouver and from Windsor to Halifax, who will think as my hon. friend, who has just sat down thought, that in case of trouble we would never amount to anything but a tinker's fiddle so far as any navy we could produce is concerned. That is a direct insult to every Canadian who takes a pride in his country. I am a Canadian first, last and all the time. I am loyal to Canada, and by being loyal to Canada I am naturally loyal to the British Empire, because what is good for Canada must be good for the British Empire. I am sick and tired of hearing this talk about loyalty. The more champagne, and the worse the champagne, the more loyalty talk we have. The man who is loyal to his family does not go down to the barber shops and saloons and tell people he is loyal to his family. If he did so no man would believe him. The man who is loyal to his country does not need to say so every time he gets on his feet. What is loyalty after all? It is the spirit that is born in us to defend to the last drop of blood we have in our bodies first our family, next our country. What is our country in this instance? We are Canadians, native born; we are Canadians first, last and all the time. Ninety-nine out of every hundred of the people of this country are Canadians, and this policy or any other policy that is for the interest of Canada is for the interest of the Empire. You cannot separate the two things. As my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce said, you cannot separate the right arm from the body or the left arm from the body; they are one and the same thing; the same thought directs every member. The same thought, so far as we Canadians are concerned is, that when we are loyal to our own country, we have got to be loyal to the Empire. No other proposition can be put before this people. In this naval question I speak earnestly because I feel earnestly. Years before I had anything to do with this House, I had thought over this naval question and there is no possible doubt in my mind that it is our duty, whether we are loyal or disloyal, to assist at any rate in defending our own shores. I believe we can do it, and no man need tell me that the Canadian people cannot build ships as well as they can build anything else. I ask my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House to drop their proposition of a contribution. It is too much going back to the time that we have passed away from, and the time that we as Liberals will never consent to go back to.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I wish to avail myself of the privilege which comes to me and to all of us as members of this House, to discuss for a time what has been regarded by most of the members who have already spoken, as one of the most important, if not the most important matter, which has ever come before this House. Before entering into a discussion of the proposition which has been made by my esteemed leader I want to make one or two references to the remarks made by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. My hon. friend from North Oxford who has just taken his seat, stated that he was a pure bred Canadian and was proud of it. I also am a Canadian, and I wish to continue to be proud to call myself a Canadian; but it is impressed upon my mind that if we in

this House were to follow the guidance of the right hon. leader of the Opposition not many of us could be proud to call ourselves Canadians. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has been trying to make excuses for the desertions from the Niobe. He did not tell the House that many of those assertions had taken place previous to the 21st of September 1911, and that those desertions took place when that vessel was under the control of so great a man as the then Minister of Marine, the hon. member for Rouville. He, if any man in Canada, judging from his own estimation of himself, should have been able to conduct the navy, or that piece of it, in such a way as to prevent any desertions. He was not able to do so. My hon. friend from North Oxford stated that the reason why there were desertions from the navy was because men on this side of the House had ridiculed that navy and called it a 'tin pot' navy. As soon as the sailors got on board those vessels, they found out for themselves that it was a 'tin pot' navy, and they being sensible men naturally took the first opportunity to get off the tin pots.

My hon. friend from North Oxford has said that there is no emergency present or prospective, yet he advocates a very considerable increase in the policy brought down by his leader in 1910. He advocates now a fleet unit on the Atlantic and another on the Pacific. If everything is as he says, perfect peace and harmony, without a cloud in prospect, against whom is he building the fleet unit on the Atlantic and the other on the Pacific? Where is the enemy? There is the utmost harmony between England and Germany? There is no prospect of trouble between them? For what reason then would he increase the proposition that was brought down by his leader in 1910 to two fleet units, which would cost some fifty or sixty millions of dollars? He has not told us of any enemy, nor has he given any reason for that peculiar position. My hon. friend said: 'Can anybody imagine all Europe attacking Great Britain?' He says that there is no fear of such a combination, none whatever. Has my hon. friend not read history? Will my hon. friend allow his mind to go back a period in history, and will he tell me that the time has never been when there has been a combination of European powers against Great Britain? Will he tell me that the time has never been when Great Britain has practically stood alone against the armed powers of Europe. My hon. friend referred to the cordial relations existing between England and Germany at the present time, and from that he deduced that there was no present or prospective danger. Allow me to call my hon. friend's attention to the conditions which existed in 1870, just prior to the war between France and Prussia, and to remind him that Napoleon III, in June, 1868, assured General Lebrun that relations between the governments at Paris and Berlin were as good as could be desired. In the latter part of June, 1870, the head of the government of France assured the people that never had peace been so solidly assured as at that time. One fortnight from the utterance of those words by the head of the Government of France, that country was engaged in a war with Prussia! So that we cannot from present cordial and friendly relations existing between nations deduce that there is no emergency, present or prospective. We can draw our conclusions in that regard only from the relative strength of the navies of Britain and the other countries of Europe, and I propose to deal with that a little further on.

If I am permitted, I will now refer to a statement made by the hon. member for South Wellington. He grew quite indignant this afternoon in making reference to some words uttered by the present Minister of Militia in British Columbia in regard to Germany. And he exclaimed: 'What sort of language is that for a Minister of the Crown?' Evidently my hon. friend from South Wellington has forgotten some of the past history of his own party. Allow me to direct his attention to the words of his present leader in the city of Boston, when he denounced both Canada and Britain as having disgraced themselves during the civil war! I ask the hon. member for South Wellington, in the words which he himself has seen fit to use, what sort of language was that for a leader of a great party in this country? I might even say what sort of language was that for the Prime Minister of Canada, because when the right hon. gentleman became Prime Minister he reiterated those words on the floor of this House, and seemed to glory in their utterance.

I now wish to call attention to another matter which took place in this House, and to a reference made by another hon. gentleman opposite. I refer to the member for South Renfrew, who, in the course of his remarks, undertook to pick out names for the three dreadnoughts which it is proposed the thirty-five million dollar contribution will build in England. I would have thought, when the member for South Renfrew was choosing names for these battleships—names which he thought suggestive from a Conservative party standpoint—that he might have chosen names suggestive of the past history of the Liberal party. It might have occurred to the hon. member—and I dare say it would have occurred to him had his party remained in power, and it became their duty to name the vessels—

to choose, as a very proper name for one of them, and as bearing a close relation to the past history of the Liberal party in this country, the name Minnie M., or The Machine. I daresay his very intimate association with the ballot box manipulators operating in the district of Kingston and Belleville would lead him to come to the conclusion that a very proper and appropriate name, also suggestive of the past history of the Liberal party, would have been The Bogus Ballot Box.

I will now refer for a moment to the attitude of another hon. gentleman in this House. When my honoured leader made his speech in the House upon the introduction of the Bill we are now discussing, the conclusion of his remarks was received with an outburst of enthusiasm from members on both sides of the House. With one exception, every member rose to his feet and sang the National Anthem---at least tried to; those of us who could sing, did so, and those of us who could not sing, showed our respect by rising to our feet---all save one man, the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver). The hon. member for Edmonton felt it incumbent upon him later on to offer some excuse or apology for his remarkable conduct on that occasion. He said that the reason he did not rise to his feet on the first occasion was that the National Anthem was being used for party purposes, and was the malicious arrangement of the whips of the Conservative party. I happen to be one of the whips of the Conservative party, and I want to assure hon. gentlemen that I knew nothing of such an arrangement, and, in fact, started to sing Rule Britannia, when I was brought up by the greater chorus in favour of God Save the King. But mark the statement: he did not rise to his feet because, he said, the National Anthem was being used for party purposes, and those who did rise to their feet showed greater disrespect for the National Anthem than he did. In that, of course, we can take comfort from the fact that all gentlemen on the other side of the House, including his leader showed the same disrespect that we did. But when the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition introduced his proposition, the members again rose to their feet and sang the National Anthem, and this time the hon. member for Edmonton stood up. And what reason did he give for getting up on that occasion? He said the reason he got up the second time was because he agreed with the proposition as it came from that side of the House; that is to say, he got up for purely political reasons. He condemned those who got up in the first instance for so misusing the National Anthem as to use it for party purposes, and says in effect that he got up in the second instance to show he was a political partisan, and that he favoured the proposition of his leader. That is the kind of argument we get from the hon. member for Edmonton, but I think the real reason he did not rise to his feet on the first occasion was because he realized, when the leader of the Government introduced his Bill, that it was going to be a popular measure; that it would be well received by the people of the country, and he became sour and surly. Possibly he got to his feet the second time because he had gone through one or two caucuses since then, and it was impressed upon him that in future he ought to remember that it was due to his own self-respect to rise to his feet when the National Anthem was sung. Possibly if we wanted to be charitable and of course we do, we might say that the reason he rose the second time was because he was ashamed, after reflection, of his conduct on the first occasion.

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

On motion of Mr. Cochrane, House adjourned at 11.18 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 15, 1913.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ended March 31, 1912, Part III.—Mr. Foster.

Report of the Departmental Commission respecting the question of Departmental and General Statistics.—Mr. Foster.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

APPOINTMENT OF F. A. MORRISON.

Mr. TURRIFF:

1. When was F. A. Morrison appointed solicitor in connection with the investigation into railway freight rates in the West?
2. When did his service begin?
3. When did his service terminate?
4. Was he paid by the day? If so, how much per day?
5. If so, for what days was he paid?

Mr. DOHERTY:

1. February 18, 1912.
2. February 20, 1912.
3. As the work is not completed, Mr Morrison's services have not terminated.

4 and 5. Mr Morrison's fees have not yet been fixed, nor has he been paid.

ROSS' MILL POST OFFICE.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the post office at Ross' Mill, county of Lévis, been abolished?
2. If so, for what reason and at whose request?
3. Has any investigation been held? If so, by whom?

Mr. PELLETIER: The Ross' Mill post office, which was in too close proximity to the St. Nicholas post office, has been removed, by direction of the Postmaster General, to a more suitable location, where it serves a larger district than at the former site. The name of the office has been changed to St. Nicholas Sud.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

What are the names of the new Harbour Commissioners for Montreal?

Mr. HAZEN: William G. Ross, Farquhar Robertson, Alfred Eugène Damasse Labelle.

SS. PETREL.

Mr. LAW:

1. Has the Government decided to lay up D.G.S. Petrel at Shelburne instead of at Liverpool during the coming winter? If so, when?
2. What reason is assigned for laying up this steamer at Shelburne for repairs where no machine shops exist, in preference to Liverpool, N.S., or the Halifax dockyard?
3. Is it the intention of the department to have repairs made to the Petrel? If so, what is the estimated cost of such repairs?
4. Will the Government ask for public tenders for this work by advertising in the Nova Scotia newspapers?
5. Will the Government use the Government wharf at Shelburne for laying up the Petrel, or will private property be used for that purpose?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes; the vessel was laid up on December 20.
2. It has been the usual custom to winter the Petrel at one of the harbours in the county of Shelburne or Queens.
3. The usual winter repairs will be made to the Petrel. The list of repairs has not yet been completed.
4. It is not considered necessary to call for tenders, as most of the work will be carried out by the Government employees.
5. The Government wharf is rather exposed for wintering a vessel, and arrangements were therefore made to berth the vessel at McGill wharf.

JOLIETTE CUSTOMS OFFICE.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Since the 10th of October, 1911, has the Government created a new position in the customs office at Joliette?
2. If so, what is the position and who is the holder of it?
3. Who recommended him and what is his salary?
4. On whose report was this position created?

Mr. WHITE:

1. An additional officer has been employed on the customs staff at Joliette since 10th October, 1911.
2. Mr. Alfred Laporte is the name of the officer and his rank is that of acting preventive officer of customs.
3. He was recommended by the Minister of Customs. His salary is $800 a year.
4. The employment of an additional officer was authorized by the Minister of Customs in view of the volume of the customs business requiring attention at this outport.

KILDARE POSTMASTER.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has Mr. Cléophas Pelletier resigned as receiver of the mails at St. Ambroise de Kildare?
2. If so, who has succeeded him?
3. Who recommended this appointment?
4. How many persons made applications to succeed Mr. Pelletier?
5. What are the names of these persons and by whom were they recommended?

Mr. PELLETIER: Mr. Cleophas Pelletier tendered his resignation as postmaster of Kildare (not St. Ambroise de Kildare), and Mr. Joseph Garceau was appointed his successor by direction of the Postmaster General.

FISHERY GUARDIANS IN GUYSBOROUGH

Mr. SINCLAIR:

What are the names and the post office addresses of all the fishery guardians appointed in the county of Guysborough, N.S. for the year 1912, and the remuneration paid to each?

Mr. HAZEN:

Guardian.	District	Remuneration for the season.
Henry Casey,	St. Mary's River	$20
John Faulkner,	St. Mary's River	20
Daniel Weir,	St. Mary's River	35
David Kirk,	St. Mary's River	20
Archibald Smith,	St. Mary's River	20
George Wilson,	St. Mary's River	20
John D. Hattie,	St. Mary's River	20
Geo. A. Hudson,	Country Harbour R.	20
Albert Mason,	Country Harbour R.	20
Moses Mason,	Country Harbour R.	20

Solomon Baker, Gaspereau Brook.. .. 15
John Cross, Indian River.. 20
Stephen Myers, Isaac Harbour R.. .. 20
Ira Sangster, New Harbour R.. 20
Otto N. Munro, Cole Harbour R.. 30
Norman McDonald, Salmon River.. .. 15
Jeremiah Jones, Salmon River.. 15
Harvey Sparks, Salmon River.. 20
Patrick McDonald, Salmon River.. .. 20
John Kenny (Porter's R. Br.), Salmon River.. 15

STEAM TRAWLERS' OPERATIONS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Referring to a statement appearing on page 25 of the Report of the Department of the Naval Service that on June 18th the SS. Canada visited Pomquet island to obtain information relating to the violation by steam trawlers, did the said visit result in obtaining information regarding such violation? If so, what information was obtained?

Mr. HAZEN: Instructions were issued by the department to C.G.S. Canada to proceed to the vicinity of Cape George, Antigonish county, to inquire if any trawlers were known to be operating inside the three-mile limit. The commanding officer reports that he landed at several places and interviewed various local residents, including the lightkeeper at Pomquet island, but was unable to obtain any information on the subject.

MONTREAL HARBOUR MASTER.

*Mr. SINCLAIR:

Was Commander Roper an applicant for the position of harbour master at Montreal or for any other government position under the present Administration?

Mr. HAZEN: I have been informed by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal that by public advertisement they caused a request to be published asking for applications for the position of harbour master at the port of Montreal, stating in the advertisement the qualifications that were required, and that some sixty odd applications were received. One of the applicants, the harbour commissioners say, was Commander Roper.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Would the hon. minister give us the date of that advertisement?

Mr. HAZEN: It was before the opening of navigation last spring; that is my recollection. I will get the exact date for my hon. friend and send it to him.

THE QUEBEC MERGER.

*Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has the right hon. the Prime Minister, or any member of the Government, received any communication from the French Government concerning the Quebec merger?
2. Is the right hon. the Prime Minister aware that the British Embassy in Paris said to have received a communication from the French Government concerning said Quebec merger?

Mr. FOSTER: The answer to that question is in the negative, both branches of it.

CUSTOMS OFFICERS AND MUNICIPAL POSITIONS.

*Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

Is it the policy of the Department of Trade and Commerce to permit collectors and subcollectors of customs to act as municipal councillors?

Mr. FOSTER: The answer to that is that the Department of Trade and Commerce has no policy with reference to collectors and subcollectors of customs.

Mr. WHITE: I understand that my hon. friend has made a mistake in the wording of this question, but, if the inquiry is intended to refer to the Department of Customs, the answer is that the Department of Customs does not object to collectors and subcollectors of customs acting as municipal councillors, provided such municipal service does not interfere with their duties as customs officers.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries received the evidence taken by H. P. Duchemin, commissioner at river Bourgeois, in the month of October last, on the charge of political partisanship alleged against Marin Bourque, keeper of the lighthouse of river Bourgeois, who was dismissed in the month of April last?
2. Has any report been received from Mr. Duchemin bearing on the investigation?
3. Is it the intention of the minister to reinstate Mr. Bourque as keeper of the lighthouse?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. The investigation referred to was arranged by Mr. Duchemin to be held on the 27th September, 1912. On that date no evidence was taken. A further inquiry was held on the 12th December, 1912.
2. Yes.
3. No.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. Has Edward C. Humphreys, of Trenton, special officer Inland Revenue, been dismissed? If so, on what ground?
2. On whose complaint was the dismissal made?
3. Who has been appointed his successor and at what salary?

Mr. NANTEL:

1. Yes. Political partisanship and lack of activity in the performance of his duties.
2. By a party in whom the department has confidence.
3. William Jardine, at $300.

Mr. RICHARDS:

1. Has James McKay McCougan, sub-collector of customs at Malpeque, Prince Edward Island, been dismissed from his position? If so, for what cause?
2. Was he granted an investigation? If so, was evidence taken under oath?
3. Is the evidence to be found in the department?
4. Who laid the charges against him?
5. Who was appointed as his successor, and upon whose recommendation?

Mr. WHITE:

1. J. McK. McGougan, sub-collector of customs at Malpeque, P.E.I., has been dismissed from his position on account of political partisanship.
2. There was no investigation by a commission under oath in this case.
3. The signed statements of Mr. P. C. Murphy and Hon. A. E. Arsenault in this case are on file in the Department of Customs.
4. Charges were made against him by Mr. P. C. Murphy, based on personal knowledge of Hon. A. E. Arsenault.
5. Mr. Robert J. Crafer has been employed as his successor, on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. RICHARDS:

1. Has William H. P. Irving, postmaster at Cape Traverse, Prince Edward Island, been dismissed from his position? If so, for what cause?
2. Was he granted an investigation? If so, was evidence taken under oath?
3. Is the evidence to be found in the department?
4. Who laid the charges against him?
5. Who was appointed as his successor, and upon whose recommendation?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes. For political partisanship.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.

4 and 5. The matter having been investigated and the postmaster shown to have been a political partisan, the Postmaster General directed his removal and the appointment of his successor.

Mr. RICHARDS:

1. Has Agno Gaudet, sub-collector of customs at Tignish, Prince Edward Island, been dismissed from his position? If so, for what cause?
2. Was his case investigated by a commissioner? If so, was evidence taken under oath?
3. Is the evidence to be found in the Department of Customs?
4. Who laid the charges against the said official?
5. Who was appointed as his successor, and on whose recommendation?

Mr. WHITE:

1. Mr. Agno Gaudet, sub-collector of customs at Tignish, has been dismissed from his position on account of political partisanship.
2. The case was investigated by a Commissioner and evidence was taken under oath.
3. The evidence is on file in the Department of Customs.
4. The complainant in this case was P. C. Murphy, Esq.
5. Mr. Joseph E. Richards has been employed as his successor on the recommendation of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. RICHARDS:

1. Has John H. Bernard, postmaster at Tignish, Prince Edward Island, been dismissed from his position? If so, for what cause?
2. Was he granted an investigation? If so, was evidence taken under oath?
3. Is the evidence to be found in the department?
4. Who laid the charges against him?
5. Who was appointed as his successor, and upon whose recommendation?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes. For negligence and misconduct as postmaster.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.

4 and 5. The matter was investigated and the postmaster's misconduct established. The Postmaster General, therefore, directed his removal and the appointment of his successor.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has Mr. Joseph Chaput, receiver of the mail at Radstock, been dismissed? If so, for what reason?
2. Who asked for his dismissal?
3. Who has been appointed in his place and at whose request?
4. Was an inquiry held?

Mr. PELLETIER: It having been represented to the department that the Radstock post office was not centrally located, an official inquiry was ordered by the Postmaster General. The inspector's report showed that the office was situated at one end of the village, and the Postmaster General directed its removal to a more central location. The change in site rendered necessary a change in postmaster.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has Mr. J. D. Gaudet, employed in the customs office at Joliette, been dismissed? If so, for what reasons?
2. Who requested this dismissal?
3. What was his salary?
4. Who succeeded him, and at whose request?
5. Was an inquiry held?
6. What is the salary of his successor?

Mr. WHITE:

1. Mr. J. D. Gaudet, examining officer of customs at Joliette, P.Q., was dismissed

from the customs service at Joliette by Order in Council for active political partisanship. Notified per letter 25th March, 1912.

2. Complaint as to political partisanship was made against him by Jos. Sylvestre.

3. His salary was $850.

4. His successor was J. P. Theriault, employed on the order of the Minister of Customs.

5. Yes.

6. Mr. Theriault's salary is $850 a year.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Who was sub-collector of customs at Joliette, from 1896 to 1911?

2. What was his salary in each year from 1896 to 1911, inclusive?

3 What amount was collected year by year during that period?

4. Has he been dismissed? If so, for what reason?

5. Who requested this dismissal from office?

6. Who has been appointed to replace him, and at whose request?

7. Has an inquiry been held?

8 What is the salary of the present sub-collector?

9. How much has be collected since his appointment up to date?

Mr. WHITE:

1. Louis Basinet was sub-collector of customs at Joliette, Que., from 1896 to 1911.

2. His salary as customs sub-collector was as follows: appointed November 14, 1896, $126.11 a year; 1897 to 1898, $200; 1898 to 1899, $275; 1899 to 1900, $500; 1900 to 1901, $500; 1901 to 1902, $500; 1902 to 1903, $700; 1903 to 1904, $800; 1904 to 1905, $800; 1905 to 1906, $800; 1906 to 1907, $800; 1907 to 1908, $900; 1908 to 1909, $900; 1909 to 1910, $900; 1910 to 1911, $900; 1911 to 1912, $950.

3. Customs collections at Joliette, year by year, from 1896 to 1911, were as follows. Fiscal year 1896 to 1897, $6,139.13; 1897 to 1898, $5,604.73; 1898 to 1899, $13,064.25; 1899 to 1900, $14,337.71; 1900 to 1901, $21,780.56; 1901 to 1902, $55,091.18; 1902 to 1903, $66,546.72; 1903 to 1904, $61,711.60; 1904 to 1905, $47,939.43; 1905 to 1906, $20,301.57; 1906 to 1907 (9 months), $10,939.50; 1907 to 1908, $22,918.37; 1908 to 1909, $25,673.15; 1909 to 1910, $31,696.37; 1910 to 1911, $39,515.17; 1911 to 1912, $49,178.95.

4. He has been dismissed on account of political partisanship.

5. Mr. J. P. O. Guilbault, M.P., was the complainant in this case.

6. C. C. Perrault was employed as sub-collector of customs at Joliette to replace Mr. Basinet, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Customs.

7. There was no formal inquiry beyond the statement of the member for the constituency.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds).

8. The present sub-collector's salary is $950 a year.

9. The customs duties collected at Joliette from 15th February, 1912, to January 18, 1913, were $55,678.15.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has Mr. Jean Roberge, customs officer at Beauce, Quebec, been dismissed?

2. If so, on what date, for what reason, and by whom has he been replaced?

Mr. WHITE:

1. The servies of Mr. Jean Roberge, customs officer at St. Côme, Quebec, have been dispensed with.

2. His services were dispensed with by Order in Council of the 2nd of November, 1912, because they were no longer required. He has not been replaced by any officer at St. Côme. The customs station has been opened near the United States boundary and St. Côme is under the charge of Mr. Auguste Rodrigue, where the duties formerly required at the St. Côme station are to be attended to.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville) moved:

That in the opinion of this House, the establishment of a cheap parcel post system would be to the advantage of the consumers of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this question of a cheap parcel post was brought to the attention of the House last year, and since then I believe there has arisen in the country an agitation which must ultimately force the hands of the Government and induce my hon. friend the Postmaster General to take action at no distant time. I notice in the press the other day that the hon. gentleman had stated that he was studying the system recently adopted by the United States Government and that within a reasonable time he might probably adopt a similar system for Canada.

This question is a most important one, as it affects the whole country, indeed it affects every household in Canada. When I had the honour of being Postmaster General the question was mooted and the officers of the department were studying a plan which could be put in force in connection with the rural mail delivery system. When I expressed the opinion that the parcel post should be in operation in Canada as it was in nearly all the European countries the department was at once deluged with petitions from all sections of the country opposing the proposed adoption of the system. I was somewhat surprised at this because I thought that cheap parcel post would be of great benefit to the consuming masses of the country. However, I found after a survey of the whole situation that the opposition came apparently from the country

store keepers in their fight against the increasingly grasping power of the departmental stores. I suspected that the store keepers had been put up by the express companies, and I have no doubt, and my hon. friend who is now at the head of the Post Office Department of Canada has no doubt, that the opposition comes chiefly from the express companies. The parcel post system is essentially part of the work of the Postmaster General. The Postmaster General, not to speak of the American continent, but in Europe, and even in Japan, is not only at the head of the post office system proper, but is also termed the Minister of Communications. He looks not only after the post office, the transmission of letters, but after the cable rates, the telegraph rates, the telephone rates, and in nearly all civilized countries the transmission of packages through the mails. The parcel post system has been in existence in Europe for many years, and it is under the direct control of the Postmaster General in the various countries. In England it has had an enormous success, in France also, in Switzerland also. In Germany it is on the cheapest scale, and is of the greatest advantage, especially to the farming community. It has a direct relation with the high cost of living; and, if you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I shall read some of the conclusions arrived at by Professor Mackenzie who was selected not very long ago by the Board of Trade of Toronto, to study with a special committee the causes of the high cost of living, chiefly in the section of the country known as the Toronto section. Professor Mackenzie cites as one of the causes of the high cost of living in Toronto the absence of the parcel post system, and I dare say it applies to every other centre in Canada. One of the causes which make for higher prices in Toronto as against the smaller places is, first—I am quoting in part the report of Professor Mackenzie :

> The apparent disappearance here of any competition in some of the businesses connected with the collection and distribution of food products which businesses appear to have fallen in the hands of a few powerful allied interests. Milk is a good example. We pay 9½ cents a quart for milk which cannot compare in quality with the 6 cents milk of the small town a few miles away. Your committee have been informed that the association of Toronto commission merchants engaged in the fruit and vegetable business have secured exclusive control of the only Toronto market for the wholesale trade and thus by eliminating competition are in a position where they can dictate terms to both producer and consumer. Men engaged in raising fruit and vegetables for city consumption report that they have found the conditions here so intolerable as to force them either to seek for other markets or to go out of the business. It is not probable that any relief can be obtained by municipal or governmental interference. The history of nearly all attempts at such interference with existing commercial conditions is not a hopeful record. The privileged corporations can afford and do employ the best brains available and are usually better served even by their legal advisers than is the municipality or government which attempts to coerce them. As a rule our economic troubles arise not from the want of but from an excess of official regulations. A better remedy would appear to lie in the hands of the growers of fruit and vegetables themselves which appear to have completely lost control of the selling end of their own business. Ireland to-day affords a splendid object lesson in this matter. Two years ago the small Irish farmer was absolutely at the mercy of the middleman who kept the prices at which they bought as low as they liked and maintained the prices to the city dealer as high as they dared. To-day these small Irish farmers are learning the trick of combination so as to control the selling end of their own business with the result that the farmer is getting better prices for his produce and the city dweller is paying less for the same. A still better example of the effects of combination is perhaps to be found in Denmark where the farmer does not lose control of his butter or bacon until it is sold on the London market. The produce may go through several hands but these hands are all agents or servants of the combination of producers.
>
> (2) While there is no evidence of any combination in Toronto among the small retail dealers, for the purpose of keeping up the prices of food and the small dealer seems barely able to make a living in the keen competition to which he is subjected, yet the unnecessarily large number of retail places of business makes for inefficiency and adds to the cost of distribution. For example, a hundred well equipped and well placed stores could probably do the whole city business in groceries and do it cheaper than the present multitude of small stores; but to limit the number of grocers would at once enable the favoured few to combine and raise prices.

Professor Mackenzie says that the increase in the cost of living is due so far as vegetables, fruits, and other commodities of life are concerned, to transportation and distribution, and he adds the following :

> (3) The very poor shipping facilities which are available for produce coming into Toronto. To begin with, our navigation laws appear to have been drawn up with the idea of injuring American shipping rather than with the idea of serving Canadian shippers, certainly not with the idea of serving Canadian consignees. Also, we have no public wharf in Toronto. The railways are thus almost freed from the competition of waterborne freight into the city. Moreover, we have no parcel post service, so that the express companies,—

That is to say the railway companies again, because the two large express companies in this country are only adjuncts or subsidiary companies to the great railway

systems, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian Pacific railways :

Moreover, we have no parcel post service, so that the express companies, that is to say the railway companies again, can and do make us pay dividends on stock that has been shown to be largely water. It seems to be the universal opinion of shippers and consignees that in spite of—perhaps it is because of—the monopoly these railways enjoy they do not give proper facilities for bringing produce into the city. It would be difficult to overestimate the advantages of a parcel post service such as is maintained throughout Europe, even in Russia, whereby produce could reach the consumer directly from the farmer. The small charge necessary for such service would at once put a limit to the profits of the middleman and would compel the express companies to meet the competition of the postal service.

I need not read any further the conclusions of the report, a very able report, of Professor Mackenzie. The report was acted upon by the Toronto Board of Trade, and as a result it has passed unanimously a resolution which reads as follows:

Resolved that the conference committee of one hundred of the Board of Trade of the City of Toronto request that the council of the board urge that the Dominion Government consider establishing a good parcel post, limited no doubt at first to the more populous localities, but extended as experience may warrant.

The desire expressed by this very important Board of Trade is that generally expressed throughout the press of the country of late. I do not wish to weary the House by reading the many articles which have been published in the various publications, commercial, industrial and political of late on this question, but the time seems to be ripe for the Postmaster General, for the Government, indeed, to undertake now a policy of cheap parcel post for Canada. We need not be ashamed of adopting a system similar to that which has lately been adopted by the United States Government. As regards postal matters my hon. friend knows that the United States Government so far have rather followed in the footsteps of Canada. Not later than two or three years ago the Post Office Department in the United States copied our system regarding the postal savings bank. I remember at the time reading some United States newspapers eulogizing the system which had been adopted by Canada and which had rendered so much service to the poorer classes of this country. The system has been adopted in the United States, and they make no bones about it; they simply followed the policy introduced a long time ago by the Canadian post office. We should not be ashamed to imitate them in their new policy of cheap parcel post. I stated a moment ago that it affected every household in Canada and, in reading American papers and magazines, I see that since the 1st of January of this year, the date at which the parcel post system came into force across the boundary, there has been a new class of mail matter going into the postal boxes in that country. I see that they can mail now through the United States post office, at a very cheap rate, such commodities as eggs, and they have even invented boxes which can be tossed about without breaking the eggs. I see also that they can mail such commodities as butter, cream, the smaller fruits, vegetables, meats, poultry, fresh fish, &c.

We have in Canada the skeleton of a parcel post system. That has been in the postal regulations for I do not know how many years. It is under the heading of fourth class matter. Clause 105 of the postal regulations says:

This class includes merchandise of all descriptions such as confectionery, dry goods, groceries, hardware, stationery (including blank books, &c.), not included in the first, second and third classes, and not excluded from the mails by the general prohibitory regulations with respect to objectionable matter.

The rate of postage for articles in this class is one cent for each ounce or fraction thereof.

108. The limit of weight for a package of fourth class matter is five pounds, and the limit of size is thirty inches in length by one foot in width or depth, but the combined length and girth (i.e. the length of a band passed entirely around the package lengthwise) of any packet must in no case exceed six feet.

That is, broadly speaking, the regulation we have as an embryonic parcel post system in Canada.

Let us see under what disadvantages we are when we compare our parcel post system with that of the United States or with that of England, France, Germany, or, generally speaking, the European countries. We are far behind the times. The world's parcel post union package unit is eleven pounds to the parcel carried through the mails at the rate of 12 cents per pound, whilst the Canadian unit is five pounds to the parcel at a cost of sixteen cents a pound. That is practically prohibitory and, as stated last year, we are face to face with this difficulty, that a parcel can be sent from London, England, to Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, even to Vancouver, at a cheaper rate than a parcel can be sent from Ottawa to Vancouver, or from Ottawa to Halifax. This does seem extraordinary, but it is a fact, and until the United States had adopted its new system a similar extraordinary state of things was in existence there. To emphasize the statement I made, let me again give the illustration I gave last year when this question came before the

House in order to show how the system worked in the United States before the 1st of January of this year and how it works in Canada to-day. The extract is from a paper which was read at a farmer's convention in the United States held to promote parcel post. The farmers of the United States have forced the Government to adopt that system just as they have forced the Government to adopt rural mail delivery. The heading of the article is 'The relation of the parcel post system to business men and farmers.' This paper was read at the trans-Mississippi Congress in November, 1911, not so very long ago:

To illustrate the inconsistency in connection with the parcel post service attention is drawn to the following conditions: An individual entering any post office in the United States——

That was before the 1st of January of this year.

—with two parcels weighing four pounds each will be obliged to pay sixty-four cents on the one to New York, for example, while for the one destined to a foreign country, although it usually passes through New York city, the charge is forty-eight cents.

Should the weight be 4 lbs. 6 ozs. a package addressed to a resident of New York will be denied admission to the mails by the Postmaster, while a package intended for a resident of a foreign land will be accepted and forwarded, probably via New York, at a rate of 12 cents per lb. Parcels for a foreign country will be received in most instances up to 11 lbs; in other words, our own people must pay 4 cents a pound more for the privilege of despatching packages to each other than when these packages are destined to residents of foreign countries.

If you change the words New York and United States, and substitute Otawa or Montreal and Canada, you have a most graphic illustration of what happens in our country. The Post Office Department of every country, as the Postmaster General knows, is under the rules and regulations of the Postal Union, and Canada is an important member of that Union. There are treaties regulating the transmission of mails from one country to another, just as there are treaties regulating, under the Postal Union, the transmission of packages from one country to another. I have stated that the parcels union package unit was 11 pounds per parcel carried at a rate of 12 cents per pound, while the Canadian unit is 5 pounds to a parcel at a cost of 16 cents per pound. Strange to say, the Postmaster General of Canada denies his own people the right to transmit parcels of a certain weight and at a certain price, but he receives through his mails the parcels which are sent at a larger weight and lower rate from foreign countries. I have no doubt that the Canadian post office and the Canadian mail cars have been carrying parcels post under the new American regulation, whilst the Postmaster General has denied—and the present postal regulations forbid him to act otherwise—to his follow country-men the same privilege of a low rate and a larger weight. That shows the inconsistency of the system. But now that the United States have adopted a parcel post system, Canada must adopt, if not the same system, a system which can be worked in harmony with it.

I have stated that in the United Kingdom this system of a cheap parcel post has worked wonders, and I have cited the case of Ireland where the farmers have been greatly benefited by the adoption of a cheap parcel post in the disposal of their farm products. The rates in the United Kingdom are:

BRITISH PARCEL RATES.

	Cents.
For a parcel not exceeding 1 lb.	6
Exceeding 1 lb and not over 2 lbs.	8
" 2 " " 3 "	10
" 3 " " 5 "	12
" 5 " " 7 "	14
" 7 " " 8 "	16
" 8 " " 9 "	18
" 9 " " 10 "	20
" 10 " " 11 "	22

Eleven pounds is the limit allowed, and in size the combined length and girth of any parcel must not exceed six feet.

I come now to the system adopted in the United States after protracted investigation and agitation by the farmers of the United States. It may be summarized as follows: The United States and its several territories and possessions, except the Phillippine Islands, have been divided into units of area, 30 minutes square. They have adopted the zone system and these units are the basis of eight postal zones. The first zone has a radius 50 miles from the centre of any unit of area; the second has an area of 150 miles; the third an area of 300 miles; the fourth an area of 600 miles, and so on up to the seventh zone, with an area of 1,800 miles, the eighth zone including all other territory covered by the American flag. They have adopted concurrently with this zone system, a system of insurance for packages transmitted through the mails, but that I need not deal with now as it is only an incident of the parcel post system. We have adopted in Canada a system of insurance not only for packages but for registered letters. The following are the rates that have come into force in the United States on the 1st of January last:

The rate of postage on matter not weighing more than 4 ounces will be one cent for each ounce or fraction thereof which will carry it to all parts of the United States and possessions within the parcel post limits. All matter in excess of this weight is to go by the pound.

RATES PER POUND.

For delivery in— Zone.	First Pound Cents.	Each Additional Pound or Fraction Cents.
1. Area within fifty miles radius of centre of "unit of area"	5	3
2. Outside first zone within 150 miles	6	4
3. Outside second zone within 300 miles	7	5
4. Outside third zone within 600 miles	8	6
5. Outside fourth zone within 1,000 miles	9	7
6. Outside fifth zone within 1,400 miles	10	9
7 Outside sixth zone within 1,800 miles	11	10
8. Outside seventh zone	12	12

I stated that the weight in Canada was limited to five pounds, and that the cost was one cent an ounce, making it sixteen cents a pound. You see that for the longest distance in the United States the cost does not amount to more than twelve cents a pound, and you can send twelve pounds; whilst here you are limited to five pounds. We might perhaps be told that we are relieved by the express companies in Canada. I do not wish to be unjust towards the express companies; they are making money, and they come under the provisions of the Railway Commission; but the business which is carried by the express companies pertains primarily to the Post Office Department. The Postmaster General, as regards parcel post, is the common carrier of Canada, and the express companies are only encroaching upon his department. Now the charges levied by the express companies for carrying a five-pound parcel from Toronto to the places named below, are as follows:

	Miles.	Cents.
Aurora	30	25
Belleville	121	40
Berlin	63	30
Calgary	2,129	80
Clarkson's	16	25
Orillia	35	86
Ottawa	250	40
Peterborough	76	35
Regina	..	80
Stratford	88	35
Vancouver	2,769	80
Wipnipeg	1,238	75

I do not know what the distance is from Toronto to Regina, but it cannot be far from 1,600 to 1,700 miles.

Mr. PELLETIER: For how many pounds?

Mr. LEMIEUX: For a five-pound parcel, while with the system in the United States a twelve-pound parcel, mailed outside the remotest zone, say from New York to San Francisco, would not cost more than twelve cents a pound, and if there are more than twelve pounds the cost is twelve cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof. You see that the difference is enormous. I must admit, of course, that the United States have the population. They have, it is true, an immense network of railways, but the difference is very great; and as we have in Canada now practically three transcontinental railways, with also a network of side lines and feeders, it seems to me that we could by adopting, if not a similar system, at least a system which would compare favourably with that of the United States, reach the same result.

Now, let us make a comparison of rates. Let us compare the rates of our express companies, which I have just given, with the rates which the people of Great Britain have long enjoyed, and those which have been inaugurated in the United States, with the excessive tolls under which we Canadians suffer.

Great Britain parcel post, for any distance, five pounds, twelve cents.

United States parcel post, for 250 miles, five pounds, twenty-seven cents.

Of course it is cheaper in the United Kingdom, because there the territory is rather restricted in area, but for 250 miles in the United States for a five-pound parcel, the cost is only twenty-seven cents, while here to carry a parcel from Toronto to Ottawa, 250 miles, the same distance, it would cost forty cents, or nearly double.

Canada, fourth-class matter, for any distance, five pounds, eighty cents.

Canada, by express, for 250 miles, five pounds, forty cents.

For the information of the House, I may perhaps read how this zone system works in the United States. I should not care to weary the House with this except that my fellow members might like to know how it works, and it is perhaps better it should go on 'Hansard'. The zone system is thus explained:

Instead of using townships and counties as units or starting points, it was decided to divide the whole country into blocks of units, each block being half a degree in latitude in north-south extension and half a degree of longitude east and west. There are 3,500 of these units in the country.

How to find zones.

An example of how to get the first zone is as follows:—

Find the center of the unit in which your post office is located. Draw a circle of fifty miles radius around that center. Every unit which lies wholly within that circle or more than half of which is within that circle, is included in the first zone from any post office, and the postage rate is 5 cents for the first pound and 3 cents for each additional pound.

The second zone is determined by drawing with the same center a circle of 150 miles radius. Every unit which lies within it, but outside of the first zone, is in the second

zone and the rate is 6 cents for the first pound and 4 cents for each additional pound. The method by which the second zone is determined is used for all other zones; their radii and rate of postage for the first and additional pounds, respectively, being as follows: third zone, 300 miles, 7 cents, five cents; fourth zone, 600 miles, 8 cents, 6 cents: fifth zone, 1,000 miles, 9 cents, 7 cents; sixth zone, 1,400 miles, 10 cents, 9 cents; seventh zone, 1,800 miles, 11 cents, 10 cents; eighth zone and all territory farther away, including the Philippines and island possessions, 12 cents flat.

Here, Sir, you have a resume of the system adopted by the United States. I do not know if my hon. friend (Mr. Pelletier) has conferred—I dare say he has—with our chief post office superintendent, Mr. George Ross, of Toronto. Mr. Ross, for several years, I know, applied himself to a study of the reforms which are taking place in various parts of the world, especially in Europe and America, concerning the parcel post system. At the time I left the department, Mr. Ross had evolved a scheme of parcel post for Canada, which, as I recollect it, is somewhat similar to the one I have just explained to the House. It is, I know, a limited system of parcel post. It would, in the opinion of Mr. Ross, do away with that strong objection which comes sometimes from the country store-keepers against the parcel post system. Perhaps my hon. friend will give to the House the views of Mr. Ross, and will state in what way that objection to which I have referred is removed. At all events, even if some of the store-keepers in the country, who object most to the parcel post system, should suffer for the time being their objections should not be found insuperable. We know that every reform has had the effect of hurting some interest. When the railway system was inaugurated, those interested in the old coaches protested very strongly, and so did the blacksmiths; and when Fulton inaugurated his steamboat on the Hudson, the steamboat was nearly destroyed by the ferrymen on the shore. But everybody admits to-day that the railway and the steamboat were acceptable to civilization and to all communities, even those who resisted at the time the introduction of such world-wide inventions.

Mr. GRAHAM: And automobiles.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, even the Post Office Department has adopted the automobile, and so has the Militia Department, and I dare say that they are very thankful to Providence and the public exchequer that automobiles are afforded to the public departments. But I hope that my hon. friend will utilize the services of—how many post offices have you in Canada?

Mr PELLETIER: Over fourteen thousand.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I hope my hon. friend will utilize the services of the fourteen thousand agents whom he has in Canada to promote the cheap parcel post system. That is his business, and the express companies should not be allowed to get exclusively the enormous profit which arise out of the parcels post. At any rate, they can only carry parcels from one station to another, while the Postmaster General has a much better system which will bring directly from any point to the very door of the consumer, by rural mail delivery, whatever he may have ordered.

I know that this will cost money. But, thanks to my hon. friend's predecessors, the Post Office Department is no longer a losing department; it is a money-making department. I do not exactly know the figures of surplus this year, but it will be a very large one—over a million dollars, if I mistake not.

Mr. PELLETIER: We would not be satisfied with that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly, the surplus belongs to the people; and while some years ago, it was wise to economize in the Post Office Department, in order to make both ends meet, the time has now come to make the necessary expenditures of the revenues of the department in order to give the people the benefit of that parcel post system which is now in vogue in every civilized country. I say that it will cost money. But it will also bring in money to my hon. friend's cash box. Let him remember that fifty years ago the Post Office Department carried letters throughout the sparsely settled Canada of that day at terribly high rates. I have not the figures just now before me, but I have studied the question, and if I mistake not, to carry a letter from Windsor to Toronto in those days involved a charge amounting to something like sixty cents. To carry a letter from Windsor, Ont., to Halifax cost something like two or three dollars. That was only 50 or 60 years ago. Gradually, however, and thanks to the efforts of that great English reformer, Rowland Hill, cheap postage was adopted by all English speaking communities. Until 1898 it cost 3 cents for a letter from place to place in Canada. Sir William Mulock decided to reduce our postage to 2 cents, hon. members in this House predicted that instead of piling up surpluses Sir William would see a succession of deficits in his department. What has been the result? Instead of decreasing the revenue of the department, cheap postage has increased it from year to year. I myself some

years ago introduced legislation to reduce what we call the drop letter rate from 2 cents to 1 cent. I was told that this would decrease materially the revenue of the Post Office Department. The result proved quite the contrary, indeed the revenue from the drop letter rate of 1 cent per letter has been much larger than from the 2 cent rates. This illustrates the well-established principle that the more you cheapen the rate of postage the larger the postal revenue becomes. In England, in France, in Germany, in Switzerland, that has been the result of every reduction of postage. My hon. friend, the Postmaster General is, I know, facing a difficulty. The railway companies are complaining that they do not receive sufficient payment from the Post-Office Department for carrying the mail matter, particularly the fourth class matter which I have described. I know they have a claim of several years standing against the Post Office Department. The increase of business in the Post Office Department makes a fairly good case for the railway companies, but legally they have no recourse against the department. Would it not be a fair proposal for the Postmaster General now to strike a bargain with the railway companies, and increase, if necessary, the mail subsidies which are paid to the railway companies owing to the greater volume of mail, and at the same time make a bargain for the carrying of parcel post? They have been obliged to increase the number of their cars and the space in the mail cars. For example I know, as a matter of fact, that the Canadian Pacific railway does not receive sufficient payment for the transportation of the Christmas mail across the continent. Whilst a few years ago it took one, two or perhaps three cars to transport the Christmas mail from Halifax to Vancouver, for the last 10 or 15 years it has taken 20 or 25 huge mail cars. It is not fair that the Canadian Pacific railway should have to increase their carrying capacity for the Post Office Department without receiving adequate compensation. The same thing applies to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Let my hon. friend strike a bargain with each of the railway companies, let him increase, if necessary, the mail subsidy, but at the same time let him boldly adopt a cheap parcel post system for the benefit of the Canadian consumer. In England the railway companies receive from the Post Office Department, I think 50 per cent of the gross receipts arising out of the transportation of packages, the balance going into the Post Office Exchequer—they are partners with the post office.

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend's motion calls for a cheap parcel post. What does he mean by cheap?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would like to leave to my hon. friend the fixing of a rate for a Canadian parcel post, but taking a general view of the system now in vogue in various countries, I would say that the system and the rate adopted by the United States post office authorities should be accepted by Canada. Of course there are details to be worked out in the department, but that would seem to me a good basis on which to work. I employ the word cheap parcel post in general terms. The present system is a dear parcel post system; it is, in fact, no parcel post system, it is only the skeleton of a skeleton, but if my hon. friend will base his system on the one adopted at Washington I think he would be rendering a real service to the country and carry out the conclusions of the very illuminative report which has been made to the Toronto Board of Trade under the direction of Prof. MacKenzie.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina): My intention is to take up only a very few minutes of the time of the House in making a few remarks on this very important question. We have had a system of parcel post or what might probably be called a partial system of parcel post in Canada for many years. The difficulties in regard to our present system seem to be that the weight which we can send through the mails is not sufficient to meet the needs of the country, and the tolls charged by the Post Office Department up to date for carrying parcels are somewhat high compared with the rates for parcel postage in other countries. I understand that while the late Government was in power my hon. friend the late Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) had in view some measure of extension of the parcel post system throughout Canada, and from what I have seen in the newspapers during the last few weeks I believe that the present Postmaster General has in view some measure for the extension of our parcel post system. I can only say to the present Postmaster General that any measure of increase in the parcel post system of Canada made by his department will meet with general favour throughout the whole of western Canada. I speak particularly for my own locality when I say that it will meet with the greatest possible favour in that part of Saskatchewan from which I come, and I believe that applies also to Manitoba, Alberta, British Columbia, in fact to the whole of western Canada. This is a question which, even in the short time I have been in this House, has been discussed on many occasions. I do not think there has been a session of Parliament since I had the honour to occupy a seat in the House that some

resolution has not been introduced first by members on one side of the House, and the next session probably by members on the other side of the House, so that the conclusion I have come to is that so far as the sentiment of members of the Canadian Parliament is concerned, both sides of the House are practically at one with regard to the advantages of extending our Canadian parcel post system. As I said a minute ago, our system in Canada is very limited, and on reference to the postal regulations I find that section 100 provides for rates on fourth-class matter. It says:

> This class includes merchandise of all descriptions such as confectionery, dry goods, groceries, hardware, stationery,

And so forth.

> The rate of postage for articles in this class is one cent for each ounce or a fraction thereof.

Section 103 says:

> The limit of weight for a package of fourth-class matter is five pounds.

We have also in Canada certain postal conventions with many other countries, and in making a comparison of rates I find that we can ship larger parcels by post from Ottawa to any place in Great Britain for a less amount than we can ship smaller parcels by post from Ottawa to say the city of Halifax or to other cities in Canada. Now, to my mind that is a state of affairs that should not exist. As a matter of fact, I believe that if the opposition to the extension of the Canadian parcel post system is sifted to the bottom, you will find that it originates with the express companies. I think my hon. friend the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) pratically stated that in the House in the debate on this question last year, and I also find that John Wanamaker, a former Postmaster General of the United States, on being asked why he did not extend the parcel post system in the United States, said there were four reasons, and the four reasons were, the four express companies in the United States. Now it is said, and I may say that for some years, ever since I occupied a seat in this House, I thought there was a good deal of force in the argument that the small storekeepers throughout the country were opposed to a parcel post system because it would do injury to their business, but I must confess that I have somewhat changed my mind on that subject. I think that during the regime of the late government many petitions were sent in, some signed even by farmers, protesting against a parcel post system. These petitions came from the provinces of Ontario, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, and from other provinces, but they were headed in typewritten form and were worded in exactly the same way, and my belief is that the opposition originated with the express companies in the Dominion. The reason is obvious. I believe that a general extension of our parcel post system, increasing the weight of parcels that might be carried, and lessening the tolls that are charged at the present time on those parcels, would force the express companies to charge smaller rates. That has been stated on many occasions in this House, and I merely reiterate it. In western Canada we suffer from heavy express rates. In Ontario you suffer from heavy express rates, and I believe that in other provinces they suffer from heavy express rates. Perhaps we feel them more in western Canada than you do in the east, on account of the greater distances that parcels have to be carried. Why, you can buy first class fruit in the Niagara district and ship it to Regina, and the express rates will be twice as great as the price paid for the fruit. And it is the same with fruit purchased in British Columbia. If a farmer in the province of Saskatchewan, or in any of the western provinces should have any injury done to or breakage in his farm machinery, and he is forced to send to some large centre to get the parts replaced, for he cannot get repairs in the smaller towns, he will pay more to express these small repairs than the actual cost of the parts which are broken. Now I submit that this is not a condition of affairs which should be allowed to exist, and if by extending the parcel post system in Canada this Government can reduce the express rates to the consuming masses of the country, the Government and this Parliament should take some action in the immediate future.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I desire to utter only a word on this question. I had a lengthy experience before coming to Canada of an efficient parcel post system in the Old Country, and I think I am justified in expressing the opinion that probably nothing in the public service of that country brings a greater amount of happiness and convenience to the homes of all classes of the people than that system. I have had a good many communications from electors in my riding, from people who have had a similar experience to mine in that respect, and who are anxious that similar advantages should be conferred upon the inhabitants of Canada. I am alive to the fact that we live in a country of magnificent distances with a very sparse population, and the difficulties in the way of establishing a parcel post system in Canada such as we have in the Old Country would, I think, be very considerable. Still, it ought not to be beyond the power and the

province of the department of the post office to make a beginning at least. I am perfectly sure that what has fallen from my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) has fallen upon sympathetic ears in the case of my hon. friend the Postmaster General. I think that there was no department in the public service of Canada more deservedly popular during the regime of the late Government than the department of the post office. It was administered with very great ability and very great impartiality, by my hon. friend from Rouville, and, so far as I have had any experience of the department since the change of Government, I wish to pay this tribute to my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Pelletier) that I have detected no symptoms of any desire on his part to change the excellent administration of that department. I can only say that if my hon. friend should see his way to make a start in the establishment of parcel post in Canada I should be one of the first to congratulate him. It is one of those things that we cannot send abroad. There is a disposition to have the work connected with some of the departments of the public service done out of Canada altogether, but the parcel post system must be established in our own country. I should be very much pleased if my hon. friend would listen to the pleadings of his predecessor in office and make a start along this line.

Mr. NESBITT: Mr. Speaker, coming from the western part of the province of Ontario, I would also like to say a word in reference to parcel post. While I have endeavoured to think that the express companies do not overcharge, I have been forced, in the last two or three years, to come to the conclusion that they do very much overcharge. As a matter of fact, there rates were revised by the Railway Board two or three years ago, but they are still too high. We have in Ontario a very good rate on farm produce. I do not think we have any particular complaints to make in regard to farm produce because we must remember that the express companies deliver nearly all these things, which is a great convenience. But, if we send an ordinary article to a small village where they have an express office, and they have express offices in nearly every section of the country now, we find that their charges are very much too high indeed. My hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) mentioned parts of machinery required to replace broken parts. They overcharge very materially on these things; in fact, they make the most ridiculous charges. I had to pay forty cents for a ten-pound parcel to go seven miles. The charge seemed to me to be absolutely ridiculous, but, I had to pay it. As a result of the introduction of the rural mail delivery system by the late Postmaster General and by the present Postmaster General, who has done a great deal, I must say, in the continuation of the system, a parcel post system would be of greater service than it formerly would have been. Farmers could get parcels up to a certain weight and size put into the postal boxes, but if these parcels were over a certain size they would not go into the boxes. It would then be necessary, I suppose, to drop a card into the box notifying the person to whom a parcel was directed to meet the courier next day, or some arrangement of that kind could be made so that the post office could deliver a parcel to the farmer to whom it was addressed. If we are going to take up parcel post in connection with the rural mail routes we will have to make some provision for the handling of parcels over and above a certain size. That, I suppose, my hon. friend the Postmaster General can work out. It would be a great convenience. I do not see why the country stores should complain of parcels being delivered in that way. I doubt if the system would take very much more from the country stores than they have lost already. In our section the country stores are largely the gatherers of farm produce. They go round with a wagon, or something of that kind, gathering up eggs and other farm products and exchanging their goods for them. In this way the country stores are quite an accommodation to farmers. I would not like to hurt the country storekeepers or any other class of people in the country. We have all got to live and the attack which is sometimes made on the retailer in connection with the increase in living expenses is, in many instances, totally uncalled for. In my judgment the attack on the retailer is absolutely uncalled for. Few fortunes are made by retail storekeepers in Canada and those who do prosper do so very slowly. If the introduction of a parcel post system will be the means of compelling the express companies to reduce their charges it would be a good thing. If it does not do so I think the express rates should be again reduced. In many cases they are ridiculous. If you want to send a parcel to Regina or Calgary all you have to do is to try and send it and you will make up your mind also that these rates are ridiculous. I wanted to send a barrel of apples the other day to Montreal; the apples cost me $2 and the express charges were $2.31. I think the express companies are seeking their own downfall. They are like a great many other people; when they are in a position to charge they seem to have no means of curtailing their ambitions or their greed. If my hon. friend the Postmaster General, by introducing the par-

cel post system, is the means of reducing the express rates to a reasonable amount, he will confer a great benefit upon the ordinary people of this country. I therefore join my voice with that of others in asking the Postmaster General to take the matter into his very serious consideration.

Mr. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton): Mr. Speaker, it is a very great source of pleasure to me to hear hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House taking such an active interest in parcel post. For some years past I have been strongly advocating the adoption of the parcel post system in Canada. I urged it upon the late hon. Postmaster General, and if you will look up 'Hansard' you will find that he frequently referred to the position that the small towns in the provinces were in and the petitions that he had received from time to time from the merchants of these towns urging him not to do anything in the matter. Apparently he was just about as well informed on the parcel post system when he was in office and as well able to give his consideration to it. But no action was taken. However, I am glad to see hon. gentlemen opposite taking an interest in it now because I realize and appreciate the fact that the time has come when he should at least take a step in the direction of forcing the express companies to reduce their rates. I do not say that we should establish a parcel post system possibly to the same extent as they have it in the Mother Country because, as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) has stated, we would find a great many difficulties to contend with if we were to adopt that system in Canada. But, there is no excuse for us not increasing the size of the parcels which go through the post office. There is no reason why we should no be able to receive some of the advantages to be derived from sending and receiving larger sized parcels through the post office. At the same time, this question is surrounded by difficulties. I have urged upon the present hon. Postmaster General, as I urged upon the late Postmaster General, time and again, the establishment of a system which would have its origin at the beginning or on the rural mail or stage route. In that way the departmental stores could not interfere with the merchants in the smaller towns, and the people living on the rural mail and stage routes of the country would be wonderfully benefited by having such an arrangement made. For instance, a man living on a rural mail or stage route in Ontario—and these routes are now well equipped with independent and rural telephones—could telephone to a store in the town to send him out whatever commodity he might require, and the parcel would be taken to the post office and for a few cents delivered to the farmer, who otherwise would be compelled to drive several miles to get it. The Postmaster General deserves great credit for the interest he has taken in this matter, and for the information he is now gathering. I know he has investigated the question to a much greater extent than did the late Postmaster General. We should not take it for granted that this is an entirely new question and force the Postmaster General to rush into a policy that might not be the best one to adopt. I believe it would be for the general advantage of the people of Canada if the proposition which I have made in this direction could be carried out.

Hon. L. P. PELLETIER (Postmaster General): I have listened with great interest to the remarks made on this important question. I notice that as we proceed with the public business, the hon. member for Rouville is always ready to tell us of the great advantage which might be reaped from certain legislation, all of which he, when in office, did not attempt to pass, but left as a legacy to us. I can assure him that had he inaugurated the parcel post system in Canada, he would have relieved me of a great deal of embarrassment and anxiety.

The question of a parcel post is bristling with difficulties, and the fact that my hon. friend did not touch it when in office, shows that he was anxious to pursue the easiest course. I have given the question my best attention in consultation with the various efficient officers whom the hon. gentleman knows we have in the Post Office Department. We thought we had found a solution of the difficulty, but new difficulties arose and we were compelled to go into the question all over again. My hon. friend has referred to a plan submitted by Mr. George Ross, the worthy superintendent of the Post Office Department; but I may tell him that although Mr. Ross thought his plan would solve the difficulty, he has since discovered enough to cause him to change his mind somewhat. The hon. member for Rouville knows that the parcel post system is popular in the country, and that the express companies are not very popular, and he tells us we should start a parcel post system in order to compete with the express companies. Then, as a kind of solatium to the express companies, he tells us that we should take care to pay the railway companies higher rates for the transportation of the mails. The hon. gentleman thinks that if the railway companies are not pleased over the adoption of the parcel post system, which would possibly reduce the rates charged by the express companies, we should give them some consolation in another direction. The rail-

way companies may have a good case for increased compensation for carrying the mails, but I dislike to have an hon. gentleman in this House invite the railway companies to ask for more money from the public treasury. It may be good policy for the hon. gentleman to suggest, that if on the one hand the express companies—which in the end are the railway companies—lose by the parcel post system, they should be recouped in another direction. That is all very well for a member sitting in Opposition, but when you have to deal with the question, in the interest of the people of the country, it is an entirely different matter. I do not view the parcel post question from the same standpoint as the hon. member. He says we should adopt the parcel post for the purpose of reducing express rates, but I do not think the Post Office Department is the source from which the public can expect to get lower express rates and lower railway passenger rates. There are other departments of government concerned with trade and commerce and transportation, and there is the Railway Board before which complaints can be made if the rates charged by express companies or railway companies are considered too high. I would ask hon. members to discard from the consideration of the subject the idea that we should go into this matter simply for the purpose of bringing about a rate war. That is not the purpose of the Post Office Department, and I would not care to approach the question from that standpoint. The Post Office Department is entrusted with the task of rendering possible the interchange of communication between people in the different parts of Canada, and between the people of Canada and the people of the other countries. Its first duty is to forward ordinary mail matter, to send out newspapers, and to diffuse information and learning generally. For one reason or another, in practically all the countries in the world the Post Office Departments have considered it as part of their business to transport or carry something else than letters and newspapers, and it is now a well-known and well settled policy of every country in the world to enter the field of what I might call to a certain extent 'freight transportation,' or, to put it as it ought to be put, 'small freight.' I am not going to quarrel with that idea. The last country which has adopted it is the United States. When I discussed this question last session, I had to point out to the hon. members of this House that the United States, a very advanced and progressive country, had not yet adopted a parcel post system, and that the limit of fourth-class mail matter which was going through their mails was four pounds. They have now made the plunge. Whilst I am not here to criticise in any way the policy adopted by the United States Government in this matter, I may say that they have made a move which is of the utmost importance from many points of view. They inaugurated that policy on the first day of the present year, after having passed a measure giving them the necessary powers, and after having looked into the matter in the most careful manner. It took them months after the law was passed to look round and get ready for this new policy. On the 1st of January, 1913, they put it into effect, and I may tell my hon. friends on both sides of the House that the post office authorities at Washington have been surprised at the weight and importance of the newly born child. In the first week during which this policy was in force, they carried through their mails the bagatelle of four million pounds of parcel post. Any hon. member can judge of the great difference which it made for even a well organized and well balanced department to have to take care of such an enormously increased amount of mail matter.

Mr. NESBITT: Might I ask the hon. gentleman what size they carry up to now?

Mr. PELLETIER: The size is just the size indicated by the hon. member for Rouville. The size is practically the same all over the world. Perhaps it was the weight my hon. friend wanted to know.

Mr. NESBITT: Weight is what I meant.

Mr. PELLETIER: Eleven pounds is their limit. I said a moment ago that I did not think that the Post Office Department was quite within its ordinary course of business in dealing with freight, or small freight. However, this appears now to be the well settled policy of all the countries of the world, and I really think that something along the same line must be carried out by Canada. How it is going to be done is not a thing to be decided without looking into this question very fully indeed. I admit that we have in this country the 'embryonic' system, as my hon. friend called it, of parcel post, something that we are not proud of. We are told, and it is true, that we can receive parcels from England and transport them over the whole of this country at a certain rate, twelve cents, while under our present regulations we have not the right to send parcels throughout this country at the same rate. I admit that Canada is today carrying the parcels of every country except its own, and this is a most extraordinary state of affairs. We have to receive parcels from the United States, and I may say that on the very first day that this system was inaugurated, parcels by

post from the United States came over the border line to Canada, and we had telegrams from important post offices, mainly on the border line, inquiring what they were going to do with what in some cases was a multitude of parcels brought into the lobbies of the post offices. Of course we have distributed them subject to our rights as a country, and whether we ought to have a parcel post convention with the United States. I shall not go into that at present, but merely refer to it en passant, because I think all our rights should be reserved in this matter. We delivered these parcels coming over from the States, and there were some which were going from one end of Canada to the other. Of course everybody will admit that, if we are carrying the parcels of other countries, it is too bad that we should not carry our own.

There is another point of view which I think is of some importance. If parcels come over the border line from the United States, and if we have no right to send our parcels from Canada to the United States, we are in an inferior position. Consequently I think it is our duty to do something, and this motion which my hon. friend has presented to this House is not the forerunner of the policy to be put before the House, but comes after months of consideration given to this matter by the officers of the Post Office Department.

Mr. EMMERSON: Under your present international arrangements, you are compelled to carry throughout Canada any parcel coming from the United States and mailed there under their postal regulations and classification, and to accept their classification, if I understand the position right. Therefore, it would appear that people living in the United States can get the benefit of the Canadian postal system in sending to their friends in Canada, whereas citizens of Canada may not have the same privileges as between themselves. That is the position?

Mr. PELLETIER: That is the position in a certain respect. I should not like to admit, as Postmaster General, that we are obliged to carry parcels coming from the United States without a new parcel post convention with our friends and neighbours to the south of us.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But has the department being doing it since the 1st of January?

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes. As I explained a moment ago, I think it would have been considered an unfriendly act on our part to refuse to deliver the parcels coming to Canada in great numbers from the United States. But, while we made delivery, sending the parcels to destination in this country, we took the precaution to write to the Post Office Department in Washington to tell them that we think that, in the first place, we should have been notified of the change. It came upon us—I will not say unawares, because we were watching it and following it closely—but without our being aware of what stamps were going to be put upon these parcels, and we could not—

Mr. LEMIEUX: They had a special stamp?

Mr. PELLETIER: Yes, of course, they had to. Of course, we could not notify our postmasters nor send the circular usual in such cases. So, our postmasters were taken by surprise and did not know what to do. However, we have carried on the business as if we had been notified, and have asked the Post Office Department at Washington to send us all necessary particulars, and have told them that we expected that a parcel post convention of some kind would be entered into.

Mr. EMMERSON: You wanted reciprocity in it?

Mr. PELLETIER: Not exactly reciprocity. But I think that neighbouring countries, even with the postal union regulations, should not be called upon, without having some notification, to take care of a sudden and vast increase in the business to be carried for their neighbours. At all events, I do not expect any trouble in that respect, but expect that we shall be able to adjust the matter to the satisfaction of both countries.

As to the difficulties which are in the way of establishing a parcel post, my hon. friend from Rouville has gone over the ground very well—in fact, so well that I am completely satisfied that if he did not establish a parcel post before the 21st of September, 1911, it was not for lack of knowledge of the subject. He is perfectly au fait with the situation,—he has the facts at his fingers' end. But, in my opinion, the petitions which he received as head of the department from the small country merchants are not to be lightly brushed aside as he suggested they should be. He has said that the express companies were at the bottom of the petitions so sent in from different parts of the country. I do not agree with him. And while, as I said last year, we should not be stopped from doing our duty in this respect, because, forsooth, we may hurt the feelings of the express companies, at the same time I do not think the express companies should be saddled with responsibility for the circulating of these petitions. I know, as a matter of fact, that the country merchant is very much afraid of this policy. Since the newspapers have given it out that some-

thing in the way of a parcel post was contemplated, I have received a resolution from the Retail Merchants' Association, protesting strongly against what they suppose is the policy of the department in this respect. I have answered their resolution, and, as they have indicated the possibility of coming to Ottawa to discuss the matter, I have told them I would receive them gladly and would discuss the matter with them. I say at once that the retail merchants have objections to this policy which ought to be considered. Should a parcel post policy have the effect, as is expected in certain quarters, of ruining the business of the country merchant, I, for one, would pause before adopting it. The retail merchant is carrying on a business which is perfectly legitimate. But there is also to be considered the wholesale merchant in the important cities who also has a great interest at stake. He sells goods to the retail merchant, and his trade also is a legitimate one. While we have not, so far, reached a conclusion as to what our policy shall be, yet, whatever we do, we will take care that we do not trample on the business of a great number of people in this country whose legitimate interests ought to be protected.

Further, if it is expected that the Post Office Department will go into this parcel post business, merely for the love of it or merely for the sake of doing it, and bring disaster and financial ruin on the department itself, I may say at once that that is a complete mistake. We must settle this question in a businesslike way. We have a surplus of over a million dollars. My hon. friend from Rouville took great care when he was at the helm, to have the surplus there. But now he tells me, you have no business to have a surplus. I am afraid this is the offer of the Greeks. If I found it desirable to do away with the surplus, it would be the easiest thing in the world to attain that end. The surplus is surrounded and coveted by so many people that, if I were willing to let it go, it would disappear in twenty-four hours. A great many people think that the surplus should not exist. The postmasters—and there are fourteen thousand of them in this country—tell me that I have no business to have a surplus, and that they ought to get it. The letter carriers tell me: The Post Office Department has a surplus; why don't you distribute that surplus to the letter carriers? Then, we have the mail contractors;—as my hon. friend from Rouville knows, we have an enormous number of employees, and they all think that the surplus ought to go. The railway companies also think we have no business to have a surplus. Well, I think we should have a surplus—not merely for the sake of having a surplus, but for the sake of carrying on without danger the well-settled policy of the Post Office Department as it has been carried out for the last year or so. We have started rural mail delivery on businesslike principles and have taken the means to expand this system; and, so far, we have had very little complaint, and many people tell us that the system is working very well.

I stated in my place in this House last year that I was more concerned about rural mail delivery than about parcel post. We have made a fair start with rural mail delivery, and we are going to increase it little by little—not by leaps and bounds; we cannot do that——

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many rural mail delivery routes have you?

Mr. PELLETIER: I think there are over six hundred. At all events I put before the House yesterday—my hon. friend from Rouville was not here—a tabulated statement on the subject. And now, having attended to this rural mail delivery policy, we think one of the next things which should be attended to is the parcel post. But, as I said a moment ago, the parcel post must be put on such a footing that it will not spell disaster and financial wreck to the Post Office Department. Let me call attention to the present situation in a very few words. I have here a tabulated statement showing the difference in the rates between the express companies and the Canadian post office. This statement was prepared by Mr. Ross, and it takes Toronto as a base. To carry a parcel of 1 lb. weight from Toronto to Hamilton costs, under our present rates, 16c.—1c. per oz. To carry the same parcel the same distance the express companies charge 25c. But if you take a parcel of 2 lb., it will cost 32c. by post office, but only 25c. by express. A parcel of 3 lb. for the same distance would cost 48c. by the post office and 25c. by express; in the case of a parcel of 4 lb. for the same distance, while the postal rate is 64c., the express rate still stands at 25c. But, take a longer distance—from Toronto to Ottawa or Montreal. For a parcel of 1 lb. the post office rate is 16c., the express rate 25c., but for a parcel of 4 lbs., while we should charge 64c., the express rate is 35c. Take a greater distance still—say from Toronto to Regina. For a parcel of 1 lb., our charge is the same as for the shorter distance, 16c., and the express rate is 30c. But when it comes to a parcel of 5 lb., the post office charge 80 cents, and the express charge 75c. Thus, they even up, with the result that in parcels of 1 lb. and under the post office gets all the traffic it desires; but when you come to parcels of 2 lb. and 3 lb. and carried over a short

haul, which is the profitable business, that is done by the express company, and the post office is left with the dry bones. But then we have this further result,—the express companies do not reach every point in Canada. They have offices in the important centres and even at most of the railway stations but there are many many points where the railways do not go, and these people have not the benefit in any form of the parcel post delivery either of the post office or express company under present conditions. That is one of the things which to my mind constitutes a valid and important reason why, whilst we are not freight carriers, the post office should inaugurate this policy. We have the equipment in Canada, with our 14,000 postmasters who will thereby become so many agents for the parcel post delivery, and thus I think we can establish it on reasonable terms.

I would like the House to understand very clearly that whilst I am speaking on this matter in a very guarded way, only to be fair to the hon. members, I am not at the present moment at liberty to say what we are going to do in the matter. This is a thing which has to be discussed by the Government as a whole. I may say that it is admitted that something might be done. My hon. friend has referred to the resolution adopted at Toronto. I had the pleasure of meeting the President of the Board of Trade of Toronto the other day when I put to him and his colleagues several questions on this subject. I am glad to say that they agreed with me that this matter should be treated in a business-like way, and that whatever we do will be done in such a way that we will find a reasonable compensation for the additional work which will be imposed on the Post Office Department and its employees. We cannot make a leap in the dark, we cannot make a plunge. I have given the number of millions of pounds of parcel post matter which has come from the United States. We must get ready for this, we must think of the objection which has been raised by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). If we are to have 11-pound parcels and if we add seven or eight or ten or twenty of them to the mail carrier he will at once tell us that this is not the contract which he has signed with us, he will have a claim for increased pay and compensation. We have purchased over 100,000 boxes for rural mail. If we go to this limit of 11 pounds with the 6-feet limit of size the mail boxes will not be large enough for such parcels. If with a system of parcel post we have double the mail matter which we are handling today it will mean a revolution in the administration of the post office, mostly in the important cities but to a certain extent in the smaller offices.

I have said that the question is one bristling with difficulties, and it is; so whilst I am well disposed to give the public the benefit of the work which has been done in the department and whilst I am free to say that I would positively hate to see Canada alone backward in this direction, that every other country in the world had adopted the system, we must not, on the other hand, shut our eyes to certain important facts. It is all very well and right to speak of parcel post in countries like England, France, Germany, Belgium. The density of population in those countries makes the problem of parcel post a comparatively easy one, but why did not the United States adopt the parcel post before this year? Their reason was a very important one. They said: We have the population, but it is spread over such a large area of territory that we must take special care of the transportation of those parcels. They now think that they have settled their problem. But we cannot say that the settlement of the problem by the United States has settled the problem for Canada because whilst we have a vast territory like the United States we have not the population which they have and they have reason to expect and to believe that their parcel post policy, with their 90,000,000 or 100,000,000 of people will be a very much more remunerative one than our parcel post policy over the same extent of territory with only 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 people. There is in that respect alone occasion to think this matter over, to weigh it well and not make a leap in the dark. I hear clamors, parcel post, parcel post, parcel post. It is all right, but the man who will be responsible to this country for parcel post has to think the matter over before he takes action, and he must act in such a way that when the whole thing is over the people who have been clamoring for parcel post will not be able to ridicule the Postmaster General. These people have not a very large responsibility in this matter but if the system is started on lines which prove ruinous and disastrous, the man who has the responsibility and who will be the laughing stock of the people will be the Postmaster General. So I intend to take my time about it, although I hope to do something during the present session. People and newspapers tell me: What business have you to watch what is going on in the United States? Watch your own country. I tell these people that I have a right to watch from a business point of view the financial result in the United States, what the system is going to cost them, what increased capacity their post office is going to require, what increased

little army of sorters and packers this will mean, and I shall not be debarred from looking over the border for knowledge on these matters. I have been told by another newspaper, an important one: What a blessing that the United States have adopted parcel post! Since the parcel post has been adopted in the United States the rates of the express companies have been lowered—what a blessing! After writing all this the same paper said: What business have you to adopt the zone system which is very well loved by the express companies. This paper was forgetting that the United States has the zone system. I am glad to say that the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) who knows something of these matters, who has been at the head of the department for five or six years, understands that it is absolutely useless to hope or expect that if we start a policy like that we will have a flat rate for the transportation of parcel post. This would put the Post Office Department out of business, and I do not intend that it shall be put out of business, at least while I am here, so that while on the whole the idea is a perfectly good one it has to be worked out on a business footing, and the people of this country must expect that we will not be competitors with the express rates. These rates do not concern the Post Office Department as a department. We believe that the parcel post is well thought of in all the countries in the world. It has been adopted in every civilized country now, but at the same time, we believe that it must be worked out not as a competitor with the express companies, but for the public service of this country, and mainly for those numerous parts of the country where the express companies do not go, and at such rates as will give to the Post Office Department sufficient remuneration to prevent it from being put out of commission. It is on those lines that we have approached this matter, and we think that something can be done. What form it shall take I am not at liberty for the moment to say. As a matter of fact it is not decided. I may say that the idea of leaving all the paying business to the express companies, of doing the lean part, and leaving the fat part to them is not a policy that appeals to me. Some change must take place. We have waited until this policy has matured to make all the changes at the same time, and as I said a moment ago, I believe that the experience they are gaining in the United States will be very helpful to us. There they have provided for a complete system of inspection and return. We shall know exactly, for we have been promised the figures, at the end of the first two months of their experience in this matter how much it is costing them, how much it is likely to cost them in the future. They have worked it out to perfection. But they say that it would be out of the question to try a flat rate such as we have for letters, and with that I entirely agree. They have eight zones, and they have prepared very beautifully arranged maps. They have distributed these maps all over the numerous post offices in the States, and I may say that they have these maps arranged to such perfection that, with the system of longitude and latitude to which the hon. member for Rouville referred, each post office, small though it may be, is the centre of a zone. They have as many maps and as many zones as they have post offices. I think that is out of the question so far as this country is concerned. We cannot think of having a poor man who gets $35 a year as postmaster——

Mr. DEVLIN: Why do you not increase it?

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend from Wright is like the man of whom I spoke a moment ago: everybody is asking for an increase. I think the salaries of the postmasters should be increased, but you must not forget that if this parcel post policy is entered into the Postmaster will find, because he is paid on a percentage of the stamps which he sells, that the work will increase, and that the wages will also increase. Now maybe we shall find in that policy some means of meeting the demands of the railway companies. The demands of the railway companies for increased rates of pay are very big. They are so big that it would take not only the post office surplus to meet them but two million dollars more. Whilst I am prepared to deal fairly with the railway companies in this respect, this country will be interested to know that we are already paying the different railway companies a sum of $2,000,000 yearly for the transportation of our mails. Whilst the railway companies are entitled to a fair deal and to fair play, it should be remembered that they have received very much from this country for the building of their roads, all of them. This is a fact which we can fairly take into consideration when we approach this question. Maybe we shall be able to make a deal all round with the railway companies on this question, and I hope the railway companies will be reasonable and not try to reap the whole benefit for themselves. But if, as they generally do, they agree to some give and take, I think we shall be able to approach the question together and settle it in the interests of this country, and without sacrificing any legitimate interests.

Mr. BELAND: I am not perfectly clear about the declaration which the minister

has made in the course of his remarks, and perhaps he can supply the information. Is the House to understand that the department is having as a primary consideration, or as a guiding principle, possible discrimination between sections of the country that are served by railway, and sections that are not served by railway?

Mr. PELLETIER: Oh, no. What I meant was this, that our parcel post policy would not only be one which would benefit the parts of this country where the railways and consequently the express companies go, because we shall have to go where the express companies do not go. But I did not mean to say that we should only go where the express companies do not go. We shall have the same points as they cover, and more; that is what I meant. Now, I think the hon. member for Rouville has attained the object he had in view, and I would suggest that the motion be dropped.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I intend to say just a word in answer to my hon. friend. I must say I am pleased with the spirit which has animated him throughout this friendly discussion on a question which is of the utmost interest to the country. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) thinks that I should have played the part of reformer while I was acting as Postmaster General, although in the same breath he urges the Postmaster General to be very cautious in this matter and not to be speedy, as the expression goes. The question is a very important one; everybody understands that; but as the years roll on the objections are being removed, and the reason why I urged the adoption of this policy in the near future was exactly the one given by my hon. friend the Postmaster General, that the United States after several years of close investigation have at least framed a system which has been in operation since the 1st of January. I am free to say that I do not urge the Postmaster General to accept exactly the same system; but in the reports which have been published in the United States regarding that investigation which took so many years to materialize, he has all the elements for the creation of a Canadian system. What we said during the last election, that we could not easily legislate against geography, is put in strong evidence to-day by this very discussion. Here is a postal convention existing between Canada and the United States. By that convention a perfect state of reciprocity exists. We have reciprocity in the mail business, and, if my hon. friend will read the convention aright, he will find that he is obliged under it to carry the packages which are sent through the mails from the United States, as the United States would be obliged to carry those from Canada. It will be a shock to our population to learn that we are to carry the packages of the United States at their low rates and that we are prevented from sending across the border packages at similar rates.

The question is not a fancy one. It is not the result of a popular fancy that the people are clamoring for parcel post. It has become an acute question from the economic point of view. I have referred to Professor Mackenzie, who presided over the investigation ordered by the Toronto Board of Trade on the causes of the high cost of living. Professor Mackenzie says that one of the chief causes of the high cost of living is the absence of a parcel post system in Canada. It is not a popular fancy. It is a very serious reason which is being advanced by the consumers of the country. It is an economic necessity, and my hon. friend will have, nolens volens, to face the issue. I am glad that he informs the House that he is ready to examine the question, and to give it a proper solution. Under these circumstances, I have no objection to withdrawing my motion, seeing that the object of that motion is met in such a good spirit and with such favor by both sides of the House.

Motion withdrawn.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved for:

A copy of all correspondence, petitions and papers generally, concerning the resignation of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the Harbour Commission of Montreal is probably, after the various departments of Government, the most important body we have in Canada. It is admitted that the Harbour Commission holds the key to the transportation question in Canada. The harbour of Montreal has become, par excellence, the national port of the Dominion and that harbour is of as much interest to the farmers beyond the great lakes as to the people of Montreal and the surrounding district. Therefore, it is a very important body, and the people who are entrusted with the duties pertaining to it, should be the best engineers and the best administrators available. The harbour commission has existed since 1830. At that time the Government appointed a commission composed of three. Later on, in 1853, the number of harbour commissioners was increased to five, in 1873 to nine and, in 1894, to eleven. At that time the harbour commission was composed of members some appointed by the Minister of Public Works, because the Department of Marine and Fisheries took charge of the channel at

the time of the appointment of the late Mr. Prefontaine. It was also composed of some members appointed by the Government, some by the Board of Trade, Shipping Federation, the Chamber de Commerce. I think, the City of Montreal was entitled to one member, namely, the Mayor. When the harbour commission was under control of these eleven commissioners so appointed it was found that, respectable as were the commissioners, they were the victims of the patronage system and from all parts of the Dominion came complaints against the perpetual wrangling between the Government, the shipping interests and the City of Montreal, due to the large number of commissioners and to the internal divisions which existed in that body. In the year 1907, if I mistake not, the Government of the day—and credit for this must be given to my predecessor in office the Hon. Mr. Brodeur—decided to do away with such a large number of commissioners, and in doing so, I may say, en passant, that the Government made not a few enemies. We confided as a substitute the direction of the harbour to three commissioners, appointed directly by the Government and to be perfectly independent of the various interests which had heretofore been at loggerheads. The pest of the harbour commission was the patronage system. Mr. Brodeur decided to wipe out that pest, to destroy that patronage system which was so vicious, and which had hampered the successful administration of the harbour of Montreal. After months of consideration he selected the three men who were probably best qualified to fill the positions. He consulted the Board of Trade, the Shipping Federation, the City Council of Montreal, the large business firms, and they all agreed that the three best men who could be selected were Mr. George Washington Stephens, Mr. Ballantyne, and Mr. Geoffrion, and he appointed them. These gentlemen were not looking for the office; the office sought them. Every one knows that Mr. Stephens is a millionaire, a man of leisure, a man who has made a study of the transportation question; that Mr. Ballantyne is a most successful business man, a man of wealth, a man of great energy, and that Mr. Geoffrion was also eminently fitted for the office. They had no axe to grind as harbour commissioners, and the people of Montreal, Liberals and Conservatives, acclaimed the choice made by Mr. Brodeur. The first thing these three commissioners did after taking office, was to do away with the patronage system, and volumes could not tell what reforms they introduced during the few years of their administration. The harbour of Montreal to-day is not the harbour of a few years ago; it has become a great national port and the pride of Canada, thanks to the wise and prudent administration of Messrs. Stephens, Ballantyne and Geoffrion. Well, the day after the general elections, I am sorry to say the Conservative organizer in Montreal rushed down to the harbour office and began to lecture the three harbour commissioners. He wanted to know if in future the patronage of Montreal harbour would go into the hands of the Conservative patronage organization, and knowing what I know now, and knowing what I knew then of the three commissioners, I am surprised that Messrs. Stephens, Ballantyne and Geoffrion, did not forcibly, if need be, eject from their office the man who came with that mandate to them. But stranger still, a man for whom I have the greatest respect, my hon. friend from St. Antoine (Mr. Ames), went also to the harbour commissioners and said that the patronage in minor matters at least, should go to the Conservative patronage committee. I regret that the hon. member for St. Antoine is not in his seat, because I wish to tell him that I am surprised at his action in this matter, especially in Montreal, the hon. gentleman and myself have fought the same battles together for good municipal government, and I have always thought he stood for an intelligent and progressive administration of public affairs. I am informed that he went, at the request of the patronage committee, and asked the commissioners to relinquish the minor patronage of the harour of Montreal.

Mr. HAZEN: Who told the hon. gentleman that?

Mr. LEMIEUX: The harbour commissioners themselves. I am bound to say that I cast no reproach on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; on the contrary I have received from the late harbour commissioners of Montreal the highest praise of his conduct. But I want to make the point clear that if the three commissioners have resigned, it is because the patronage committee in Montreal made their lives miserable. Why, the first thing that patronage committee did was to appoint over the head of the commissioners Mr. Massé the defeated candidate, in St. Mary's Division, and after that the employees who were under the control of the harbour commissioners and until then had been debarred from taking part in politics, began to give interviews in the papers against the harbour commissioners. Life was made so miserable for them that they decided to withdraw from office. I repeat that the Minister of Marine has been most gentlemanly and most courteous with the late harbour commissioners, and I know that had he had his own way, Mr. Stephens, Mr. Ballantyne and Mr. Geoffrion would be to-day the harbour commissioners of Montreal. But, he was hounded by all the

patronage seekers; he was surrounded by all the ward politicians; by all those who believe that there is any amount of boodle in the Montreal harbour works. With all this intriguing and all this scheming against them, the harbour commissioners have chosen to give up office. I say that their withdrawal is a decided loss, not only to Montreal, but to the country generally, because no three men of equal ability could be found to administer with so much intelligence the affairs of the national port of Canada. They were not even spared the humiliation of being investigated by such pious gentlemen as Messrs. Morine and Ducharme, two men who have been forced to resign themelves, and for cause, since last session. The three harbour commissioners of Montreal, men of the highest repute, men most highly respected by the business men of this country, were made the victims of an investigation by Messrs. Morine and Ducharme. The latter gentleman spent weeks going through the books, ordering this and that from the commissioners in order to discover what they had in mind—some scandal in the harbour commission in Montreal. They were fishing for scandal, fishing for evidence. We also saw the members for Rimouski (Mr. Boulay) and Gaspé (Mr. Gauthier), from the outlying sections of the province of Quebec, coming in a delegation to the minister's office, speaking on behalf of the ministerial patronage of the province of Quebec and ordering that the three commissioners should be dismissed. I say it is a scandal. It was a scandal first to send Messrs. Morine and Ducharme to investigate men of the standing, the ability, and the uprightness of the commissioners.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BELAND: They should have been fishing in their own waters.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But the result was highly satisfactory to the harbour commissioners. Even Messrs. Morine and Ducharme, who have been forced to resign since because their skirts are not so very clean, were obliged to admit that they found nothing against the harbour commissioners, that they had ransacked the books and found everything right. They said that in the case of large purchases of material and supplies it was the practice of the commissioners to call for tenders and to award the contracts to the lowest tenderers. That was the great issue. Some of the Quebec members were under the impression that the contracts were not given to the lowest tenderers, and they expected much, they thought that many of their friends would make fortunes. That explains why the members for Rimouski, Dorchester and Gaspé were so deeply interested in the harbour of Montreal as to come in a delegation and ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to dismiss Messrs. Stephens, Geoffrion and Ballantyne, who had administered the affairs of the harbour of Montreal.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. BELAND: All big men.

Mr. LEMIEUX: They were the spokesmen of the gentlemen who wanted that investigation. The investigation was held and those two honest men, Messrs. Morine and Ducharme found that everything was in perfect order.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I beg to say that I have absolutely nothing to do with the harbour commissioners in Montreal, and the member for Rouville, who goes to Montreal as he did the other day, mentioning some supposed words of the Bishop of Sherbrooke, has absolutely no right to come here and say—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: I am afraid the hon. gentleman is not stating a point of order.

Mr. SEVIGNY: I was mentioned by the hon. member for Rouville as being interested in that affair, and I beg to say that I am not.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When my hon. friend is in his sober senses he will leave the bishops alone and not bring them in contact with Messrs. Ducharme and Morine.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe): Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask a question?

Mr. LEMIEUX: No; I will not allow the hon. gentleman to put a question, because he does not know the bishop. I know what will be the nature of my hon. friend's question, and I would rather avoid it.

Mr. BENNETT: It was a fire extinguisher. Perhaps you are reminded by that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not know what the hon. gentleman has in mind, but if he has in mind the fire extinguisher, he might have in mind also a certain oath which was given before a court in the Province of Ontario. If he has that in mind, he can ask the question.

Mr. BENNETT: I will ask it another time.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I said a moment ago that the hon. minister who presides over the Marine and Fisheries was not responsible for the resignation of the three harbour commissioners in Montreal, but the ward heelers and the patronage seekers forced the hands of the three commissioners, and I am sorry to say it is a loss not only for Montreal but for the country. I am pleased to say, however, the commissioners of the harbour of Montreal carried with them the respect, the esteem, and the confidence of the citizens of Montreal, and of the broadminded citizens of this country.

Hon. J. D. HAZEN (Minister of Marine and Fisheries): It is my intention to move the adjournment of the debate, as the House has to separate at six o'clock this evening. Before doing so, however, I propose to take just two minutes to say to my hon. friend that I cannot believe for one single moment that his extraordinary action in this House this afternoon has been inspired by the gentlemen who have recently resigned as harbour commissioners in the city of Montreal. Two of these gentlemen have assured me time and again, both verbally and in writing, that their sole reason for resigning was because they felt that with their large private businesses they were unable to give to the discharge of the important duties of the position the time they considered the position required. Those are the facts. In addition to that, time and time again, all three commissioners, not only verbally, but in writing, have assured me that they appreciated the manner in which the Government and department, of which I am the head, stood by them during the time they have discharged those duties since the change of government took place on the 21st day of September, 1911. That being the fact, I cannot believe that my hon. friend from Rouville has been inspired by the harbour commissioners in making the very extraordinary attack which he has made on the Government in connection with the resignation of these commissioners. Whilst he has spoken in high terms of praise of the way in which those commissioners dicharged their duties, terms with which I have no disposition to find fault, he has attempted at the same time to make it clear that some insult was cast upon those commissioners because their proceedings were investigated by the Public Service Commission; but the effect of that is rather destroyed when I say that it was at the request of the harbour commissioners themselves that the Public Service Commission was directed to investigate the affairs of the harbour commissioners. Further, although those gentlemen have discharged their duties well as harbour commissioners of Montreal, I am very glad indeed to find that after most careful consideration, after consultation with the business interests of Montreal and with representatives of the Board of Trade, we have appointed as their successors three gentlemen who are universally well spoken of by the business community of Montreal, men who measure well up to the standard of the commissioners whose places they have taken, and who have been well and favourably spoken of by every newspaper published in Montreal, whether in the English or the French language. That is a guarantee that the work of the harbour of Montreal will be carried on in the future as it should be carried on, as a great public work, not from a party standpoint, not from the standpoint of the port of Montreal, but from the standpoint of the general well-being and general public interest of the Dominion of Canada.

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

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Duncan Gillies, fishery overseer at Baddeck, C.B., in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of John G. Morrison, fishery inspector at Englishtown, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Joseph Day, customs officer at Little Bras d'Or, C.B., in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Robert Musgrave, postmaster at North Sydney, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Robert Musgrave, quarantine medical officer at North Sydney, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and report of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Archibald McKenzie, sectionman, Intercolonial railway, at Grand Narrows, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Neil McNeil, bridgetender, Intercolonial railway, at Grand Narrows, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of John Fraser, bridgetender, Intercolonial railway, at Grand Narrows, in the riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Dr. J. D. R. Williams, collector of canal tolls at Cardinal, Ontario, and of the appointment of his successor.—Mr. McMillan.

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of W. A. Scott, lockmaster at Cardinal, Ontario, and of the appointment of his successor.—Mr. McMillan.

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Neil Cummings, lockmaster at Cardinal, Ontario, and of the appointment of his successor.—Mr. McMillan.

For a copy of all papers, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of W. H. Saver, collector of customs at Cardinal, Ontario, and of the appointment of his successor.—Mr. McMillan.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Adam Henderson, bridgemaster at Cardinal, Ontario, and of the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Murphy.

For a return showing all the employees on the Soulanges canal who have been dismissed from their duties since the 21st September, 1911, by whom each of these employees has been replaced, and for what causes were they dismissed.—Mr. Boyer.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of John W. Bohan, preventive officer at Bath, Carleton county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of John Y. Fleming, customs officer at Debec, Carleton county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of Matthias Meagher, preventive officer at Debec, Carleton county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of George F. Briggs, customs officer at McAdam Junction, York county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of Mary A. Bohan, as postmistress at Bath, Carleton county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of Denis McGaffigan, postmaster at Florenceville, Carleton county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of Arthur Armstrong, postmaster at Greenfield, Carleton county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of Edward Lafferty, postmaster at Benton, Carleton county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of Oliver Hemphill, immigration agent at Debec, Carleton county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all papers, letters, telegrams, evidence and other documents regarding the dismissal of Newton S. Dow, immigration agent at McAdam Junction, York county, N.B.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Captain Roderick McDonald, tide waiter, at Big Bras D'Or, Riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, N.S., and of the evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of George Hines, lighthouse keeper at South Ingonish, riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, N.S., and of the evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of James Maloney, customs officer at Dingwall, riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, N.S., and of the evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Thomas Chalmer McLean, postmaster at Ivera, Middle River, riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, N.S., and of the evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relative to the dismissal of Daniel Dunlop, postmaster at New Campbellton, riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, N.S., and of the evidence taken and reports of the investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents rela-

tive to the dismissal of Donald McAulay, lightkeeper, Plaister, Baddeck Bay, C.B., riding of North Cape Breton and Victoria, and of the evidence taken and reports of investigation held by H. P. Duchemin in regard to the same, and a detailed statement of the expenses of such investigation.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence, &c., relating to the dismissal of J. V. Smith, sub-collector of customs at Wood's harbour, Shelburne county, N.S.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all papers, documents, correspondence, &c., relating to the dismissal of James Amereault, lighthouse keeper at New Edinburgh, Digby county, N.S.—Mr. McLean (Halifax).

For a copy of all charges, correspondence, letters, telegrams and other documents relating to the dismissal of J. A. McKenzie, postmaster at Ashfield, Inverness county, N.S.—Mr. Chisholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all papers, letters, documents, telegrams, reports and opinions in relation to the claim of William Iceton, of Purcell's Cove for a return of a boat from the Department of Marine and Fisheries or any other department.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and documents referring in any way to the claim of the municipalities of Pictou, Antigonish, Guysborough and St. Mary's for payment or refund to them of the monies paid by said municipalities for the right of way of that part of the Intercolonial railway running through the counties of Pictou, Antigonish and Guysborough.—Mr. Chisholm (Antigonish).

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, complaints, petitions, and other documents concerning the dismissal of Sebastien Savoie, superintendent of the lobster hatchery at Shippigan, Gloucester county, N.B., and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams and petitions concerning the dismissal of Henri Fricott, wharfinger at Caraquet, and Richard Southwood, wharfinger and agent of the Storm Signal Service at Bathurst, Gloucester county, N.B., and the appointment of their successors.—Mr. Turgeon.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of D. Perrin, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. Lane, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. McNutt.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. A. Mundle, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. Offspring, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Warnock.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. Hayes, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Turriff.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. McInnis, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. McCoig.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of G. Scott, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Nesbitt.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Edward F. Moran, locktender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. Oliver.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Thomas McLatchie, locktender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. Graham.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Robert Robertson, locktender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Elgin McLaughlin, locktender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. Emmerson.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of William L. Gladstone, locktender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. Pugsley.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Byron VanCamp, locktender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. Murphy.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Andrew Melville, locktender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. Proulx.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of N. Broderick, locktender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. McMillan.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Samuel English, canal bridgetender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of George Short, canal bridgetender at Cardinal, Ont.—Mr. Guthrie.

For a return showing a list of the lighthouse keepers removed by the present government in the county of Two Mountains, the names of such persons, the reasons for their dismissal, the nature of the complaints made against them; also a copy of all correspondence and petitions relating thereto, and reports of enquiries in the cases, where such have been held; and also the names of their successors.—Mr. Ethier.

For a return showing a list of the mail carriers whose contracts have been cancelled or renewed by the present Government in the county of Two Mountains, the names of such

persons, the reasons for cancelling or renewing the said contracts, the former price and the present price of the said contracts; also a copy of all correspondence relating to the said mail carriers.—Mr. Ethier.

Return showing a list of the postmasters dismissed or removed by the present Government in the county of Two Mountains, the names of such persons, the reason for their dismissal, the nature of the complaints brought against them, and a copy of all correspondence and petitions relating thereto, and reports of enquiry in the cases where such have been held; also the names of their successors.—Mr. Ethier.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of George Walsh, immigration agent at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Oliver.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of L. Place, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Pacaud.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. Shaver, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Law.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. Roche, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Sinclair.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. Walsh, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Chishholm (Inverness).

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. McDermott, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Devlin.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of J. Slattery, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Béland.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of D. Boivard, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of E. Scott, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ontario.—M. Demers.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of W. Jarvis, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Gauvreau.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of H. Birks, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescot, Ontario.—Mr. Charlton.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of C. Kavanagh, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Carvell.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of B. Hughes, immigration agent at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Graham.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of L. Lalonde, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Bureau.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of D. Dishaw, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Turriff.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of Thomas Colligan, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Ross.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of W. Gerts, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Wilson (Laval).

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of R. Lunay, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Carroll.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of C. Wright, employee of the marine shipyard at Prescott, Ont.—Mr. Clarke.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of M. Barry, from the service of the Marine Department at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. McKenzie.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of W. Granton, from the service of the Marine Department at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Thompson.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of S. Delaney, from the service of the Marine Department at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Buchanan.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of P. Bélanger, from the service of the Marine Department at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Proulx.

For a copy of all letters, documents, telegrams, reports, correspondence and recommendations in any way relating to the dismissal of H. B. Easton, immigration agent at Prescott, Ontario.—Mr. Murphy.

For a copy of all documents, correspondence, petitions and telegrams respecting the dismissal of M. Sauriol, postmaster at St. Janvier, county of Terrebonne, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. Ethier.

For a copy of all correspondence and other papers in connection with a proposed guarantee of bonds to the Quebec and Saguenay railway.—Mr. Lemieux.

For a copy of all minutes of the Treasury Board, all Orders in Council, and all other papers or documents in any way relating to the issue by the Minister of Finance of the license to La Banque Internationale du Canada.—Mr. Lemieux.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, January 16, 1913.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Railway statistics of the Dominion of Canada for the year ended March 31, 1912.—Mr. Cochrane.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31, 1912, Vol. I.—Mr. White.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 66, respecting the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation.—Sir Edmund Osler.

Bill No. 67, to incorporate the Canada Permanent Public Trustee Company.—Sir Edmund Osler.

Bill No. 68, to incorporate the Dominion North Western Railway Company.—Mr. Bennett (Simcoe).

Bill No. 69, respecting Ebro Irrigation and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Ross.

Bill No. 70, respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Toronto and Northwestern Railway Company.'—Mr. Lewis.

Bill No. 71, respecting a patent of the Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 72, to incorporate La Banque Immobilière.—Mr. Baker.

Bill No. 73, to incorporate the Peoples Trustee and Security Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 74, respecting the York County Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. Macdonell.

TITLES OF HONOUR.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 75, to abolish Titles of Honour in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. BURNHAM: Mr. Speaker, it is perhaps not so easy to explain as some hon. gentlemen surmise. I may say, to begin with, that the scope and power of this Bill are comprised, I fancy, in section 12 of the British North America Act which says that:

> All powers, authorities and functions which under any act of the Parliament of Great Britain, or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, or of the Legislature of Upper Canada, Lower Canada, Canada, Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, are at the Union vested in or exercisable by the respective governors or lieutenant governors of those provinces, with the advice, or with the advice and consent, of the respective executive councils thereof, or in conjunction with those councils, or with any number of members thereof, or by those governors or lieutenant governors individually, shall, as far as the same continue in existence and capable of being exercised after the union in relation to the Government of Canada, be vested in and exercisable by the Governor General, with the advice or with the advice and consent of or in conjunction with the Queen's Privy Council for Canada, or any members thereof, or by the Governor General individually, as the case requires, subject nevertheless (except with respect to such as exist under Acts of the Parliament of Great Britain or of the Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland) to be abolished or altered by the Parliament of Canada.

Briefly, as I understand democracy and conditions in Canada, the people are not desirous of having their representatives either accept or create class badges or distinctions. It so happens, of course, that sometimes, long after men have lost their usefulness, honours are conferred upon them on the basis of their good reputation, though, in the language of Scripture they have become whited sepulchres. My only justification for using those words is that they are derived from a sacred source. That condition, of course, is not satisfactory to the people. The genius of democracy in Canada is that the people should remain upon a common level in so far as class or social distinctions go. That view, I think, commends itself to all the people. My Bill does not propose to deal with anything outside of Canada or outside of the scope and powers of the people of Canada or their representatives. It may seem limited but it enunciates I think, at least, a great principle and that is the principle of democratic equality in Canada.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

MIRAMICHI RIVER DREDGING.

*Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Having reference to a question contained on page 603 of 'Hansard' and the answer thereto, relating to dredging in the Miramichi river, New Brunswick, what amount of dredging remained to be done under the contract when the contractors abandoned the

contract on 7th May, 1912, as stated in the answer to question No. 13?

2. What additional sum will be paid to the new contractor for such dredging above what would have been paid had the previous contract not been abandoned?

3. What was the amount of the security of the first contractor, which was forfeited?

4. Was the Department of Public Works or the Minister of Public Works, or any other member of the Government, aware that the persons now owning and controlling the charter and dredging plant of the Northern Dredging and Construction Company, had, as alleged, previously purchased the plant of the former contractor, and that they abandoned the first contract at eleven cents per cubic yard in order to receive the work at a higher price, as it is said they did secure it at a price nearly double that previously paid?

5. Will the minister cause an investigation of this matter to be made and inform the House at as early a date as possible of the result of such investigation?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2. No definite quantity of material to be removed, was specified in contract entered into with the Eastern Dredging Company at 11 cents a cubic yard.

3. $5,500 with $336.02 interest.

4. The department was aware that the plant of the Eastern Dredging Company had been purchased by Messrs. Tennant and O'Leary who sold or transferred it to the Northern Dredging and Construction Company.

5. The minister is not aware that there is anything to investigate. The Northern Dredging Company abandoned the contract and the department forfeited their security cheque. New tenders were called, the only offer received being from the Northern Dredging and Construction Company, at 25 cents per cubic yard. The department refused to award a contract at that price and the work was finally let at 20 cents per cubic yard.

AMHERST PAVING INSPECTOR.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Who was the inspector of pavement work performed by the Government during the latter part of 1911 and the first part of 1912 on Station street, Amherst, N.S.?

2. What is his usual occupation?

Mr. COCHRANE: J. N. Fage, during the latter part of 1911, contractor; Adolphe Landry, during the first part of 1912, building contractor.

FORT LAWRENCE DREDGING INSPECTOR.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Who was inspector of dredging at Fort Lawrence, Cumberland county, N.S., during 1912?

2. What remuneration did he receive?

3. What is his usual occupation?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Adolphe F. Landry.

2. $80 per month.

3. Agent correspondence school and law student.

COAST GUARD NEWSPAPER.

* Mr. KYTE:

1. Has any sum of money been paid to the Coast Guard newspaper published at Clark's Harbour, Nova Scotia, since October 1, 1911, for advertising or subscription?

2. If so, what is the amount and date of payment, and to whom was the warrant or cheque payable?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Department of Marine and Fisheries, yes; Department of Public Works, yes, for advertising; Department of Railways and Canals, yes, for advertising Intercolonial railway; Department of the Secretary of State, yes, subscription; Department of Naval Service, yes, for advertising.

2. Department of Marine and Fisheries, $13, 7th March, 1912, 80 cents 18th March, 1912, $13.80—payable to the Coast Guard.

Department of Public Works, $8.70, May 23, 1912, $16.85, July 15, 1912; $20, October 10, 1912, $45.55—paid to proprietor of the Coast Guard, Clark's Harbour.

Department of Railways and Canals, $7.50, December 11, 1911, payable Coast Guard Publishing Company; $7.80, December 14, 1911; $12.25, April 11, 1912; $8.75, May 9, 1912; $3.75, May 9, 1912; $2.50, September 5, 1912, $43.55—payable to the Coast Guard.

Department of the Secretary of State, subscription of $1 paid through accountant of Contingencies, Finance Department. This department has no knowledge as to whom any cheque issued for such subscription was made payable.

Department of Naval Service, $17.20 paid by cheque to the order of the Coast Guard, dated July 29, 1912.

THREE RIVERS PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. BUREAU:

1. How many tenders have been received for the public building at Three Rivers?

2. What are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender?

Mr. ROGERS: As the contract has not yet been awarded, it is not advisable to make public such information.

THE DREDGE CAPE BRETON.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. At what places did the dredge Cape Breton operate during the season 1910 and 1911, respectively?

2. Who was the master of the dredge during this period?

3. What quantity of dredgible material was removed by the said dredge each season, and

how much at the different places where she worked?

4. How long did she work at each place?

5. What did the removal of the dredgible material cost per yard at the different places where the said dredge operated during the said two seasons?

6. What are the names of the tugs, and names of the owners, that have tended said dredge during the two seasons mentioned?

7. What tugs were engaged in towing said dredge from one place to another during the seasons above mentioned, and what did each towing cost per mile each season?

8. What is the date of building, name, dimensions and horse-power of each tug engaged in tending on the dredge Cape Breton during the above season and during the year 1912 up to date?

9. What was the total cost per month during the seasons of 1910 and 1911 of tug boat attendance upon said dredge?

10. At what places did the dredge Cape Breton operate during the seasons of 1912 up to the present date?

11. Who was the master of this dredge during the season 1912 up to the present date?

12. What quantity of dredge material was removed by said dredge during the current season of 1912 up to date, and how much at the different places at which she worked?

13. How long did she work at each place?

14. What did the removal of the dredgeable material cost per yard at the different places at which the said dredge worked during the current season of 1912?

15. What are names of the tug-boats and names of owners that attended said dredge during the season of 1912 up to the present date?

16. What tugs were engaged in towing said dredge from one place to another during the seasons above mentioned, and what did each towing cost per month?

17. What was the total cost per month during the season of 1912 for tug-boat attendance on dredge Cape Breton?

18. Did the dredge Cape Breton finish the work to be done by the Public Works Department at Little Bras d'Or, county of Cape Breton?

19. What was the depth of the channel at low tide at Little Bras d'Or before this work was commenced?

20. What is the depth of water now in said channel at low tide at the point where the proposed dredging is completed?

21. What will be the uniform width and depth of the channel at low tide when the work is fully completed?

22. If the said work is not completed yet, how much remains to be done and when will the work be completed?

Mr. ROGERS:

1, 3, 4, 10, 12, and 13. Season 1910:

Port Hood, May 2, to June 30, 19,324 cubic yards; Little Bras d'Or, July 1 to November 12, 67,600 cubic yards; total, 86,925 cubic yards.

Season 1911:

McKinnon's Harbour, May 26 to June 5, 11,050 cubic yards; St. Anns, June 19 to July 15, 17,500 cubic yards; South Gut wharf, St. Anns, July 17, 1,260 cubic yards; Englishtown wharf, St. Anns, July 18 to 19, 1,260 cubic yards; North River wharf, St. Anns, July 20 to 21, 1,800 cubic yards; Bar, St. Anns, July 22, 720 cubic yards; Little Bras d'Or, July 28 to September 11, 36,400 cubic yards; St. Anns, September 28 to November 27, 15,575 cubic yards; North Sydney, December 7 to January 24, 7,350 cubic yards; total, 92,915 cubic yards.

Season 1912:

North Sydney, May 2 to May 15, 400 cubic yards; Baddeck, May 27 to June 10, 9,100 cubic yards; Port Hawkesbury, June 17 to July 16, 13,800 cubic yards; Little Bras d'Or, July 30 to August 3, 1,600 cubic yards; Alder Point, August 5 to August 10, 5,100 cubic yards; North Sydney, August 28 to August 31, 3,100 cubic yards; Little Bras d'Or, September 9 to September 19, 8,400 cubic yards; Alder Point, October 4 to November 30, 35,300 cubic yards; total, 76,800 cubic yards.

2. Peter Decoste.

5 and 14. Season 1910:

Port Hood, 77 cents per cubic yard. Little Bras d'Or, 50.6 cents per cubic yard.

Season 1911:

McKinnon's Harbour, 27.4 cents per cubic yard; St. Anns, 38.7 cents per cubic yard; St. Anns, South Gut, 24.1 cents per cubic yard; St. Anns, Englishtown wharf, 48.2 cents per cubic yard; St. Anns, North River wharf, 33.7 cents per cubic yard; St. Anns, Bar, 42.1 cents per cubic yard; Little Bras d'Or, 31.4 cents per cubic yard; St. Anns, $1.00 per cubic yard; North Sydney, $1.65 per cubic yard.

Season 1912 :—

North Sydney, 45·25 cents per c. yd.; Port Hawkesbury, 38·65 cents per c. yd.; Baddeck, 23·95 cents per c. yd.; Little Bras d'Or, 35·25 cents per c. yd.; Alder Point, 25·85 cents per c. yd.

6 and 15. Season 1910 :—Tug Fairy, Joseph Fraser & Sons, owners; tug Iona, registered in name of David Rudderham; tug Minora, A. & R. Loggie, owners; tug Nelson, registered in name of A. P. McLennan; tug Merrimac, North Sydney Tow Boat Company, owners; tug W. H. Weatherspoon, H. McDonald, owner. Season 1911 :—Tug Fairy, Joseph Fraser & Sons, owners; tug Maggie M., North Sydney Tow Boat Company, owners; tug Merrimac, North Sydney Tow Boat Company, owners; tug D. H. Thomas, Dominion Coal Company, Limited, owners. Season 1912 :—Tug Boonton, registered in name of David Rudderham; tug Nelson, Angus Young, owner; tug E. N. Cates, James Kelly, owner; tug D. H. Thomas, Dominion Coal Company, Limited, owners; tug F. L. M. Paint, T. Howard Macdonald, M.D., owner. Tugs Cates and Boonton employed regularly

under contract. Tugs Nelson, Thomas and Paint employed for special towing for 6, 2 and 2 days respectively.

7. Answered by 16.

8.

Tug.	Date Built.	Length.	Breadth.	Depth.	Registered Tons.	Horse-power.
Fairy	1881	37·1	11·2	5·3	9	8
Iona	1900	72·0	16·4	7·3	35	30
Minora	1904	95·0	20·6	9·5	81	45
Nelson	1885	78·4	14·7	7·0	44	21
Merrimac	1876	73·5	17·6	10·0	26	80
Boonton	1871	75·0	18·5	8·9	53	48
E. M. Cates	1869	73·0	18·5	7·9	46	23
D. H. Thomas	1892	116·5	21·0	13·0	98	57
F. L. H. Paint	1902	68·0	17·9	8·9	39	24
Maggie M	1888	68·3	16·3	8·7	45	30
Weatherspoon	1890	70·2	15·8	6·0	34	24

9 and 17.

Year.	April.	May.	June.	July.	August.	September.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1910	540 00	1,755 00	2,498 00	1,971 50	3,006 00	2,560 00
1911-12	.....	2,050 00	2,680 00	2,610 00	2,720 00	2,750 00
1912-13	52 50	1,330 00	1,931 25	2,396 50	1,905 00	945 00
	October.	November.	December.	January.	February.	March.
1910	2,608 00	2,600 00	188 00	400 00	.....	.....
1911-12	2,750 00	2,382 00	2,516 00	2,907 00	.....	.....
1912-13	1,040 00	1,040 00	.....	.....	.....	.....

16.

Tug.	Season 1910—Places.	Total cost.	Cost Per mile.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
Merrimac	Mulgrave to Port Hood	292 00	10 06
Minoru	" "	400 00	13 79
Nelson	Port Hood to Little Bras d'Or	180 00	1 46
Minoru	St. Peter's to Little Bras d'Or	150 00	2 15
Weatherspoon	Alder Pt. to Sydney	30 00	1 42
	Season 1911.		
Douglas H. Thomas	St. Ann's to North Sydney	100 00	2 50
	Season 1912.		
Douglas H. Thomas	North Sydney to Baddeck	100 00	1 89
F. L. M. Paint	Baddeck to Hawkesbury	131 25	1 64

18. No.

19. 7 feet.

20. 20 feet.

21. 120 feet wide and 20 feet deep outside; 80 feet wide and 18 feet deep inside.

22. 49,840 cubic yards to be removed. Approximately 17 weeks' work after commencement.

Mr. ROGERS.

HALIFAX DOCKYARD PROPERTY.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

Did the Government negotiate with the British Admiralty during 1912 for the purchase, lease, use or occupation of the dockyard property at Halifax, N.S., for the purpose of the Intercolonial railway? If so, what was the result of such negotiations?

Mr. BORDEN: That property and other properties was vested in the Government of Canada by an Order in Council of the Imperial Government some years ago. These properties were vested for certain purposes only and this particular property for the purpose of its continuance as a dockyard. It can only be used for other purposes upon certain conditions which are set out in the Order in Council. The subject of applying this property to another purpose was informally discussed during the past summer, but without any result up to the present time.

FREDERICTON MILITARY GROUNDS.

Mr. CARVELL:

1. Was the fence around the military grounds at Fredericton, N.B., built or repaired during the year 1912?
2. If so, was the work done by contract or by day labour?
3. What is the total cost of same?
4. Who was the inspector of said work?
5. What amount has been paid him to date and what is the total amount claimed?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Yes. Stone and iron fence now under construction.
2. Part contract, part day labour.
3. Estimated cost, $7,085.85.
4. Lieutenant Russell, R.C.E.
5. Nothing except his regimental pay.

INDIANS—SHELBURNE COUNTY.

Mr. LAW:

1. What persons has the Department of the Interior authorized the Indian agent in Shelburne county, Nova Scotia, to employ to supply medical attendance to Indians in Shelburne county?
2. What remuneration do they or each receive?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Drs. J. D. Densmore and L. O. Fuller are authorized by the Department of Indian Affairs to attend Indians of Shelburne county; and the Indian agent has authority to employ Dr. Burns in an urgent case when Dr. Fuller is absent from home.
2. Fifty cents one way for the distance travelled in visiting patients, also cost of medicine.

DISMISSAL AT JOLIETTE ARSENAL.

Mr. SEGUIN:

1. Has Mr. Joseph Lavoie, keeper of the arsenal at Joliette, been dismissed? If so, for what reason?
2. Who asked for his dismissal?
3. Who has been appointed in his place, and who recommended this appointment?
4. Was there an inquiry held?
5. What is the salary of Mr. Joseph Lavoie?
6. What is the salary of his successor?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax)

Mr. HUGHES:

1. Yes. Active political partisanship in the last federal elections.
2. Minister assumes responsibility.
3. Mr. Félix Misael Trudeau.
4. No.
5. $1.50 per diem, without quarters, fuel and light.
6. 1.50 per diem, without quarters, fuel and light.

ST. PETERS HARBOUR.

Mr. KYTE:

1. Has the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, or the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals received any protest from the harbour master or other residents of St. Peters against the contractor in charge of the St. Peters canal improvement, using the harbour for a dumping ground?
2. Has any communication on the subject been received from the resident engineer? If so, has any action been taken thereon?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No.
2. On May 15, the resident engineer in reporting on this work drew attention to the possibility of the material being dumped into the bay, being washed around the canal entrance. He was instructed to establish permanent reference works and closely watch the action of the tides on the material. The resulting information has shown that the silting is so slight as to be hard to determine. On December 9, the resident engineer reported that storms were damaging the toe of the dump slope and recommended that dumping at this point be temporarily discontinued, until such time as the contractor would be excavating rock; the clay now being excavated, to be deposited along the shore some distance east of the present dump.

TUBERCULOSIS.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the Department of Agriculture or the Minister of Agriculture, observed the following despatch which appeared in the Evening Citizen of Saturday, 14th December, 1912?

Berlin Physician conquering Tuberculosis—Uses serum which he gets from Turtles—Treatment is to be sent all over the World—Dr. Frederick Friedmann is World's expert in White Plague Treatment—A Remarkable Feat.

Special Correspondence, by William G. Shepherd.

Berlin, December 14.—The Christmas gift of science to the world is a cure for tuberculosis

Dr. Frederick Franz Friedmann, of Berlin, is the donor.

Two weeks ago Friedmann astounded German physicians by declaring in a public conference that he had been successfully treating tuberculosis for the past two years and

that he has now nearly six hundred cured cases to display to scientists.

He exhibited a considerable number of cured patients to the conference.

Many of the most scientific Germans admit Friedmann has discovered the long sought cure.

Several hospitals in Germany are now turning their tuberculosis cases over to him.

Scientists from America, Australia, England and other centres of the earth are hurrying to Berlin to investigate.

Appeals for the treatment by letter and telegram overwhelm the young doctor.

I spent ten hours in three visits with Dr. Friedmann. He showed me actual cases of cures. It was impossible for me to doubt.

2. If so, does the minister intend to become acquainted with the new method of curing consumption, by sending experts to Berlin to consult with Dr. Friedmann, to study the results of his treatment and provide the means by which our country may profit by the incalculable advantages of a possible discovery to check and even cause to disappear this terrible malady, which decimates our population?

Mr. BURRELL :

1. No. The despatch above referred to does not appear in the Evening Citizen of date the 14th December, 1912.

2. The Director General of Public Health has reported as follows with regard to the despatch above referred to:—

'The last information which has reached me in connection with this is the report of an address delivered by Dr. Friedmann before the Berlin Medical Society on November 6, in which he claims favourable results in numerous patients. His address was followed by a discussion, in which several speakers took part. Some said that they had seen good results in children with bone and joint tuberculosis; others spoke with some reserve; while some observers thought that the use of this method of treatment not free from danger. One speaker, Professor Goldscheider, complained that the description of the present conditions in the patients treated, especially of those with pulmonary tuberculosis, was not enough; at least, the results of the inoculation were doubtful; and Prof. Orth called attention to the fact that although guinea pigs treated lived longer, yet they all finally died of tuberculosis. One speaker challenged Friedmann to tell what his inoculation material actually is, but Friedmann, so far as we can learn, has not yet done so.

'I may say in general terms that the profession hesitates to accept any treatment with any material the nature of which is not published to the profession, and as a rule awaits the confirmation of the original discoverer's results by their being checked by the results of other observers in their use of the material during a somewhat extended time, and it is only as a rule after results have been so confirmed that they are accepted by the profession.

'A special Canadian expert sent to Berlin at this time to watch the treatment of the cases could not, therefore, obtain any material to experiment with himself; and it is a question whether the advantages of watching the treatment personally in the hands of Dr. Friedmann alone would so greatly outweigh the information to be gained by reading his literature, and the remarks of other members of the Berlin Medical Society, as to make it very desirable that a special Canadian expert be sent at this stage of the proceedings.'

The Department of Agriculture does not intend, at present, to send experts to Berlin to study the results of Dr. Friedmann's treatment or to consult with him.

SERVICE OF C. S. LANE.

Mr. LAW:

1. How much has been paid by the Government, or any department thereof, up to December 18, 1912, to Mr. C. S. Lane for services and expenses in connection with investigations into complaints or charges against officials?

2. If any accounts of Mr. Lane for remuneration or expenses have been rendered and not paid, what is the amount of the same?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Department of Customs, $7.50; Department of Marine and Fisheries, $235.28; Post Office Department, $491.20; Department of Public Works—services, $63.75; constable's account, $10.75; stenographer, $31.50; total, $106; Railways and Canals, $442.50; grand total, $1,282.48.

2. Post Office Department. $221.20.

COLD STORAGE WAREHOUSES.

Mr. VERVILLE:

1. What was the amount paid in subsidies to the different cold storage warehouses during the year 1912?

2. What are the names and the places of operation of these warehouses to which these subsidies have been paid?

Mr. BURRELL:

1. $148,448.04.

2. Trenton Cooperage Mills, Ltd., Trenton, Ont., $3,564,21; New Brunswick Cold Storage Co., St. John, N.B., $3,340; The Cold Storage, Ltd., Woodstock, N.B., $511.54; Campbell & Hamilton, Calgary, Alta., $12,300; St. Lawrence Produce Co., Brockville, Ont., $11,440; Dominion Fish & Fruit Co., Quebec, P.Q., $24,512.74; Gunns Limited, Harriston, Ont., $8,553; The B. Wilson Co., Ltd., Victoria, B.C., $3,040; Flavelles Limited, Lindsay, Ont., $11,660; Chatham Fruit Growers Association, Chatham, Ont., $1,731; Lockport Cold Storage Co., Ltd., Lockport, N.S., $6,507.04; O'Keefe & Drew Abattoir Co., Ltd., Chatham, Ont.,

$6,000; J. D. Moore Co., Ltd., St. Marys, Ont., $1,440.78; W. Scott & Co., Ltd., Peterborough, Ont., $290; Lemon Bros., Owen Sound, Ont., $400; Davis & Fraser, Charlottetown, P.E.I., $2,000; Halifax Cold Storage Co., Ltd., Hawkesbury, N.S., $607.73; Brantford Cold Storage Co., Ltd., Brantford, Ont., $3,300; Canadian Fish & Cold Storage Co., Ltd., Prince Rupert, B.C., $45,000; The Whyte Packing Co., Ltd., Mitchell, Ont., $2,250. Total, $148,448.04.

RIVER ST. LAWRENCE DAM.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Is the Minister of Public Works aware of the following article which appears in the Canadian Mail, of London, England, of the 7th December, ultimo:—

Two New Power Schemes—Vast Undertakings —Plans to Dam River St. Lawrence.

The Canadian Government are now considering two big power schemes which have been formulated, both with the object of damming the River St. Lawrence at two points between Montreal and Prescott. The schemes in question, both backed by powerful financial interests, are that of the Long Sault Development Company, promoted by the Aluminum Company of America, and that of the Eastern Canada Power Company, which is supported by Sir Max Aitken and Mr. D. Lorne McGibbon, together with other prominent capitalists in Canada, England, and the United States.

The proposal in regard to the Long Sault Development Company is to dam the river above the Long Sault rapids from the American to the Canadian side, with the idea of developing from 600,000 to 800,000 h.p. of electrical energy. The Eastern Canada Company's scheme is on an even more gigantic scale. If the plans are carried out it is expected that about 1,000,000 h.p. of electrical energy will be obtained. In order to appreciate the magnitude of this proposal some geographical knowledge of the district is necessary. It is proposed to raise the level of the river in the vicinity of Coteau, Cedar, Split Rock, and Cascade rapids to the level of the water in Lake St. Francis. This practically means damming the river from Cascade point to the Cornwall canal, and the retaining dams would connect various islands down the river for a distance of some fourteen miles. The intervening rapids would be obliterated and a portion of the Soulanges canal would be flooded.

Both schemes involve the development of power far outrivalling that of the Niagara Falls, and would completely alter the industrial conditions of Montreal and the eastern portion of Canada. They would also change the whole system of navigation from Prescott to Montreal.

2. What truth is there in the above article?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. No.

2. The Canadian Government is not now considering any such schemes as no application has been received lately by the Department of Public Works from either of these companies.

Mr. BURRELL.

CAP DE LA MADELEINE WHARF.

Mr. BUREAU :

1. Were any repair works done at the wharf at Cap de la Madeleine during the year 1912?

2. If so, by whom were they made, and who had the overseeing of the works?

3. Who recommended the overseer of these works?

4. Who determined the price to be paid to the men employed on these works, and who had the choice of the men?

5. What wages were paid to the men employed on these works, the wages paid to the day labourers and to the teamsters respectively?

6. What is the total amount expended for executing these repair works?

Mr. ROGERS :

1. Yes.

2. (a) Mr. District Engineer, F. X. T. Berlinguet. (b) L. H. Loranger.

3. Appointed by the district engineer.

4. The district engineer.

5. From $3.50 per day for master carpenter to $1.50 per day for common labourers. Teamsters were paid $3.50 per day to $2.50.

6. $1,071.42.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EMPLOYMENT OF CHAS. PATTERSON.

Mr. MACDONALD :

1. Is there a regulation in force on the Intercolonial railway that persons suffering from physical defect are not eligible for employment?

2. If so, was this rule applied in the case of Charles Patterson, employed as car checker at Westville in the county of Pictou?

3. Has Charles Patterson been appointed permanently as car checker at Westville?

Mr. COCHRANE :

1. There is no regulation in force on the Intercolonial railway to the effect that persons suffering from physical defect are not eligible for employment, but Section 15 of the Provident Fund Act provides that all employees must pass a medical examination in order to qualify as members of the provident fund.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. On April 11, 1912, instructions were issued that Mr. Charles R. Patterson should be employed as car checker at Westville, provided he was found to be a suitable man for the position and capable of complying with requirements regarding employees. On April 29, 1912, Superintendent Campbell reported that while Mr. Patterson had a defective hand he was competent for the work of car checking or most any other kind of clerical work. The agreement in effect with the Canadian Brotherhood of Railroad Employees, which covers car checkers and certain other classes of employees, provides that a person who works ten months or more during any one

year will be considered as a permanent employee for the purposes of that schedule.

ISAAC KENNEDY—CLAIM.

*Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. Has the Minister of Public Works received any claim from Isaac Kennedy, Douglastown, Quebec, resulting from an accident while at work on one of the Government works?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to investigate this matter and settle it?

Mr. ROGERS :

1. Yes.
2. The district engineer has been instructed to investigate and report.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What was the gross amount on deposit in the Post Office Savings Bank Department at the close of each year from 1907, including 1912?
2. What was the number of branches of the Post Office Savings Bank Department in operation at the close of each year mentioned in paragraph 1?

Mr. PELLETIER:

Date.	Amount.	Number of Offices.
March 31, 1907	$47,452,957.75	1,043
" 1908	47,564,284.28	1,084
" 1909	45,190,484.21	1,102
" 1910	43,586,357.42	1,133
" 1911	43,330,579.19	1,151
" 1912	43,563,764.33	1,172

SHIPPING AT CANADIAN PORTS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many registered tons of shipping entered and cleared from Canadian ports excluding the coasting tonnage, for the year ending March 31, 1912?
2. How much of the tonnage referred to in question was Canadian registered tonnage, how much British and how much foreign?

Mr. REID:

1. 52,973,127 tons.
2. Canadian, 18,069,983 tons; British, 13,342,929 tons; foreign, 21,560,215 tons.

CANADIAN COASTING TRADE.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Has any change or changes been made since October 11, 1911, in the regulations by which foreign ships are permitted to engage in the Canadian coasting trade? If so, what are the changes?

Mr. REID: No.

OCEAN FREIGHT.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. How many tons of ocean-going freight was carried to and from Canadian seaports for the year ending March 31, 1912?
2. What percentage of freight referred to in question 1 was carried in Canadian bottoms, what percentage in British, and what percentage in foreign bottoms?

Mr. REID:

1. 7,324,126 tons weight; 1,813,208 tons measurement.
2. Canadian 10.5 per cent of tons weight; 12.7 per cent of tons measurement; British 56 per cent of tons weight; 56.2 per cent of tons measurement; foreign 33.5 per cent of tons weight; 31.1 per cent of tons measurement.

PRINCE RUPERT MARINE DEPOT.

*Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Were tenders called for the construction of a marine depot at Prince Rupert?
2. If so, what were the amounts of the tenders respectively?
3. Was the lowest accepted?
4. Who obtained the contract and what was the amount?
5. Has the contract been completed?
6. Has any amount been claimed by the contractor for extras or in addition to the contract price? If so, what was the amount?
7. Has the Government paid anything in excess of the contract price, or does it intend to pay such addition?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes.
2. Pacific Coast Construction Company, Limited, Victoria, B.C., $159,445; Wm. Henry Russell Humber, Victoria, B.C., $159,500; Wm. Geo. Gillett, Vancouver, B.C., $218,794; Northern Construction Company, Prince Rupert, B.C., $275,000.
3. Yes.
4. The Pacific Coast Construction Company, Limited, $159,445.
5. Yes.
6. Yes. $13,020.
7. Yes, the Government has paid $10,261 for extras in connection with this contract.

NAVAL SCHOONER ADVOCATE.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. What was the date of the purchase by the Government of the naval schooner Advocate?
2. Was it purchased before or after the Government had decided to abandon the Act respecting the Naval Service of Canada, assented to 4th May, 1910?
3. When was it put into commission?
4. Has it been fitted out for practical instruction of cadets in seamanship under the law of the 4th May, 1910, or on account of any urgency of naval defence of Canada?
5. From whom was it purchased?
6. How much did the Government pay for it?
7. Was it a new boat or an old boat?
8. What was its original cost of construction?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. 29th September, 1911.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Immediately.
4. This schooner is used in the training of naval cadets at the Royal Naval College.
5. Mr. J. W. McLachlan of Lunenburg, N.S.
6. $5,800.
7. The Advocate was built at Lunenburg in March 1909.
8. No information in Department.

HUDSON BAY RAILWAY—ONE-MILE STRIP.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Has a strip of the public land, one mile in width, along the line of the Hudson Bay railway, been closed against settlement?
2. If so, for what object and under what section of the statute?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes.
2. In the public interest of the Hudson Bay railway under the Dominion Lands Act.

PRESENTATION OF RETURNS.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Before the Orders of the Day are called I should like to draw the attention of the Government to a matter of some importance. A great number of motions for returns have been made during the session so far, and for my part I find it very difficult to follow whether or not returns have been made in response to the several motions. I do not know whether other hon. gentlemen have met with the same difficulty. I wish to ask the Government if it would be objectionable on their part to present to the House shortly, say at the end of this month, or perhaps periodically, a tabulated statement detailing the motions for returns of papers and setting forth which of them have been brought down up to date. I think it would be a matter of great convenience to members if this could be done without very much trouble to the Government.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not think that the Government could very well undertake any work of that kind. When I was sitting on the other side of the House, I suffered to some extent from the embarrassment which my hon. friend is experiencing in regard to the bringing down of returns. I used to arrange with the Clerk of the House to have such a statement prepared from time to time, and I think my hon. friend would have no difficulty in carrying out the same arrangement. I should be glad to facilitate the matter in any way within my power.

Mr. DEVLIN.

Mr. EMMERSON: Would it not be possible to have a notice sent to each member when a return has been made in response to a motion that has been presented by that member?

Mr. BORDEN: At one time the practice did obtain of having the answers handed in in duplicate so that a copy might be sent to the member. That could be carried out if desirable, or an arrangement could be made with the Clerk of the Records, if he is the proper person, to send a notice to the member who had moved for the return that it had been brought down. The Clerk informs me that the latter course is being pursued at the present time. I was not aware of it.

Mr. EMMERSON: It would be preferable to have a duplicate of the return, and it would not add to the cost of preparing it.

Mr. BORDEN: I think there has been no precedent in regard to bringing down returns in duplicate. However, I will take into consideration the suggestion of my hon. friend.

BRITISH EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. JAMES J. DONNELLY (South Bruce). Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the Government, and particularly of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Burrell) to a dispatch in this morning's issue of the Ottawa Citizen, as follows:

London, January 15.—Hon. Mr. Runciman informed Captain Compbell in the House of Commons yesterday that the Government did not contemplate the removal of the embargo on Canadian cattle. During the past two years, he said, glanders, sheepscab, rabies and tuberculosis had existed among Canadian stock.

Captain Murray to obviate the difficulty suggested the purchase of a small island on the west coast of Scotland to be utilized as a Canadian quarantine station but no reply was given.

This is a question of very considerable importance to stock breeders of Canada. This embargo on Canadian cattle, I have good reason to believe, has been enforced in the past, not for the purpose of protecting British cattle from the disease, but for the purpose of protecting British cattle raisers from competition in the British market. I have no desire to object to any government giving a fair measure of protection to its own people, but I do object to that protection being given at the expense of the good name of our Canadian cattle. I would ask if it is the intention of the Government to take action to establish the fact that our cattle are free from disease at the present time.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Minister of Agriculture): I noticed the dispatch to which the hon. member for South Bruce (Mr. Donnelly) has directed the attention of the Government. Also, we received a cable from the High Commissioner's office to-day informing us that Mr. Runciman, in answering a question in the British House of Commons as to whether they intended to remove the embargo on Canadian cattle, stated that they did not contemplate any legislation of that kind. My hon. friend, I am sure, is familiar with the facts, but I may say to the House that it was in 1892 that the British Government, or the Board of Agriculture rather, owing to an alleged case of pleuro-pneumonia found in a shipment of 750 head of Canadian cattle, put into force this regulation. They could not prove their case, and, notwithstanding that 3,000,000 head of Canadian cattle have been slaughtered in Great Britain, not a single case of pleuro-pneumonia has been found. Still, they maintained the policy, and, in 1896, crystallized it in legislation. As my hon. friend and others interested know, from that time until the present continual representations have been made to the British Government that there were no grounds sufficient to justify their establishing this embargo on Canadian cattle. I need not go over the whole series of negotiations. It became evident that the British Government were determined to adhere to what had become a settled policy. In 1907, I think it was, Lord Elgin transmitted to Lord Grey, then Governor General of Canada, a letter from the Board of Agriculture in which were set forth the reasons why they maintained this policy. The effect of it was that they did not do it in order to prohibit or restrict trade, but purely on account of the enormous open border line between us and the country to the south; that it was not a stigma upon Canadian cattle, but was a sanitary measure to prevent the introduction of the disease and so was necessary in the interest of British agriculturists. The question was left there, because it was evidently not consistent with the self-respect of Canada that we should go on beseeching in this manner a government that was evidently determined not to open the question again. I desire to say just a word with regard to what Mr. Runciman stated as to diseases like glanders, rabies, sheep-scab and tuberculosis existing in this country,—the implication in the press despatch, I suppose, being that therefore they were justified in an exclusion measure of this kind. In that connection, I would only say that it cannot be contended that glanders does not exist in Great Britain. So far as this country is concerned, we have practically wiped it out in Eastern Canada and we are doing what we can—and I think with some measure of success—to control it in Western Canada. As to rabies, that is a pest that they can keep out, as, owing to their insular position they can isolate the cases. We have only a very few cases,—but one during the past year, I think. As to sheep-scab, that is practically non-existent in Canada at the present time. As to bovine tuberculosis, it cannot be contended by the British authorities that their country is in any better position than ours in regard to this disease. And I think that this Government will be able to show soon that we are moving against that disease more rapidly than they. As to other diseases, like anthrax——

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) is extending the discussion beyond what is allowed under the rule.

Mr. BURRELL: Mr. Speaker, I have nearly finished. I referred at first to the diseases to which the paper referred. But there are diseases of which we have not any in Canada, while they have them in Great Britain. And, while I am referring to this question, let me point out that foot and mouth disease is prevalent in Great Britain and exists in several counties, and we have never had a case in Canada. In conclusion, I can only say to my hon. friend and to the House, that I do not think that any good could result from opening up this question with the British authorities. We are all agreed that they are not justified by the facts or conditions in Canada in keeping on that embargo. Whether they are justified in their protection or not is a question that I would not care to discuss here. But I think we would not move in the matter again.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC THREE PER CENT BONDS.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved that the House go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorize and empower the Governor in Council to purchase at par from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company such of the three per cent bonds of the company the issue and sale of which is provided for by chapter 98 of the Statutes of 1905, and the deed of trust set forth in schedule A to said chapter 98, as may be unsold at the time of the passing of an Act that may be founded on this resolution.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee, Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair.

Mr. WHITE: The proposals of the Government embodied in this resolution arise out of a judgment of the Judicial Commit-

tee of the Privy Council, which I brought to the attention of the House last session. It is, I think, within the knowledge of the House that by two agreements, dated respectively 1903 and 1904, between the Government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, the Government undertook to guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company issued in respect of its western division to an amount not exceeding $13,000 per mile upon the prairie section, and not exceeding three-fourths of the cost of construction of the mountain section. In pursuance of these agreements, and of the legislation validating them, a trust mortgage was entered into by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, covering bonds so to be issued and guaranteed. The total amount of that authorized issue was limited under the terms of the mortgage to £14,000,000, and there were provisions in the mortgage whereby the bonds should be sold from time to time, and their proceeds deposited, as is usual in such cases, to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada, to be paid out upon the issue of certificates showing the progress of construction of the railway from time to time. I may say that those bonds were fifty-year bonds, maturing in 1962. They bear interest at the rate of three per cent, and are guaranteed absolutely, as to principal and interest, by the Dominion of Canada. Under the terms of the statute validating the agreement of 1904, it is provided that those bonds may be sold from time to time, with the consent of the Receiver General of Canada and of the Governor in Council.

I may explain that in 1903, at the time the first agreement was entered into, it was thought that the three per cent bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada, would sell at about par. By the year 1904 it became apparent that that expectation would not be realized, and in the agreement of that year there was inserted a clause—commonly known as the 'implementing clause'—whereby the Government agreed to implement its guarantee to the extent of the difference between the selling value of the Grand Trunk Pacific bonds and par. That is to say, if the bonds should sell at less than par, the Government would implement its guarantee to produce par, the intention evidently being that the par value of the bonds should be available for the purposes of the construction work of the railway company. A dispute arose between the Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company as to the interpretation of that clause, the Government contending that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should issue additional bonds to be guaranteed by the Government, so that the Government's liability would be secondary and not primary, and that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company should be liable, as makers of the bonds, for the amount required to implement, so as to realize the par value of the bonds sold at less than par. The railway company, on the contrary, contended that the Government should make good the amount of difference in cash. The Supreme Court of Canada held in favour of the contention of the Government, but, on appeal to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, this decision was reversed, and as a consequence the Government of Canada is to-day responsible to pay in cash the amount of difference between the selling value of the bonds to which I refer, and par.

The issues already made are as follows: In 1905, £3,200,000, par value of the bonds were sold at 92½ net. In 1909, £2,000,000 sold at 80 net; in 1910, £2,000,000 sold at £80 3s. 9d. net. The amount required to make up the difference between the selling value of those bonds and par was $4,994,000, and, under the authority of an Act which was passed by this Parliament last session, the Government paid in the sum of $4,994,000 to the credit of the Receiver General, to be dealt with in the same way as the proceeds of the bonds are dealt with under the provisions of the mortgage; that is to say, to be applied in payments to the railway company from time to time as the work of construction progresses.

There now remains to be sold £6,800,000 of bonds. I have explained to the House that the amount of the mortgage was limited to £14,000,000, if so much should be required. There remains, as I have stated, this £6,800,000, the par value of bonds still to be issued under the terms of the mortgage. As there appears to have been considerable misapprehension on the part of some of the newspapers as to what the Government proposes to do, I may say that it is not the intention of the Government to go on the market and purchase these bonds which have been issued, but it is the intention of the Government from time to time to purchase from the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, at par, the balance of the bonds. With regard to the bonds which have already been issued, and with regard to the bonds which are still to be sold, the House will understand that the Government has already paid out $4,994,000 for which it has nothing whatever to show, and if the remaining £6,800,000 of bonds were sold at the prevailing prices, the Government would have to pay about $8,000,000 more in implementing; that is to say, a total of about $13,000,000 would have to be paid by the Government by virtue of this judgment of the Judicial Committee of the

Privy Council. The way that calculation is made is this: the Grand Trunk Pacific bonds are quoted on the London Stock Exchange to-day at about 78 or 79. When an issue of bonds of any large amount is being made, it usually has to be offered to the public at a point or two below the prevailing market, because of the amount that is offered. Taking into account the commission, underwriting expenses, and other outlays in connection with the selling of bonds, about 2 per cent should be further deducted. The result is that the Grand Trunk Pacific 3 per cent bonds, guaranteed by the Dominion of Canada, as to principal and interest, would realize, at the prevailing prices, only about 75 net; that is to say, the Government would have to implement to the extent of 25 points on each bond, and that, as I say, upon the remaining bonds which are to be issued, would amount to over $8,000,000. Now, if the Government paid out the $8,000,000, of course the Dominion would have nothing to show for it, although the £6,800,000 bonds would be in the hands of the public who would purchase them at the price I have mentioned, let us say 76 or 78. I propose, therefore, to endeavour to save at least something from the situation, and fortunately, by reason of the buoyant revenues of the country this year, I am in a position to do so without injuring or straining in any way the credit of the Dominion. It would be unfair for me to tell the House that we can save over $8,000,000 for the reason that the Dominion has to pay on long date loans more than 3 per cent. In other words, if we go on the market and borrow the money we would issue our standard security, that is, a 3½ per cent security. Therefore it would not be proper to say that we are saving $8,000,000. But there is this fact to which I drew the attention of the House last year that an obligation, which is a direct obligation either on the Dominion or of a company, always sells at a higher price than an obligation that is guaranteed by the Dominion or by a company. In the case of these bonds the security is precisely as good as the Dominion 3½ per cent security for the reason that the guarantee is absolute both as to principal and interest, but by reason of the fact that a guaranteed bond never sells as well as a bond which is a direct liability, and by reason further of the fact that trustees are not allowed in Great Britain to invest in debentures or bonds guaranteed by the Dominion, but are allowed to invest in bonds which are a direct liability of the Dominion, there is a difference in selling value of about say six or eight points or about seven points. That is to say, if you take the price at which the guaranteed bonds to which I am referring are selling on the London market, and take the price at which the Dominion bonds are selling and put the Dominion bonds on the same basis, and make them mature in 1962, that would institute a fair comparison between the direct obligation of the Dominion and these guarantee bonds. That is to say, it is 3½ per cent debenture stock and on those guaranteed bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway you have a difference of a little over six points in favour of the Dominion. That is to say, if the Dominion went on the market and borrowed, it would save six points upon the amount which it is required to implement in respect to these £6,800,000 bonds. Now, that would amount to something over $2,000,000; but I expect to have a considerable amount of money on hand at the end of this year which will be available for the purpose of purchasing at par a large amount of those bonds and the balance of payments will be spread over the next few years. Therefore, in so far as the Dominion has on its hands money for which it has not an immediate investment, we will have the 3 per cent securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific guaranteed absolutely as to principal and interest by the Dominion, and even if we were obliged to borrow to make good the whole amount which we are required to implement in respect to the issue of bonds it would result in something over $2,000,000 of advantage to the Dominion Government. I may say that the Grand Trunk Pacific guaranteed bonds sell on a basis of 4.05 per cent and the Dominion direct obligation debentures upon a 3¾ per cent basis.

There is another consideration that I think should not be lost sight of in addition to what we save in respect to the implementing. There is the further fact that it is inadvisable, at least that is my judgment, that the guaranteed bonds of the Dominion should sell as low as 76 or 77 on an issue. Once you get away from the interest rate that is standard so far as the Dominion is concerned the quotation is frequently misunderstood, and it looks as if the Dominion securities were selling at 76 or 77, which is not the fact. The public might draw the conclusion that these guaranteed securities of the Dominion are not the undoubted securities that they are. Of course anyone who understands the situation would know that they are on a parity with the other guaranteed securities of the Dominion. The explanation I have given will, I hope, be sufficiently full for the present purpose.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: The Bill introduced by my hon. friend of necessity requires a good deal of technical explanation and to the members of the House who have not had some previous knowledge of the situation it may be a trifle difficult to follow. For my own part, I may say that

the explanation of the Minister of Finance is very clear and exactly to the point, and it states the circumstances as fairly as they could possibly be stated. His remarks concerning the undisputed fact that an indirect security if I may call it such, does not bring as high a price as a direct security, are borne out by the business transactions of every day, particularly where governments are concerned. The members from Ontario will remember that in the construction of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway it was at first designed that the money should be secured by a guarantee of bonds for the road by a certain method which I will not detain the House to describe. It was not long before the treasurer of the province discovered that he could not realize on a security of that kind as good a price as he could on the direct security of the province of Ontario itself. Consequently that method was abandoned, and the province borrowed directly, and dealt with it in a direct manner, thus making a better bargain than it could possibly have made by bonds issued by other parties and secured by the province. I suppose there is a reason for these things which financiers understand, although it is difficult for an ordinary person like myself to understand why a bond secured by the Dominion of Canada should not bring as good a price as one issued directly by the Dominion. But it is the case nevertheless. The reason is, I suppose, that the Dominion becomes the secondary security instead of the first, and thus makes the collection of the amount due somewhat of a more far-reaching transaction, a little more hazardous perhaps, although I should hardly say that, than it would be if there was a direct obligation. Under the arrangement made between the Grand Trunk Pacific and the late Government, as my hon. friend would discover, there was what is known in the second agreement as an implementing clause which provided briefly that the Grand Trunk Pacific for the purposes of construction should realize par on its bonds. The late Minister of Finance argued that it did not mean that the Dominion of Canada should implement with cash the difference between the selling price and par, but that the Dominion should guarantee further securities in order to allow that deficiency to be made up. The Supreme Court upheld that view; on appeal the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council reversed the decision, and in view of that decision the present Government, acting through the Minister of Finance, has taken the very wise step I think that that hon. gentleman has announced to the House today of the Government purchasing the securities themselves at par instead of allowing them to be sold at much less than par and implementing the difference by cash. Speaking for myself, in view of the decision of the Privy Council, I think the step is a wise one, in the interest of the Grand Trunk Pacific and in the interest of Canada; in addition to which there is this secondary reason that above all we must maintain our credit as a country in the money markets of the world. We cannot afford to see the bonds guaranteed by Canada selling at the price that they would sell at under the present circumstances. As far as I am concerned and knowing the history of the situation, I fully agree with the measure brought before the House by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): There is another question that arises out of this proposition and it is this: Why should not the courts of Canada be the final interpreters of legislation passed in this country dealing absolutely with Canadian questions? This question also comes up in connection with the legislation of the province of Ontario which has sole jurisdiction in municipal affairs. We are passing laws in Ontario dealing with municipal questions, largely settled by the best judgment of our provincial legislatures. These laws are upheld by the provincial courts and by the Supreme Court of Canada and yet they are subject to transference to England and to submission to the judicial committee of the Privy Council there. Almost invariably its decisions are against the Canadian authorities, against the intentions of the legislature and, as in this case, against the intention of parliament when it passed the original Grand Trunk Pacific contract. I think it is time that we ought to consider this question from this point of view. I can conceive that it might, in a way, injure the credit of Canada if the final interpretation of Canadian legislation on purely local matters should be in the hands of our own courts. But, it is a matter well worthy of the consideration of this House and of the legislatures of this country whether we should not limit to the higher courts in Canada appeals in connection with the interpretation of our own legislation. If that were the case a very serious issue as to what are the municipal rights of Ontario and what are the rights of municipalities as against private corporations receiving franchises and other things from the provincial authorities would be referred to the provincial or Canadian courts. I take this occasion to say that the matter is worthy of the most careful attention on the part of this parliament and of the legislatures as to whether we

should not limit the interpretation to our own courts.

There is another question that I would like to ask the Government in connection with this proposition and I suppose it is in order. I would like to ask whether the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway company have asked for any additional financial assistance and, inasmuch as we are passing this legislation, whether any arrangement has yet been made, or whether any negotions had taken place, between the Government and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway for taking over any portion of the National Transcontinental railway and running it as it was understood it would be run under the original agreement.

Mr. LEMIEUX : I do not wish to discuss the resolution brought forward by the hon. Minister of Finance. I share the views which have been expressed by my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). But my ear was caught by the remarks which were made by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean). There is a true ring of Canadianism in his remarks, although I am afraid he may be taken to task when he returns to his electors should he undertake to express the same views in that section of the country. Speaking seriously, about the relations of our courts with the Privy Council I must say that in Quebec we are perfectly satisfied with the appeals which are taken to the highest court in the Empire—that is to say the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. We have limited, it is true, to a certain class, appeals to that high tribunal, but the people of our province are perfectly satisfied with the judgments that have been rendered by that high court of justice. But, I am bound to say that there are people who are not satisfied with that court, and I know, for instance, that the right hon. gentleman who has been considered as the guardian angel of Canada in Imperial politics, Mr. Chamberlain, has made several assaults on that tribunal. At the conferences in 1897 and 1902 he suggested an Imperial Court of Appeal to be constituted differently from the present judicial committee of the Privy Council, but fortunately the Prime Ministers of all the colonies who were representing their dominions at those conferences objected so strenuously that Mr. Chamberlain's plan failed. We must remember that Mr. Chamberlain refused also, on the floor of the Imperial Parliament, the request made by the authors or fathers of the Australian constitution. The Australians were opposed to any appeal except upon constitutional questions to the judicial committee of the Privy Council, and they succeeded in carrying their view. But Mr. Chamberlain opposed that very strenuously. Again I say that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean), representing a constituency which is so much imbued with the ideas and principles of Mr. Chamberlain, will have something to explain to his electors. But, I commend his sound Canadianism. I am glad to hear such true notions of our country's rights coming from my hon. friend.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): I did not rise for the purpose of making any extended remarks upon the resolution which has been explained by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance. All the facts were put before the House last year by him in a very clear manner, and I think are well understood by the House now. I would hardly be inclined to agree with the suggestion of the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) that in all cases the interpretation of statutes should be limited to the judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada. But, I venture to remark that in cases with respect to transactions between companies or individuals and governments, where the facts of the agreement or agreements clearly point to a certain conclusion and where these facts have not been clearly set forth in the legislation covering the agreement, Parliament itself might make what was the understanding perfectly clear by amending legislation. In this particular case the issue between the Government and the company was whether the implementing between the selling price and par of the guaranteed stock should be done by an additional issue of stock or by a payment of cash on the part of the Government representing the difference between the selling price and the par value. When this matter was before the House last year, I was impressed with the idea that all the facts clearly pointed to an understanding between the Government and the company that the implementing was to be made by an additional issue of bonds. If I remember correctly the Minister of Finance stated last year that in an estimate presented on behalf of the company an additional estimate of cost was added to meet the expected depreciation in the price of the bonds which were to be sold. If that be the fact, it might have been strictly proper for Parliament before referring the points of difference to the courts, to have taken the matter in our own hands, and said by legislation that the implementing should have been in the form of an additional issue of bonds. However, the matter was considered last session and definite action taken in another way and I suppose it must now stand. I desire to concur in the action proposed by the Minister of Finance on behalf of the Government. I think the course he intends to pursue is in every respect a busi-

ness-like and proper one. This same course was suggested last year by the hon. member for Welland and the question arose whether or not it would be wise on the part of the Government to borrow money at three and a half per cent. in order to purchase the Grand Trunk Pacific three per cent bonds. I think the Minister of Finance took the position, and properly so, that that would be a very doubtful procedure. Of course, as matters stand at present, the Minister of Finance has at his control a large surplus this year, and I think he is doing what is quite proper in using that for the purpose he proposes. I would like to ask him if he does not consdier it advisable that the measure should contain a provision for enabling the Government to dispose of these bonds so purchased at any time they had reached a price which would justify the Government in realizing on them.

Mr. WHITE: In the Bill authority is given to the Government to borrow for the purpose of purchasing these bonds, if they should deem it advisable to do so. However, the Bill authorizes the Government to purchase the whole or any part of the issue. The Government has complete control. It is conceivable that a condition may arise, although I do not think it will, in which the Government may be willing that the Grand Trunk railway should sell a portion of the bonds under the terms of the mortgage. My present intention is that the Government shall purchase these bonds during the next couple of years. I am hopeful we will be able to do that without borrowing, but of course I cannot say that definitely. That is why I rather elaborated the point that it would pay the Government to issue its securities at three and a half per cent, and buy these in, because it would be advantageous to the extent of six or seven points. No doubt my hon. friend realizes that in so far as putting an issue on the market is concerned, all bonds guaranteed by the Dominion go on the market on the strength of the Dominion credit, and, therefore, unless under very unusual circumstances, there would not be much difference so far as market considerations are concerned, in issuing a Dominion three and a half per cent. security or in allowing the Grand Trunk Pacific to put on a three per cent bond as they have in the past. The point I make is that if we have idle money upon which we derive no interest, then we we can buy the bonds which yield three per cent. If, on the other hand, we deem it advisable to borrow the money, we will still make seven points in borrowing the money and purchase the securities. I understood my hon. friend from Halifax to suggest that it might have been expedient for Parliament to have put through an Act whereby the Grand Trunk Pacific would be compelled to issue securities guaranteed by the Government to an amount sufficient to implement. I do not know whether my hon. friend has considered the question from the standpoint of the credit of the Dominion. It must be remembered that the Dominion and the railway company submitted themselves to the Supreme Court and to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I agree with the hon. gentleman that would never have done after the matter had been submitted to the courts.

Mr. WHITE: After having submitted the case to the court and after the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, there was nothing else for the Dominion to do but to bring in a bill as I did authorizing the payment of the amount.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): My suggestion was as to before the judgment was rendered.

Mr WHITE: Yes, I understand that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I desire to express a difference of opinion from that given by my hon. friend from Halifax. I think it would have been exceedingly improper for the Government to have asked Parliament to pass a law changing the rights of the Government and the company respectively. It would have been an exceedingly improper thing to do. The effect would have been that Parliament would say to the company: We intended to do so and so; we did not know what views you might have taken of the legislation, but our intention in passing the Act was to create certain obligations and rights; we have not made it so clear as that the court would decide in favour of the Crown and, therefore, we will ask Parliament to amend the law so as to make it absolutely clear that the contention of the Government should be sustained. That would be, in my judgment, entirely unjustifiable legislation. It would be ex post facto legislation; it would take away the vested rights of this company, and I cannot but think that the late Government did what was eminently proper when they decided to refer the matter to the courts. I do not think this Parliament had any more right to legislate with respect to the rights which were affected by that agreement before the matter was referred to the courts, then they would have to legislate after the decision had been made by the courts.

Mr. BORDEN: What my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) has just stated is particularly applicable to what

was a contract in the first instance. It is perfectly apparent I think that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company are thoroughly imbued with the view which eventually prevailed, even if the other party to the contract had an entirely different impression. I think my hon. friend from Halifax will see what an exceedingly dangerous precedent it would be for one of the parties to the contract, having the administration of affairs with a majority in Parliament, were to use that majority for the purpose of making its view prevail. Such a course of action would put an end to all confidence in the observance of contractual relations by the Government, and therefore I entirely agree that the late administration took a perfectly proper course in submitting this question to the courts for determination. My hon. friend from South York asked some questions.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): As to financial aid, and as to further negotiations in taking over the Transcontinental.

Mr. BORDEN: I do not think those questions are exactly pertinent to this matter. So far as I am aware there no pending proposals for financial aid on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific. As far as the other matter is concerned, the operation of the line, two questions are involved: First, operation of such portions of the line as have been completed, pending the final completion of the whole line. The Minister of Railways and Canals has that under consideration. He is making certain arrangements, and I think they have been consummated, for operation by the Government of certain portions of the line, the Government and the company having failed to come to an interim agreement respecting the operation of those portions of the line by the company in the meantime. So far as the operation of the road after the completion of the whole line is concerned, my hon. friend from South York will no doubt remember that very full provision had been made in the contract and the Acts which were passed in 1903 and 1904 with regard to that. The period was fixed; the basis of the rental was fixed, and other provisions were made. That agreement cannot be entered into until the whole line has been completed.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARP (North Ontario): I just rise to ask the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Pugsley) how he can reconcile his present position with the stand he took when the Canada Life Assurance Bill was before this House. As I understand it, that Bill was an interpretation of the statute that interfered with the policyholders of the Canada Life, notwithstanding that a writ had been issued to define the rights of the parties. The hon. member for St. John who was a member of the Government which supported that Bill, now says that he deems it highly improper for the Government to put any interpretation upon the Grand Trunk Pacific Act. I cannot understand how he takes the position he does to-day.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not recall what were the provisions of the Bill relating to the Canada Life Assurance Company. I am sure I did not express any view which would not be in harmony with the view which I expressed a few minutes ago. I do not think this legislation is at all proper. There may have been circumstances in the Canada Life case which were out of the general rule; there are no circumstances in this case which would prevent the principle which I mentioned being acted upon, just as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister says it should be acted upon.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): In reply to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) I wish to say that we have gone to great expense in Canada in building up a supreme court, and its judgments are not carrying to-day in the eyes of the world that standing and reputation that to my mind they should carry and which Canadians expect them to carry. Too many of those decisions have been reversed by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and it is a rather regrettable thing that the Supreme Court, which we have created at such great expense and to which we thought we might look for final decisions, has not become a court of final appeal so far as this country is concerned. I should like to see that court strengthened and stand before all the world as the final interpreter of Canadian law and Canadian rights. It is the duty of this Parliament, having established that court, to see that it be what it was intended to be, always reserving the right to appeal to the Judicial Committee in matters involving civil rights of individuals and the interpretation of the constitution. The Supreme Court ought to be built up, and should have the reputation of the Supreme Court of the United States. Its decisions should be final before all the world, and carry a respect for Canadian institutions in the same way as the United States Supreme Court carries a respect for United States institutions. My contention is that the final court of Canada, the Supreme Court, ought to be the interpreter, and the sole and last interpreter, of the legislation of this Parliament. I would go as far as to say that when this Parliament makes a formal agreement involving the credit of the country and the voting of millions of dollars for the creation of a National Trans-

continental system, the national court ought to be the interpreter of the law in connection with it. We can build up a court here in Canada which will give a final decision, one that will carry respect. If it is to be carried on as it has been, those judgments will not carry the respect they should carry. In most important business matters, it is usually inserted in the contract what the court or body is to which the last appeal is to be made. If I happen to be in this House again and a contract of this nature is going through, I certainly would like to see a clause inserted in that contract setting out that the final appeal shall be in Canada. If municipalities or provinces enter into negotiations or make contracts with corporations of one kind or another, I tell them that they should set forth in the contract that the final legislation shall be the provincial court. There is no way in which we can guard our municipal, provincial and federal rights so much as in our own courts. I give every credit to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as being a court of the very highest character, and a court which would do absolute justice in so far as it might be able to do so; but I think an Imperial Court of last resort might be created with full representation in that court of all the dominions, instead of being made up as it now is almost exclusively of members of the courts of Great Britain. As a Canadian who wishes to see our institutions become Canadian and suitable to the wants of Canadians, I say it is time we considered this matter, and having established a Supreme Court that we should see that it is the final resort, and that it is of such a character that its judgments will carry respect all over the world. I think I voice the view of a good many Canadians, when I say that. My hon. friend refers to Mr. Chamberlain. It is true, he is Mr. Chamberlain; but I am Mr. Maclean, and I have a seat in this House, and I am a Canadian; and I assert the view —and it is my view, and perhaps it is not unacceptable to Canadians—that Canada is good enough by her own courts to interpret Canadian legislation and maintain Canadian rights, whether they be municipal, provincial or federal; but always reserving to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council the interpreting of the Constitution; for the Constitution was made in England, and that is the proper place to interpret that constitution. If I properly estimate the development of public opinion in Canada, in a very short time, the Parliament of Canada will really be the maker of even our own constitution, while still maintaining the closest tie with the Old Land, Canada being under the Crown of England.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York).

Mr. EMMERSON: I am very heartily in accord with the sentiments expressed by my hon. friend from South York. I am glad that there is an hon. member of this House who has the courage to speak out in the manner in which he has spoken this afternoon. It is a rugged Canadianism, but it is true Canadianism. I think that the same view is held, very largely, if not completely, by many throughout this Dominion. And I am sure that if one takes the trouble to review the judgments that have been delivered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council dealing with Canadian affairs under conditions and amid an environment entirely foreign to this country and in an atmosphere different from that of Canada, he will soon understand that the Supreme Court of Canada is in a better position, in very many respects if not in all, to give a true interpretation of laws passed under the conditions which prevail in Canada. I wish only to express my hearty concurrence in the views which have been so ably stated by my hon. friend from South York.

Mr. THOBURN: Before this motion passes, I desire to refer to a point which has not been touched upon so far as I have learned. It is this. These bonds were issued at three per cent. The Government of that day must have been aware that it was not possible to get anything like par value for them, being issued at such a low rate of interest. What object had the Government of that day in issuing the bonds at three per cent when they must have been aware that no bonds were being negotiated in Great Britain at that time at such a low rate? Would it not have been of greater advantage to the Government to have issued the bonds at rates that would have yielded par or as near par as possible? Had this been done the Government would not have been called upon to implement such a large sum of money as they are called upon to implement to-day. Possibly the ex-Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) might answer that question. And I would ask the Minister of Finance (Mr. White) if in his opinion, it was in the best interests of the Govenrment to issue bonds at the low rate of three per cent.

Mr. GRAHAM: Perhaps at the time referred to the hon. gentleman was a member of the House. I was not a member of the House, much less a member of the Government. But it is a fact, I believe that at that time the Government rate of interest was three per cent. In fact, the Dominion of Canada was then borrowing at as low a rate as two and three-quarters per cent.

Mr. DEVLIN: Before we pass on to another question, and without entering into the discussion of the bond issue, I wish

to say a word in connection with the remark which the hon. member for South York made. We, in the province of Quebec, have had entire satisfaction in the interpretation given to our laws by the Lords of the Privy Council. But, after listening to the hon. member for South York, I do feel that he expresses a sentiment which is truly Canadian, and it is one of which I cordially approve. I have absolutely nothing to say about the constitution of the courts of appeal that we now have. But I do not agree with the statement which was made by the hon. member that the decisions of the Supreme Court of Canada are such that they do not bear the weight they should bear. The Supreme Court of Canada is a body of which we, as Canadians, have every right to be proud. The composition of the Supreme Court of Canada is one of very great merit. We ought to be satisfied, in Canada, with the final decision of the Supreme Court. Let me give to the House the procedure in appeal followed in the province of Quebec. From our Superior Court, litigants are obliged to go to the Court of Review; from the Court of Review to the Court of Appeal, consisting of five judges; then to the Supreme Court and then across the ocean. There is among Canadians too general a belief that it is absolutely necessary to go outside of our own country to get inspiration. We have recently had an example of this. The Government of the day thought it necessary to go to London and engage a gentleman—no doubt eminently qualified and well endowed—to come over here and reform our civil service departments. Is there anything more stupid on the part of Canadians than that they should think that it is necessary to go to another country, or even to another part of the Empire, to find a man to inquire into our book-keeping or our principles of civil service administration? We have, at the present moment, in the city of Ottawa a question affecting the purity of water——

The CHAIRMAN: I ask the hon. member to come to order.

Mr. DEVLIN: Mr. Chairman, if I am out of order in speaking of water, I apologize. I respect your ruling, but I have never known it to be out of order, in the discussion of a question to bring in a comparison. Is that your ruling?

The CHAIRMAN: What is out of order is the whole discussion.

Mr. DEVLIN: I accept your ruling, Mr. Chairman, as I always do, but are we not now discussing interpretation of the statutes, and are statutes not subject to interpretation by the House?

Mr. BORDEN: We are dealing with the question as to whether or not an Act should be passed enabling the Government to buy in these bonds.

Mr. DEVLIN: I am very sorry that the Prime Minister should at this moment think I am going a little too far. I am simply taking up the words of the hon. member for South York, and I do not think the right hon. the Prime Minister took any exception at the time to his remarks. However, I submit to your ruling, Mr. Chairman, though I think it is not at all in keeping with the discussion for the right hon. the Prime Minister to interfere at this moment. I wanted to say in connection with the interpretation of the statutes, that I thoroughly agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for South York.

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

Mr. White thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 76, respecting the purchase by the Government of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company's three per cent bonds.

Motion agreed to, and bill read the first time.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

House resumed adourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of and concurrence in the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Mr. JOHN W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I will begin my remarks this afternoon by quoting very briefly from the speech of one of the most prominent members on the other side of the House, the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), made on Tuesday last. He said:

> I believe that apart from matters of form, in matters of substance, we are not very far apart. You propose a contribution to Great Britain, to spend money to construct three dreadnoughts, to be constructed in Great Britain. We, on the other hand, propose to enlarge the Canadian Naval Service Act by the establishment of fleet units, which will necessarily be headed by one dreadnought for each unit. Is there, then, a very great difference between us, except in the matter of form?

The hon. gentleman also made use of these words:

> My suggestion is that two dreadnoughts might go to Great Britain, and be built in England; that our two fleet units should be proceeded with in Canada, leaving the Admiralty to concentrate its forces in the decisive theatre of probable war.

Before commenting on that, I would like to call attention to the cost of build-

ing a fleet unit in England as compared with its cost in Canada; also the cost of upkeep and maintenance of such fleet unit in the respective countries, the cost of maintenance or upkeep being exclusive of depreciation

	First Cost.		Annual Cost of Upkeep.	
	British.	Canadian.	British.	Canadian.
	$	$	$	$
One battle cruiser	11,750,000	15,650,000	700,000	980,000
Three cruisers of Bristol class	3,393,000	4,524,000	700,000	980,000
Six destroyers	3,600,000	4,800,000	486,000	680,000
Three submarines	1,350,000	1,800,000	120,000	168,000
Cost of one fleet unit	20,093,000	26,744,000	2,006,000	2,808,000
Cost of two fleet units	40,186,000	53,488,000	4,012,000	5,616,000

I may say that the figures as to the cost of construction are based on the lowest tenders received by the previous Government for the construction of cruisers and destroyers, and that the figures with regard to annual upkeep are 40 per cent in excess of the actual cost to Britain.

I want to point out now the position taken by the Prime Minister in speaking of the matter. He said, as reported in 'Hansard':

> These ships will be at the disposal of His Majesty the King for the common defence of the Empire. They will be maintained and controlled as part of the Royal Navy; and we have the assurance that if at any time in the future it should be the will of the Canadian people to establish a Canadian unit of the British navy, these vessels can be recalled by the Canadian Government to form part of that navy, in which case, of course, they would be maintained by Canada and not by Great Britain.

That is a feature of the speech of the Prime Minister which has not been referred to by hon. gentlemen opposite. Now, what is the difference in the two plans? We propose to give $35,000,000 for the construction of three dreadnoughts; the hon. member for South Wellington proposes to give $23,500,000, the price of two dreadnoughts to be built in England, and, in addition to that, two Canadian fleet units. Now, it is an easy matter to compare the two policies in the matter of cost. If, as he says, there is in substance no difference, or very little, between the proposition of the Government and his proposition, why was all this fuss made during the Christmas vacation? Why all this stumping by the hon. gentleman from South Wellington, and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), who held out to the people of Ontario and Quebec the argument that in a few months there will be a change of government; that the present administration will be forced to the country on this matter a matter on which, in the estimation of the hon. member for South Wellington, there is very little difference between the proposition of the Government and the proposition of his own leader.

But, Mr. Speaker, what is the real difference between the proposal enunciated by the Prime Minister and the proposal of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. The real difference between the two propositions, the real issue, the germ of the whole matter, is that the proposition of the Prime Minister makes for the unity of the Empire, while the proposition of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition makes for the separation of this country from the Empire. That is the difference between the proposition on this side of the House and the proposition on the other side of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That means, then, that there is to be no Canadian navy, does it?

Mr. EDWARDS: My hon. friend may interrupt; but before I get through, I shall make good the statement I have made, and I shall give him some evidence, and some statements by members on his side of the House, which will go to substantiate my assertion.

Let me proceed by referring to the resolution moved in this House on March 29, 1909, by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Here is the resolution:

> That in the opinion of this House, in view of her great and varied resources, of her geographical position and national environments, and of that spirit of self-help and self-respect which alone befits a strong and growing people, Canada should no longer delay in assuming her proper share of the responsibility and financial burden incident to the suitable protection of her exposed coast line and great seaports.

The right hon. leader of the Opposition, speaking after the hon. member for North

Toronto, on that resolution, said that the only exception he had to take to that resolution was that it should have been presented in a more concrete form. It did not go quite far enough to suit the right hon. gentleman. In speaking to that resolution the hon. member for North Toronto made a proposition to this House and to the Government then in power. He said: If the Liberal Government, which was then in power, will give one or two dreadnoughts to Great Britain, we on this side of the House, the Conservatives, will support that move on their part. I want to call your attention to some of the arguments and statements made by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition immediately following that proposition submitted by the hon. member for North Toronto. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition made use of words which can only have one meaning. He made use of words which showed that in his mind there was some need for Canada doing something along the lines suggested by the hon. member for North Toronto. He said :

But this is an age when events happen very fast. We have learned lately that the foremost military power of the world at present is contemplating perhaps to cope with Great Britain on the high seas. We have, perhaps, reason to believe, as we have just been told that Germany is building more ships than Great Britain and building them more rapidly. Possibly there is a conclusion to be drawn from this, and the only conclusion is that Germany intends sometime to do with Great Britain on the high seas what she has done with France on land.

The right hon. the leader of the Opposition said further :

Everybody knows, it is a matter of history that Prussia had for years been silently preparing to cope with France which, up to that time had been the greatest military nation in the world; that Prussia waited its opportunity and when that opportunity came, delivered a mortal blow.

I would like to ask the right hon. leader of the Opposition whether the words of warning which he uttered on that occasion are less applicable to the situation to-day than they were to the situation then. Are Germany's intentions less obvious to-day than they were in 1909, when he uttered those words of warning ? In my estimation, Germany's intentions are even more obvious now than they were then. What was the position of the Toronto Globe at that time ? This has already been stated in the House, but I propose to quote from that paper again. On March 24, 1909, the Toronto Globe said :

But as a matter of fact war is in progress. The contest in ship building is war. If the Mother Country were engaged in a deadly conflict Canadians could not get across the ocean fast enough to the aid of the Motherland. But we must remember that our aid is as much needed now as if a physical war instead of shipbuilding war were on. It is Canada's duty from every point of view, from our affection for the land of our fathers, and for our own self interest to take prompt and practical action.

These are the words of the Toronto Globe in regard to that. Two days later the same paper, the Toronto Globe, said this :

The sort of vessel that should be built is fixed by the circumstances. The competition now raging between Great Britain and Germany is in the direction of first-class battleships. If Canada were to build a little fleet of wasps and hornets it would have no moral effect on the situation at all. What we would like Canada to do would be to manifast by a veritable act that in this competition of the fleets she ranges herself proudly and gladly by the side if the Mother Country.

That was the position of the Toronto Globe at that time, and I specially commend to the members opposite the reference to a little fleet of wasps and hornets as having no moral effect on the situation.

Now, what was the position of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition ? In 1909 he clearly recognized danger ; he clearly recognized Germany's purpose. He acknowledged prospective danger at that time, but he said the danger was not imminent. Let us follow him a little further; and I may say right here that it seems to me that in all the speeches of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition on important questions there should be an explanatory index accompanying them, because it is a very difficult matter to find out what the right hon. gentleman means on anything. On February 3, 1910, when he brought down his Naval Act, he said again that he recognized Germany's purpose; that he recognized danger. But he added, 'You need not be afraid at the present time; there is no danger threatened now, but look out three or four years from now.' He said the danger was not to be apprehended for three or four years. Well, the three years will be up next month, and the limit of his prophecy will be reached in a little over a year from now, so that according to the hon. gentleman's statement in 1910, we approach very close to the day of trial for the Empire, very close to the day of Canada's destiny, for that is exactly what it means. Notwithstanding his own statement in that regard, he persists in putting the telescope to his blind eye and declaring that there is no emergency and no danger imminent. Twice in 1911 Germany and England were on the verge of war and the British flagship turned its searchlights on German cruisers off the coast of Britain. Why does the right hon. leader of the Opposition persist in a policy which will make it impossible for Canada to do anything

in the matter of Imperial defence, or to take any part in strengthening the Empire. Light may be thrown upon his attitude by some of the utterances of the right hon. gentleman, and I propose to place a few of these on 'Hansard.' Let us see what position the right hon. gentleman took at the Imperial Conference. I might quote here from the London Times in regard to his attitude at the Imperial Conference to see how it was regarded. I shall first quote from the statement of Sir James Findlay showing how the attitude of the right hon. leader of the Opposition was regarded by a person entirely outside of this country. Sir James Findlay is the Attorney General of New Zealand, and was one of the delegates at the Imperial Conference of 1911. He says:

There undoubtedly seemed to me in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's words—and attitude in the conference, a certain aloofness from the family circle—a civil or rather courtly coldness to the claims of the relationship and to any proposals for a closer co-operation.

Further on the same gentleman says:

I am certainly safe in saying that the future of Canada and some of the policies of the Laurier Government affecting that future—notably the treaty of reciprocity with America and Canada's separate naval policy—give British ministers more concern than the future of any of the other dominions.

That gentleman was not in a position, I take it, to know all the utterances of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. Let me give a few of these to show his attitude in times past. Speaking in this House in 1892, as recorded in 'Hansard,' page 1143, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition said:

Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy, the day when Canada would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy?

Again, in 'Hansard' of 1910, page 2977 he is reported as having said:

Lord Durham stated in his report that the conditions were such that the two provinces should be united so that the French-Canadian should be ruled by the stern and relentless hand of an English-speaking majority.

It is needless for me to say that these are the words of the right hon. leader of the Opposition, and not those of Lord Durham. Then, speaking at Boston in 1891, the right hon. gentleman said:

Canada would never consent to Imperial federation even on commercial lines because the consequences would be the participation of Canada in Britain's wars and Canada would never consent to participate in Britain's wars.

Mr. EDWARDS.

Do you not see in these words an expression of his peculiar attitude in regard to when England is at war Canada is at war and the rider he attaches thereto? Again he said, speaking in Boston:

The conduct of England and Canada during the civil war, 1861-1866, was a disgrace to England and Canada.

He made that statement in a foreign country notwithstanding the fact that the Dominion archives contained the public thanks of the United States Government of that day to the Government of Canada and the Canadian people for the wise, prudent, neutral and conservative course which they had taken during the civil war. They exonerated Canada from the charge which the right hon. gentleman made in a foreign country against the people of this country. In regard to the charge against Great Britain, I want to place on 'Hansard' the statement of no less a Liberal than the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, who, in a letter to a friend in the United States, said:

I can state that the British Government never at any time dealt with the subject of recognizing the southern states in your great civil war except when it learned the proposition of the Emperor, Napoleon III, and declined to entertain that proposition without qualification, hesitation, delay or assent.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is incumbent upon me to state these facts in the House and to clear Canada and Great Britain, in so far as my feeble voice is able to do so, from the aspersion which was made against them by the right hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition. Another remark of the right hon. gentleman was this:

It is a great, a fatal mistake to make allegiance—British allegiance—the basis of trade.

Another statement that he made in a foreign country is this:

The present position of Canada cannot last. Even at this day England and Canada have interests totally apart and the time will come when, in the very nature of things, separation must take place.

Now he tells us that any thought of separation would be a folly and a crime. Who is the man who was guilty of this folly in the first place, who is the man who stands before the people of the country to-day saying that his own words were unjust and showing that he is the self-confessed criminal as far as this matter is concerned?—the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. He says further:

I am a subject of the British Crown——

It is a good thing for Canada and for the Empire that all the subjects of the British Crown are not of the same calibre as the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. (Reading):

—but, whenever I have to choose between the interests of England and of Canada, it is manifest to me that the interests of my country are identical with the interests of the United States of America.

This is the right hon. gentleman who, in this debate, has found fault with utterances used along the same line down in the province of Quebec. Another assertion which he makes is this:

I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation in due course of time.

Which of the assertions of the right hon. gentleman are we to believe? Is not that an assertion which, if it means anything, means separation and yet, today, he says that the thought of separation would be a folly and a crime. Which assertion of the right hon. gentleman are we to take as expressing his true sentiments? For my part I do not know which to take. The natural consequence of such assertions coming from a man who has been a leading light in one of the great political parties of this country as long as the right hon. gentleman has been is that his views have been impressed upon many of his followers. I would like to give you some expressions of opinion by leading Liberals. Sir Frederick Borden, in discussing the Naval Service Act in 1910, referred to the Monroe Doctrine, and said that:

The Monroe Doctrine means that Canada is safe from foreign agression.

Mr. Roy, of Dorchester, also said:

The Monroe Doctrine imposes on the United States the obligation of protecting us.

Let me say right here, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion—and I am giving my own opinion—the Monroe Doctrine is an unwarranted assumption of authority on the part of the United States that the Monroe Doctrine holds out nothing to the Dominion of Canada but that if at any time we were so unfortunate as to come under the operation of the Monroe Doctrine we might rest assured that we would pay dearly for any protection we got from the United States. I would like to see the day when the Monroe Doctrine would be swept away entirely and I believe it should be regarded as a thing of the past. I believe that in the southern part of this continent, in South America, there is room for the splendid energies of the German people and I would like to see that part of this continent thrown open in such a way that the German people would there have an opportunity of exerting themselves.

Let me quote another of the Liberal members who addressed this House in 1910. I refer to the hon. member for Nicolet (Mr. Turcotte) who said:

I am in favour of a sufficient fleet for protecting our fisheries and for nothing more.

Mr. Beauparlant said that he would agree to a Canadian fleet, but only for us alone. Mr. Ecrement took the position that the Canadian fleet must be built in Canada under Canadian control, and must do nothing outside of Canada. I believe that I am quite correct in saying that Mr. Brodeur took very much the same position. The then hon. member for South Huron, Mr. McLean, said, as reported at page 4418 of Hansard, 1910:

As a Canadian I wish to say that in a material sense we are not indebted to Great Britain for anything.

Now, let me call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to a statement of their leader in this House and in this debate as reported at page 1056 of 'Hansard' of this session. He was referring to some statements which had been made in Quebec. He said that in Quebec it was being stated that Canada had discharged its whole duty in the matter of defence simply by providing for the defence of her own shores. That apparently horrified the right hon. gentleman, for he said:

But when harmful doctrines of that kind have been preached for months and years, that preaching leaves behind it an impression which it is much more easy to create than it is afterwards to destroy.

No person knows the truth of these words better than the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. For years he has, by just such utterances, been creating an impression which he did not wish to have destroyed. He takes exception to that conduct and he thinks it is a terrible thing to do, and yet, right in this House, sitting behind him, in the debate of 1910, member after member on the Liberal side of the House got up and made exactly the same statements, and the right hon. gentleman sat there and he did not call them to task for it; he did not say: these are harmful statements; he acquiesced in these statements at that time. Let me give you another gem from the Liberal side of the House. Mr. Turcotte of Nicolet ('Hansard' 1910, page 4628) said:

It is not patriotic nor loyal, I say, to contend that we must remain forever under the protection of the British flag; But, thank God, I am satisfied it will not be so, and the establishment of a war navy will in my humble opinion be the last step towards independence. I speak from the Canadians point of view and that my viewpoint is also that of the greater number of the electors in my constituency, and I would even say of the majority of electors in the province of Quebec. Will not Canada sooner or later have to choose between annexation and independence?

Sir, the hon. member for Nicolet spoke in French; unfortunately I do not understand that language; I wish I did and was able to speak it; but the right hon. the leader of the Opposition understood that language; he understood the statements made by the hon. member for Nicolet, and yet he sat in his place in the House and allowed the member for Nicolet, one of his own supporters, to say that it was neither patriotic nor loyal to suppose that Canada should remain forever under the British flag; he sat in his seat and allowed the member for Nicolet to call God to witness that he hoped that condition of things would not continue. The right hon. gentleman sat silent in his seat while he heard the member for Nicolet say that the views he expressed were not only his own views and the views of his constituents, but that they were the views of the people of the province of Quebec. It ill becomes the leader of the Opposition at the present time to animadvert on the statements which may or may not have been made in the last few months in the province of Quebec, in view of the fact that he sat dumb while the statements I have cited to you were made by his followers in his own presence. And, what has been the whole course of the right hon. gentleman as a public man in this country? His whole course since he entered public life in Canada has been in the direction of separation of this country from the Empire, and in trying to bring that aim of his about, he has misrepresented British diplomacy, and has taught others to do so. He has misquoted and mis-stated British and Canadian history, and taught others to do so; he has offered insults, at times covert, at times open, to the people of this country of British birth and encouraged others to do the same; he has represented British statesmen as tyrants and oppressors and Canadian heroes as rebels, and he has encouraged others to do so. That is the present leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He has spoken in this House very bitterly of the Nationalists of the province of Quebec. I am not here to enter into any defence of the Nationalists of Quebec; I do not agree with many of the views expressed by the leaders of the Quebec Nationalists; but, Sir, we can at least tell from the words of the Nationalists leaders of Quebec what they mean; they speak out and they leave us in no doubt as to their meaning. But, the right hon. gentleman should be the last man to criticise the Nationalists of the province of Quebec, because they are his own children, his own product. It was at his feet they imbibed the doctrines which they are now giving voice to. The right hon. gentleman has charged the Nationalists of Quebec with saying that Canada owes nothing to England. Mr. Speaker, he has preached the same doctrine from one end of the country to the other for the last twenty-five years. He has charged the Nationalists of Quebec with making unworthy appeals to race and prejudice, but is the right hon. gentleman himself guiltless of raising questions of race and religious prejudice for political purposes in the province of Quebec? He has charged the Nationalists of the province of Quebec with utterances that smacked of treason. Has he forgotten his Saskatchewan musket? Quote me the utterance of any Nationalist leader of the province of Quebec; quote me the utterances of any political firebrand from the time of Papineau and Mackenzie down to Bourassa and Mackenzie King, and no matter how disloyal and how unpatriotic these utterances may have been, I will quote you the counterpart of them in the words of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. True, his words may have been more subtle and more skilfully arranged, but the underlying sentiment was there; the covert sneer was there under a thin veneer of polished rhetoric.

On the ground that the resolution of the hon. member for North Toronto was not sufficiently explicit, Sir Wilfrid Laurier proposed another, and the second paragraph of it has a very direct bearing on this debate. That paragraph reads:

> The House is of opinion that under the present constitutional relations between the Mother Country and the self-governing dominions, the payment of regular and periodical contributions to the Imperial treasury for naval and military purposes would not, so far as Canada is concerned, be the most satisfactory solution of the question of defence.

That is the paragraph as adopted, the words 'regular and periodical contribution' being substituted at the suggestion of the present Prime Minister for the words 'any stated contribution,' which appear in the paragraph as originally drafted by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. That paragraph states that we were against regular and periodical contributions in 1910; we are against regular and periodical contributions in 1913, and this has been made very clear in this debate by the statement of the Prime Minister in this House, when he said:

> In presenting our proposals, it will be borne in mind that we are not undertaking or beginning a system of regular and periodical contributions.

What does the change of words suggested by the Prime Minister in 1909 mean? Anyone with even a primitive knowledge of the English language must admit that the statement as originally drafted by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition was

an absolutely negative proposition and if it had been carried by this House would have made it utterly impossible for Canada to have ever contributed anything in any way, under any circumstances. Now, Sir, I contend that the change of these words at the suggestion of Mr. Borden changed that negative proposition into a definite declaration of policy. Let me give you one of the arguments of Mr. Borden on that occasion. He said:

In declaring against the payment of any stated contribution, we tell Great Britain and the world what we are not prepared to do when we should declare to all men what we are prepared to do.

Further on he said:

The day might come when the only thing we could do in the absence of preparation in this country would be to make some kind of contribution.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that when the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition accepted the proposition made by Mr. Borden as sound, and changed the words of his original resolution to meet the suggestion of Mr. Borden, he, by that act accepted the principle of making a contribution to England under certain conditions. What inference would be drawn or could be drawn by Britain and other nations when they read the original resolution of the present leader of the Opposition, the suggestion and argument of the present Prime Minister, and the resolution as finally read by the right hon. gentleman and unanimously adopted by this House? The only possible conclusion they could come to would be that Canada is against making regular and periodical contributions, but that Canada is not against making a contribution under certain conditions, and under just such conditions as exist in Canada at the present time.

Allow me to contrast for a moment the position taken by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition and the position taken by the Prime Minister. I do this in order that people, in my constituency at least, may understand the difference between the two men and make their choice accordingly. The leader of the Opposition, in answer to a question asked him by yourself, Mr. Speaker, as reported in 'Hansard' of 1910, page 1735,

Is the war referred to war in any part of the Empire or in Canada only?

Made the following reply:

War everywhere. When Canada is at war, Canada is at war; there is no distinction.

Then he proceeded at once to make the distinction:

If Great Britain, to which we are subject, is at war with any nation, Canada becomes liable to invasion, and so Canada is at war.

At page 2965 of the same 'Hansard,' he said:

It does not follow, however, that because England is at war, we should necessarily take part in the war.

That is a policy of semi-detachment. That is exactly what it means, an utterly impracticable policy and one which does not in any way meet with the approval of the people of Canada. The position of the Prime Minister in regard to the matter is expressed in these words in the same debate:

So long as Canada remains in the Empire, Canada is at war when the Empire is at war. So long as the English flag floats above Canada, Canada is at war when that flag is attacked. The moment a shot is fired or a blow is struck at that flag, Canada is at war with the nation or country which fires that shot or strikes the blow.

There is no quibbling there. I put up to the people of this country the assertions of the two gentlemen who are leading the opposing parties in this House, and I ask them which of these two gentlemen they are going to choose. I have no doubt which one of them the people of my county will choose. As reported in 'Hansard' of 1892, page 1144, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition said:

I am ready any day whether I am charged with annexation or not to take a Yankee dollar in preference to an English shilling. I have again and again repeated that the goal of my aspiration is the independence of Canada, to see Canada an independent nation in due course of time.

I might here interpolate that this is the same right hon. gentleman who said, 'Any thought of separation would be a folly and a crime.' In 'Hansard' of 1892, page 1142, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition said:

I hold out to my fellow countrymen the idea of independence. If we are true to our record we will again exhibit to the world the unique, the unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by slow degrees and as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree.

This is the same right hon. gentleman who in this same debate said, 'Any thought of separation would be a folly and a crime.' Which assertion are we to believe? When you find a man sitting on both sides of the fence as the right hon. gentleman has been doing on every question brought before the House, what confidence can you place in him? I ask you to contrast those utterances in this matter of independence with those of my esteemed leader, the right hon. the Prime

Minister of this country. As reported in 'Hansard' of 1909, page 3518, he said:

I am not one of those who look to see the integrity of the British Empire menaced by the future independence of Canada.

Like Sir John Macdonald, I was born a British subject, I shall remain a British subject and I hope to die a British subject.

I trust the day will never come when the British flag will cease to float over this Canada of ours.

These are my sentiments; they are the sentiments of the people of Frontenac; they are the sentiments of the people of this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I believe that the right hon. the Prime Minister is voicing the true sentiments of the people of every province in the Dominion of Canada. I believe that the right hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition is not even voicing the sentiments of the people of the province of Quebec. A few years ago a British military expert, Sir John French, came to Canada and made a report, in which he pointed out many of the weaknesses in the land defences of this country. Sir Frederick Borden, then Minister of Militia, when his estimates were before the Committee of Supply, made an admission respecting the status and purpose of the militia of Canada in these words:

The business of the militia has been to assist the British army when difficulties occur in Canada.

That means that it is to the men and the guns of Britain that Canada had to look and still looks for the defence of her soil. How much more dependent are we on Britain for protection by sea? At present we have absolutely no naval service of our own for the protection of our shores. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition proposes a fleet unit on the Atlantic and another on the Pacific, the vessels to be built in Canada and manned by Canadians. How long would it take to construct such a fleet? I want to quote to you the opinion in that regard of Mr. Churchill, First Lord of the Admiralty, when speaking in the British House of Commons on the 22nd of July last. He said:

Small ships take eighteen to twenty months to build; large ships take from two to three years, sometimes four years. Docks take more than four years to build. Seamen take from two to three years to train; artificers take much longer; officers take between six and seven years.

These are the words of the First Lord of the Admiralty, who is regarded as the highest naval authority in the Empire. Now what inference must we draw from these words? Even if the policy of the right hon leader of the Opposition were gone on with, for the next ten or fifteen years at least, Canada must be absolutely dependent on Great Britain for her protection by sea.

An hon. MEMBER: Can you give us any idea how long it would take to build them in Canada?

Mr. EDWARDS: There are a variety of opinions in regard to that. It appears to me that it would take fifteen years at least; at any rate ten or fifteen years. During that time, will any person on the other side of the House deny that we as Canadians must look for protection to Great Britain? That is our position. Our naval defence will come from the same quarter from which Sir Frederick Borden said the main part of our land defence must come—from Great Britain. Yet in the face of these undeniable facts, there are to be found a few Canadians led by the right hon. gentleman and his front benchers, who are small-souled enough to have us occupy the position of receiving at the hands of Great Britain our protection by sea for the next ten or fifteen years without doing one single thing, without putting up one single dollar. I maintain the only thing that at present we can do to retain a semblance of our very much damaged self-respect—and it has been badly damaged, and badly damaged because of the attitude and action of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and his colleagues—is to make the contribution which is proposed by the right hon. leader of the Government, and thereby—to use again the words of the Toronto Globe—'To manifest by a veritable act that in this competition of the fleets Canada ranges herself proudly and gladly by the side of the Mother Country.'

The question as to an emergency has been discussed very frequently, and the word has been given sufficient interpretation here. It all comes down to the position which Great Britain occupies as a naval power in relation to other powers. And I cannot state it in better words than those used in the memorandum of the British Government which has been placed in the hands of members:

The power of the British Empire to maintain the superiority on the sea, which is essential to its security, must obviously be measured from time to time by reference to the other naval forces of the world.

Again permit me to place a few figures on 'Hansard' in regard to Germany and her naval position:

Whereas in 1898 the German fleet consisted of:—

9 battleships (excluding coast defence vessels), 3 large cruisers, 28 small cruisers, 113 torpedo boats, and 25,000 men, maintained at an annual cost of £6,000,000 ($30,000,000), the full fleet of 1920 will consist of:—

41 battleships, 20 large cruisers, 40 small cruisers, 144 torpedo boats, 72 submarines, and 101,500 men, maintained at a cost of £21,000,000 ($115,000,000).

Why this very large increase in the naval armament of Germany? Has it been induced by the action of Great Britain? In 1905 Great Britain built four capital ships, and Germany two; in 1906 Great Britain reduced her number to three, Germany increased hers to three; in 1907, Great Britain built three, Germany built three; in 1908 Great Britain further reduced hers to two and Germany increased hers to four. Why this was done is stated, I think, very correctly in the memorandum:

From this point of view, the development of the German fleet during the last fifteen years is the most striking feature of the naval situation to-day. . .

Taking a general view, the effect of the law in view of that increased dreadnought building on the part of Germany, I think it is fair to say that the development of the German fleet is the most striking feature of the naval situation of Europe, and you might say of the world. Add to this very fact that four-fifths of the German navy is kept constantly manned and ready for action at a moment's notice, and it does seem to me that the only power which this arming can be directed against is Great Britain. The memorandum to which I have referred contains the following:

It is the general naval supremacy of Great British which is the primary safeguard of the security and interests of the great dominions of the crown, and which for all these years has been the deterrent upon any possible designs prejudicial to or inconsiderate of their policy and safety. . . . Larger margins of superiority at home would, among other things restore greater freedom to the movements of the British squadrons in every sea, and directly promote the security of the dominions.

Have we not in that statement a guarantee of the security of Canadian commerce throughout the world? But we must also consider the possibility of a combination of powers against Great Britain. I do not wish to place more quotations on 'Hansard' than are absolutely necessary, but in this regard, take this from the memorandum:

Whereas, in the present year, Great Britain possesses 18 battleships and battle-cruisers of the dreadnought class against 19 of that class possessed by the other powers of Europe, and will possess in 1913, 24 to 21, the figures in 1914 will be 31 to 33 ;and in the year 1915, 35 to 51.

One hon. member on the other side said it was folly to think of such a thing as a combination of powers against Great Britain. History has shown us differently in the past; there have been times when Great Britain has stood in a position of isolation against the combined powers of Europe.

Any action on the part of Canada to increase the power and mobility of the Imperial navy, and thus widen the margin of our common safety, would be recognized everywhere as a most significant witness of the united strength of the Empire, and to the renewed resolve of the Overseas Dominions to take their part in maintaining its integrity.

Now, I wish to call attention to another statement in that memorandum, and it is the last parapgraph:

The Prime Minister of the Dominion having inquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective, we have no hesitation in answering after a prolonged consideration of all the circumstances that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

Sir, it does seem to me that if we take these statements as true statements—and one hon. gentleman on the other side, I think the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt), said that he believed that the statements and assertions in that memorandum were absolutely true in every particular—I fail to see how hon. gentlemen opposite can continue to assert that there is no emergency or possible danger.

It has been asserted by hon. gentlemen opposite and in this respect I think the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) is the principal aggressor perhaps I should say the principal sinner—that it was not money that Great Britain wanted, but what she was in need of was men. In answer to that, allow me again to quote from the speech of Mr. Churchill delivered in the British House of Commons on July 22 1912:

Now I come to the manning of the fleet. There have been a great many ill-informed statements during the last few weeks about the shortage of men.

I do not know that he was particularly referring to the hon. member for South Renfrew in these words:

I have seen it asserted that it was not possible to man the manœuvre fleet without resorting to all sorts of expedients. Statements have been made which would appear to indicate that we would not be in a position to man all our fleets on the outbreak of war. The manœuvre fleet contains a large number of vessels which depend for their complement in war upon a regular compulsory moblization of the naval reserve, and in war such a moblization would bring to the naval forces many thousands more men than there would be room for on all the ships of all classes fit to put to sea.

He is First Lord of the Admiralty, and should know what he is talking about. He said further:

The problem we have to face is not the supply of men for the moblization of the fleet when war is imminent or has actually broken out.

Further he said:

There is no lack of good and healthy boys and youths in these islands to man the navy.

Surely this statement ought to be sufficient to satisfy the minds of hon. gentlemen opposite. They have their fair quota of doubting Thomases on this question, but allow me to call their attention to our position in this country as regards men. We were unable to man the Niobe and the Rainbow; we had to obtain British seamen for that purpose. Where do we get our men for the A and B batteries in Kingston? In Canada? No; we have to get them from England. Where do we get the men for our Northwest Mounted Police, which is perhaps the finest body of its kind in any country? Ten or twelve years ago a man had to have considerable pull to get into the Northwest Mounted Police, and to-day we have practically got to pull them in. Why do Canadians not go into the service now? It is due to the expansion of the country; the men are wanted everywhere for the construction of public works, the building of railroads, for agricultural purposes, and for a thousand and one things. I would like to ask some of the hon. gentlemen from the West how many men will Alberta or Saskatchewan supply to the navy? Every summer this particular part of the country, and thence eastward to the Atlantic coast, is placarded with requests to send out five or ten thousand men to help them with the harvest. When men are getting, as laborers, a daily wage of $2, $2.25, and even $2.50 working in the city streets, you cannot expect them to be particularly anxious to join the Canadian navy.

But, Sir, there is another feature I might mention as pertaining to the question of cost. Suppose it takes four or five thousand men to man two fleets, one on the Atlantic and the other on the Pacific, what is that going to cost this country? In view of the high wages paid in every walk of life, you will have to pay these men at least $1.50 a day and their board—and that is a small estimate. If it takes four or five thousand men to man the two fleet units—I do not know how many it would take—but on that assumption it would cost $2,000,000 or upwards for wages. And that is not all. You will take these men out of productive employment and place them in non-productive labour, and, in fairly estimating the cost to this country, you must value also their labor at so much per day in what they are engaged in productive employment.

An hon. MEMBER: What do they pay in the British Navy?

Mr. EDWARDS: Two shillings.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Shamefully low wages.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is that not evidence that they have any number of men in the Old Country who cannot get work, while in Canada we have more work than men? Thousands and tens of thousands of Englishmen are coming from the Old Country to Canada—why? Because they get better wages and have better prospects than in the Old Country. It is no reflection upon the loyalty or patriotism of the people of Canada that they should not agree to enter the navy at such small wages when there is so great a demand for their services in other walks of life.

Mr. PUGSLEY Is my hon. friend, therefore, opposed to the establishment of a Canadian navy?

Mr. EDWARDS: I am absolutely opposed to the establishment of a Canadian navy with such a string to it as the hon. gentleman's leader proposes. But my hon. friend, I know, is eager for information, and while I recognize the fact that he has plenty of things in his head, it is also true there is room for much more. My hon. friend is trying to get information from this side of the House as to the permanent policy of the Conservative party in regard to a navy, but I may tell him he will get that soon enough. At present I am expressing my entire concurrence with the proposition of giving $35,000,000 to Great Britain to build three dreadnoughts, and my absolute dissent with the proposition of building two fleet units, one on the Atlantic and one on the Pacific, with a string on each one, enabling the right hon. gentleman, if in power, to take them away from the theatre of war when trouble arises.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend could take the string off if he wanted to; they could arrange that to suit themselves.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is precisely what we are going to do, and we are going to arrange it also to suit the country.

Mr. PELLETIER: If you take the string off, there is nothing left.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is now nearly six o'clock, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. PUGSLEY: Go on—time is precious.

Mr. EDWARDS: Time was not so precious when the hon. member for South Wellington recently saw fit to adjourn the

debate at fifteen minutes after five. However, I am willing to do whatever pleases the hon. member for St. John.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was being honoured with a little attention from the hon. ex-Minister of Public Works. I can understand the sore feelings of the hon. gentleman. He is on the side of the Opposition now, and the plums of office are no longer within his grasp. No longer is it within his power to promulgate dredging contracts and sawdust wharfs. He is consequently feeling somewhat sore as the result of the change. I can also understand some of the soreness of the hon. member for Rouville. As Minister of Marine and Fisheries he would have been the head in a certain sense, of the navy if it had reached completion. I have been told that the hon. gentleman went so far as to order a uniform for the occasion, a nicely made suit with gold braid, with a cocked hat and a dinky little sword, and all these he has been obliged to place carefully away. He has not even comfort in the prospect of being able to sell them at a reasonable discount to the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries on account of the difference in their size. The hon. member for North Oxford made a statement the other day to which I wish to refer. He said:

> The Germans say they have to augment their navy to protect them from the aggression of England, and perhaps from their standpoint they say it just as truthfully as we say the reverse.

The hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) also made a statement which I wish to quote. He said:

> Surely there is no reasonable probability that the United Kingdom can be conquered and kept by any other power or combination of powers any more than France was kept because she was conquered by Germany.

I take issue with both hon. gentlemen in regard to these statements. My reason for doing so is this: England is absolutely dependent upon foreign countries for her food supplies. If by any possiblity her trade routes or her ports were blockaded by the German navy or by a successful combination of powers against her, she could be starved into submission or into granting any terms which the successful power or combination of powers might see fit to demand. It is not so in the case of Germany. If you will take the trouble to look at a bulletin issued by the International Agricultural Institute dated 26th September last, you will see that in close proximity to Germany, and entirely independent of the sea, there are several countries which export large quantities of wheat. Russia, Roumania, Hungary and Bulgaria in the year 1910, exported over 323,000,000 bushels of wheat. Now, it must be plain to every person that even if Germany were defeated on the sea, she would not be cut off from her food supplies. The reverse is the case so far as England is concerned. Not only is that true in regard to wheat, but also in regard to rye, which, in several countries, is a substitute for wheat. In the production of rye Russia takes the lead, and the next country I believe in point of production of rye is Germany herself. So that, so far as her food supplies are concerned, Germany, I repeat, is independent of a navy, and is, in that respect, in a different position entirely from that occupied by Great Britain.

I cannot agree with much that has been said by the hon. member for Edmonton. I cannot, for instance, agree with his acrobatic performance in regard to the National Anthem. But he has placed on 'Hansard' some statements with which I do agree, and which I think are worth repeating. In this debate, as recorded in 'Hansard,' page 1377, speaking of the successful combination of powers against England, he said:

> I ask our anti-militarist friends in Canada if it is not an absolute certainty that under such conditions,—

That is, the defeat of England on the sea——

> Canada would pass from the control of the British Empire to the control of the successful one of those European powers?. . . And so, assuming the possibility of such an occurrence as I have suggested, in my mind there is nothing more certain than that Canada would be the prize that would go to the victor.

I entirely agree with that, and with a further sentence which was uttered by the same hon. gentleman:

> If they have any ideas on this subject, let them recall Alsace and Lorraine, the prize of a successful war, and let them figure to themselves whether Canada would not be just as fair a prize, or whether Canada would not, in absolute fact, be the prize for which those fleets would contend in the North sea if ever such a terrible event should take place.

Now, Sir, I repeat that I agree with these statements by the hon. member for Edmonton. I think he has described the position very well. We shall suppose that we have the Laurier Government in power in this country and that we have two fleet units, one on the Atlantic and the other on the Pacific. We shall suppose that a war breaks out in Europe and that in that war

Great Britain is defeated. What would likely happen in this country under the policy advanced by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition? He says that in the event of war he would call his cabinet together. Very well. The Government announces some day that war is in progress between England and Germany we shall say, and the Cabinet is called together to consider the matter. Events at sea in the case of war happen very rapidly, and we shall suppose that the cable flashes over the news that Great Britain has been defeated. The Cabinet is considering the matter and the right hon. gentleman asks the question: 'Gentlemen what are we to do? We have a fleet unit on the Atlantic, and we may suppose that in a very short time a portion of the successful German fleet will start for Canada. We know that our fleet unit on the Atlantic cannot contend successfully against a fleet which has defeated the power of Britain on the sea. What are we to do in this case?' There are only two things for us to do—fall back upon the intervention of the United States, ask them to send their army and navy up here to defend us, in which case we may be sure they would exact some compensation from us, or declare our neutrality, in other words, declare our independence. I fancy the right hon. gentleman might say: 'This time has come for the ripe fruit to drop off the parent tree.' But someone asks how can we declare our neutrality and fly the British flag? Will not Germany regard that as the flag of an enemy? I fancy also the right hon. gentleman saying the order must go forth that the British flag be hauled down from our fleet units, from our military stations and from every public building in Canada; that is the only thing we can do if we are not to fight. If we are to declare our independence we must haul down our flag. Sir, that is a prospect which is not pleasing to me as a Canadian and a British subject, nor to the vast majority of the people of this country. As the Toronto Globe very properly said on March 31, 1909, in reference to the possibility of the British navy being defeated.

> While the British fleet is master of the channel no European fleet could be a serious menace to the shores of Canada. . . In the day of trial the all-important aim would be to make the Imperial fleet so strong that the issue of a combat would not be doubtful.

That is precisely what the Prime Minister of this country proposes to do under this Bill. So far as our circumstances will permit, and out of the abundant revenues of this country, he proposes to give the price of three dreadnoughts to strengthen the British fleet in home waters, where, as has been admitted by members on the other side of the House, the test of strength, if it ever comes, will undoubtedly take place.

Now, let me deal further with the right hon. the leader of the Opposition. He has stated in this House that when England is at war, Canada is at war. He has accompanied that with a reservation that it does not necessarily mean that we are in the conflict. I have already quoted his words on that. Let me quote to you from what is probably the greatest newspaper in the world, The Times of London, England. It says:

> If Sir Wilfrid Laurier's argument means anything, it presupposes that the Empire may be engaged in a life-and-death struggle about a cause which Canada disapproves. Our minor troubles do not touch Canada. If her ships are needed for action it can only be either in a question nearly effecting herself, or else in some broad conflict which may bring the whole Empire down. Semi-detachment is therefore, in reality, not a practicable alternative. Mr. Borden has seen that clearly enough. He has realized that, in any great struggle where her ships might be required, Canada would stand or fall by the results, whether she wished it or not. He has, therefore, claimed, and rightly claimed, that she should have a voice in the main issues of policy which govern peace or war. Such a voice is, in truth, the only means to that security at which Sir Wilfrid's argument is aimed. The alternative is independence, nothing less. For it really is not possible, except as a form of words, to denounce the thought of separation from the Empire as 'folly and crime' and in the same breath to insist upon a species of Imperial connection much looser for defensive purposes than that of ordinary allies.

That is the opinion of the London Times, and, as my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) so aptly said the other day, if the policy of the right hon. leader of the Opposition were carried into effect our alliance with Great Britain for defensive purposes would be weaker than the alliance which existed between Great Britain and Japan. My right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, during this debate, denounced certain utterances as harmful; he denounced as harmful the very same doctrines which he applauded when spoken in this House in 1910 by his own supporters, by Mr. Turcotte of Nicolet, by Mr. Beauparlant, by Mr. Ecrement and by Mr. McLean of Huron. He stated in this House in 1889 and again in this House in 1892, 'Hansard' page 1145, that the conduct of Great Britain and Canada during the American civil war was a disgrace to Great Britain and to Canada. In this House and in this debate, page 1057 of 'Hansard,' the right hon. gentleman said that:

> If there is one thing which tends to the glory of England it is that when the North and the South were engaged in that famous truggle resulting in the abolition of African

slavery, she would not interfere as against what might have been her own interests; and, as a result of her non-interference, that blot upon Christian civilization has forever been wiped out.

I ask the right hon. gentleman to contrast his own words as printed in 'Hansard' of this session with his own words as printed in 'Hansard' on different occasions and especially at page 1142 of 'Hansard' of 1892, when he declared for independence, the same as his former pupil, Mr. Bourassa, declared in the city of Ottawa on the 18th of December last for the independence of Canada and the establishment in this country of an Anglo-French republic. The right hon. gentleman said in this debate, page 1057 of 'Hansard,' that the thought of separation was a folly and a crime. I ask him to contrast that statement with his other statements in regard to the independence of Canada being the goal of his ambition, his highest aspiration. So we have the right hon. gentleman on this question, as on other questions, taking one position to-day, another position to-morrow, suspended, as it were, like Mahommet's coffin, between heaven and hell and fit for neither place and there I leave him.

Now, I want to direct the attention of the House for a time to how this matter affects the great agricultural interests of the Dominion. I do so more particularly because I have the honour to represent what is probably one of the most strictly agricultural constituencies in Canada. In the Trade and Navigation Report for the year ended March 31, 1912, I find the following statements with reference to to our trade relations with Great Britain and the United States:

Total trade..	874,637,794
With Great Britain..	$268,760,000
With United States...	476,889,000
Canada bought from Great Britain.. .. .. =	$117,192,000
Canada sold to Great Britain. =	151,853,000
Balance of trade in Canada's favour..	34,640,000
Canada bought from U. S... .. =	$356,354,000
Canada sold to the U.S... .. .. =	120,534,000
Balance of trade against Canada.	$235,819,000

Here let me say that in Canada's trade with foreign countries there is one of the important countries only with which the balance of trade is in our favour and that country is Great Britain. I want particularly to refer to animals and their products and agricultural products because under these heads we have practically all that concerns the farmer and in this connection I find the following results:

	Total Exports from Canada to all Countries.	Sold by Canada to Great Britain.	Sold by Canada to United States.
	$	$	$
Animals and their products.....	49,220,897	36,923,000	9,864,000
Agricultural products.....	115,154,486	81,784,000	11,685,000
	164,675,383	118,707,000	21,549,000

You will observe from this that, of all those products of his labour for which the Canadian farmer has to find a market outside of Canada, 72 per cent went to Great Britain, 12½ per cent to the United States, and 15½ per cent to other foreign countries. If we exclude entirely all of those products which went to the United States—and doubtless some of those that went from the Maritime provinces and British Columbia were sea-borne—it means that if all of the products the farmer has to dispose of outside of Canada, 87½ per cent are carried by sea and are dependent for their safe carriage by sea upon the supremacy of the British navy. Without going at length into details I want to direct your attention to one or two of these articles in which the farmer is particularly interested. Bear in mind I am only referring to Canadian products to stuff produced in Canada, not to farm products which have come into this country and been carried out. In the year to which I allude Canada exported to all countries of cheese, butter, bacon, &c., the following quantities:

	Canada exported to all Countries.		Canada exported to Great Britain.	
Cheese	163,450,000 lbs.	value $20,888,818	162,395,000 lbs.	= $20,733,000
Butter	8,844,000 lbs.	" 2,077,000	7,458,000 lbs.	= 1,769,000
Bacon	58,977,000 lbs.	" 7,520,000	58,351,000 lbs.	= 7,437,000
Apples	1,664,000 brls.	" 5,104,000	1,481,000 brls.	= 4,678,000
Wheat	64,466,286 bush.	" 62,590,000	60,343,000 bush.	= 58,677,000
Oats	8,880,673 bush.	" 3,819,000	7,014,645 bush.	= 2,903,000

The item of our wheat to Britain is particularly interesting to the farmers of the West, for it will be seen that Britain took $58,000,000 worth out of a total export of $62,000,000 worth. In addition to the above articles, we sent over a million dollars' worth of hay to England, nearly half of our barley, two-thirds of our wheat flour, practically all of our oatmeal flour, and over eighty per cent of our cattle over one year old that were exported were exported to the British Isles. I ask hon. gentlemen to consider what it would mean to the farmers of Ontario, to the farmers of Quebec, and to the farmers of all Canada, if Great Britain's navy were defeated. A short time ago, I met in Montreal a gentleman who has been engaged in trade in that city for the last thirty years, and the volume of whose trade may be indicated by the fact that during that thirty years he has himself alone purchased upwards of one hundred million dollars' worth of farm products for export, principally cheese and butter. I said to this gentleman: What do you think of the proposition to give thirty-five millions to Britain from the standpoint of your trade, and his answer was: There is one class of people in Canada, if this matter is put before them squarely and fairly, who will hold up both hands for the proposition of the Prime Minister or for double the amount he has offered, and they are the farmers of the Dominion. This gentleman said to me further: You ask me how it would affect me in my business; do you suppose for one moment that I would be fool enough to place on board ship in the city of Montreal two hundred thousand dollars' worth of cheese to send to England if I did not feel that ship was secure and had safe conduct across the seas to bring that cheese to the market; do you not see that if Britain's supremacy on the sea was lost and there was doubt of our produce getting to the British markets in safety, it would mean to the farmers of Ontario, of Quebec, and of all Canada, absolute and utter ruin?

In the face of these facts, in the face of the fact that for the next ten or fifteen years of waiting for a navy even if the policy of the leader of the Opposition had been carried out, we would absolutely have to depend upon Britain's naval supremacy for the security of our ports and of our commerce; in the face of all these facts hon. gentlemen opposite have quibbled about a Canadian navy taking part in Britain's wars, and they quibble now about giving out of our abundant revenue a matter of thirty-five million dollars to show to Britain and to the world that in the matter of the defence of the Empire and in the matter of our own self-interest, Canada is bound to stand by the Motherland and the Empire. Germany has been preparing for years by building great ships of war. Why is Germany doing this? Germany, as Lord Roberts said, will strike when Germany's hour has struck. We need only look to the history of the past for proof of this. Germany's dealings with Denmark, her dealings with Austria, her dealings with France in 1870, all support that view. Everyone believes that the fight if fight there should be will take place in the North Sea and that there are only two ways by which the German navy can get near Canada, either by going through the English Channel or going north through the North Sea. So long as England's navy is supreme, our naval unit on the Atlantic or on the Pacific as proposed by the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, would be just as secure as a party of tourists on the lakes of Muskoka and just as ineffective, from the standpoint of taking any part in Imperial defence. And, if Great Britain loses, what then? I have pictured as well as I could, and the hon. member for Edmonton has pictured in the words of his which I have quoted, what might be in store for us in case of such a disaster.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall mention to hon. gentlemen a few of the things which Great Britain has done for Canada:

1. When Canada as an infant nation needed soldiers to support her growth and maintain her interests, British troops and fortifications were maintained here at a cost of $300,000,000 during the nineteenth century.

2. If our churches in the early days wanted vast sums for pioneer work and continued development, British voluntary societies contributed $100,000,000 during the nineteenth century.

3. When provincial credit was poor and interprovincial unity a dream, Great

Britain guaranteed loans to the extent of $25,000,000 that our railways might be started.

4. If in recent years countless enterprises, private and national, required vast sums of money it has been freely accorded in London to the extent of over 2,000 millions dollars. Some may say that British money has been invested here in order that British capital might get interest, but there is another side to that question, and that is that we have been able to get British capital in our country for our national enterprises at a lower rate of interest than we could possibly have obtained that money if we had not been under the prestige and protection of the British flag.

5. When we wanted to build our canals, a Canadian Pacific railway, Grand Trunk, Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific, we have obtained the money in London at a rate of interest and with a facility which no small nation not under the prestige of the British flag and not having British power and stability to guarantee its position, could possibly have consummated.

6. During all these years, our overseas trade, which is steadily increasing, has never been disturbed by the shadow of a fear because of the unquestioned naval supremacy of Britain to which we have never contributed one dollar.

Let me tell the House what was contributed to Britain by the overseas dominions towards naval expenditure in the year 1911: Australia gave $1,000,000, New Zealand $500,000, South Africa $425,000, Newfoundland $15,000, India $500,000, and Canada, as yet, I am ashamed to say, not one single cent. I think we owe it to ourselves, and to our own self-respect, to say nothing of what we owe to England, that Canada should take some part now in the naval defence of the Empire. These gentlemen opposite quibble about this grant of thirty-five million dollars to the Motherland, and they say it may affect our autonomy, but there was no quibbling about autonomy at the time we voted $50,000 in this House to the relief of the sufferers from the Paris floods; there was no quibbling about autonomy when we granted sums of money in this Parliament for the relief of the afflicted people in San Francisco and Martinique. Let me ask if Australia or New Zealand or any of the other overseas dominions lost any of their autonomy by contributions on the naval question? It is nothing but quibbling to refer to the matter in that way.

In conclusion, allow me to say that I support the proposition of my leader, because in the absence of preparation it is the only thing we can do to retain a semblance of our damaged self-respect, and to demonstrate to the world that the Empire is a unit. I support it because we do not wish to be any longer in the humiliating position of being regarded as the charity ward of the British Empire. I support it because, should the day of Britain's trial come, should the fight take place in the North sea, I, as a Canadian and a British subject, would like to see vessels representative of Canada in the battle line as well as the battleships of Australia, New Zealand and the other overseas dominions. I support it because I believe, as others more able than I have stated, it will have a deterrent effect on German dreadnought building, and therefore our contribution is a contribution to peace. I support it, because it is a forward step in our constitutional relations with Great Britain, making as it does in the direction of that closer unity which is essential to the integrity of the British Empire, and is the world's best guarantee for the security of commerce and the peace of the world. I support it in preference to the policy of the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, because his policy is a policy of semi-detachment, whereas our policy is a policy of closer union. I support it, because I believe it makes for the fulfilment of Canada's destiny; it is a step forward to the time when Canada will be the dominant and controlling factor in the greatest empire that the world has ever seen; it is a step towards that time when Canada, having, as it is bound to have in the course of time a larger population than any other portion of the British Empire, will be the keystone in the arch of nations, will occupy a position at the head of the British Empire, and is destined, I believe, to perform a great work in this world in bringing about the peace of all nations and the end of war.

Mr. G. H. BOIVIN (Shefford): Mr. Speaker, before entering into the subject of this debate, I think that I should congratulate hon. members on both sides of the House upon the excellence of the speeches which have been delivered here since the Christmas adjournment, and express my regret that I should be the first to spoil this eloquence. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) who has just taken his seat, has made what may be considered from a Conservative point of view, an excellent speech. He has ably presented many of the arguments already given in support of the resolution, but I fail to see that a long discussion, concerning the names that the Liberals should suggest for boats they do not want, can prove the necessity of this immediate contribution. I am very sure it is not going to make them acceptable

to the Liberal party of Canada. I also fail to see how a reference to the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver), and the fact that he rose or did not rise to sing the National Anthem, can have any great bearing on the case. He did, however, give us some information concerning himself, and I think that he was more consistent than his fellow-members when this Naval Bill was presented. He said that he did not rise to sing the National Anthem, but that he rose to sing 'Rule Britannia'; he started to sing 'Rule Britannia,' but was drowned out. In the presence of this policy 'Rule Britannia' was certainly very much more appropriate than 'O Canada' or 'The Maple Leaf Forever,' and even more appropriate as a party anthem than 'God Save the King'; I say more appropriate as a party anthem than 'God Save the King,' because the Liberal party in Canada takes no second place when it comes to proving by deeds and not only by words its attachment and its loyalty to our King and country. The hon. member, according to his usual custom, wasted much time in an effort to prove from past statements that the right hon. the leader of the Opposition is so disloyal that he is hardly worthy of being called a Canadian. He read many shortened sentences from speeches made by my leader in years gone by, but even after searching for the worst, he found not one word that was not an expression of loyalty to Canada, to that country which he transformed from a colony to a nation, and in which he is considered by friend and foe alike, as the greatest of Canadian statesmen. He perhaps forgets that a certain number of the leaders of the Conservative party did not have the same opinion of the loyalty of the right hon. leader of the Opposition when they asked the Prime Minister to confer with him, and when they asked him to assist Mr. Borden in taking this naval question out of politics where the present Prime Minister had placed it. He says that the Borden naval policy meets with the approval of the nine provinces of Canada. If he is so sure, if his leaders are so sure, why not prove it by an appeal to the people? We are ready and willing to meet the Conservative party upon the hustings of Canada upon this question. We would prefer to see a redistribution Bill put through first in order that all parts of Canada may have in the next Parliament the representation that they are entitled to, but, redistribution or not, we are ready to meet them whenever they see fit. Frontenac may return the same hon. member, but if he wins his election with speeches like the one which we have just heard, by making personal attacks on our greatest Canadians, I, for one, will have a poor opinion of the electorate of Frontenac. The other arguments, the serious arguments contained in the speech of my hon. friend from Frontenac, were very well presented; but they are all to be found in different words in the speech pronounced in this House on the same subject a few weeks ago by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). Long before I ever imagined that I would have the honour one day of representing the good old county of Shefford in this Parliament, I had learned, through the press and upon the hustings, of the great ability of the hon. minister. I was anxious to learn myself that these reports were true. I had the pleasure of listening to him during the last session, but it was not until the day of the adjournment for the Christmas holidays that I became convinced that he was really an extraordinary debater. In discussing this resolution for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, he showed himself not only a great debater, but he made us believe that he was a lawyer and an excellent lawyer, that is if one who can make a bad case look like a good case, can really be called an excellent lawyer. For almost three hours encouraged by the well-deserved cheers of his fellow members on the other side of the House, who were certainly justified in showing their appreciation of a real speech, he was in turn historian, narrator, defender and critic; he was in turn severe, sarcastic, eloquent, loyal and imperialist; he gave new energy, new life and new hope to the Canadian Conservative party. In a word, he made a speech which will go down to posterity and be recorded in history side by side with, almost equal to, but entirely different from the speech pronounced in this Parliament in March 1909 by the same hon. member for North Toronto.

He then spoke in favour of a Canadian navy. He now supports a resolution whereby the right hon. the Prime Minister proposes to borrow from the people of Great Britain, and hand back to the people of Great Britain for the construction of three dreadnoughts, the sum of $35,000,000. It may be argued that this amount is to be taken from revenue, but if it is, a like amount will have to be borrowed for our permanent public works. In other words, Canada will accomplish her share in the defence of the British Empire; Canada will save that Empire from its present dreadful predicament; Canada will do away with the present emergency; Canada will wipe out the German peril—by borrowing the sum of thirty-five million dollars, and then handing it back.

It certainly required the eloquence and ability of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, to clothe the proposition so as to make it acceptable to the hon. members who occupy seats on the other side of this

House. He was not unequal to the task, but I am sure that he did not succeed in convincing hon. members on this side and the people of Canada that this contribution would be either as effective or as loyal as a Canadian navy, built and equipped in Canada, manned by Canadians, controlled by Canada for the defence of our Canadian coasts and ready to go to the assistance of the British navy at a moment's notice if England were on trial. He did not convince the people of Canada that the Prime Minister deserved nothing but credit, and the leader of the Opposition deserved nothing but blame. He did not succeed in making you forget, Mr. Speaker, that the veteran statesman who leads the Opposition to-day was the first to take the responsibility of inducing the people of this country to go one step further in the manifestation of their loyalty to Canada and the Empire, by laying the foundation of a Canadian navy.

He did nothing and said nothing to prove that an emergency existed, save and except that the right hon. Mr. Borden was Prime Minister of Canada, and that because the Prime Minister said so, it must be so.

He did not contradict a line nor a word contained in the report from the Admiralty which was read to this House when the Bill was presented and which discloses no emergency, not even a pressing need. He did not succeed in making the Nationalist electors of Quebec—I mean those who voted Nationalist in September 1911, but very few of whom will ever do so again—forget that they had voted for the followers of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, because they believed that these candidates, when elected, would vote against every contribution of any kind to Imperial defence.

He was unable to convince those Nationalist candidates who were elected in September 1911, and who seized upon the Prime Minister's promise of a plebiscite or referendum to justify their allegiance to the Tory party, that they will be able to vote for this resolution and be re-elected in their respective counties.

He was unable to make the electors of Quebec county believe that this contribution would be not only a plebiscite but even better than a plebiscite. He was unable to make any true Canadian believe that Canadian liberty and Canadian autonomy would not suffer by the payment of an unsolicited, unrequired and unwarranted tribute to the Mother Country. He was unable to prove, even by a statement from the Prime Minister, that the Hon. George E. Foster of 1912 was a greater statesman or that he loved his country more than the Hon. George Foster of 1909.

Let us see what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said in this House in March of that year. He was speaking of contributions:

That is the idea which is in my mind—that when we make our contributions in the way of a fixed sum, and it goes from us, and we are not responsible for it, we have none of the inspiration arising from the growth and development of a system of future defence in our own country. We are deprived of the larger benefit ourselves, and in the future we do no greater service to the Empire of which we form a part, in this matter of defence.

The next day March 29, 1909, in this same House of Commons, he said:

The first Canadian-owned vessel, built and equipped in Britain, and sent out to defend our coast would become the nucleus and the training-ground of Canadian stokers, Canadian sailors and Canadian officers, and by-and-by perhaps of a Canadian Admiral on the Canadian coast. How much time would be taken in completing that circle none of us can say, but if we begin the tracing of it and follow it fairly faithfully, the time must come when we get a complete circle, and have an Imperial adjunct to the British navy for the defence of Canada and the defence of the Empire, in which Canada has some of her body, her bones, her blood and her mental power, her national pride.

We have already agreed with him to the extent of purchasing the two first vessels to form the nucleus of a Canadian navy. But conditions have changed. Another issue came before the people of Canada and we have changed sides in this House. We have changed sides, but we have not lost our interest in Canada; we have not lost our love for Canada and things Canadian, we are still ready and willing to assist in the defence of the Empire in case of emergency or need; but we have not changed our opinions. We are sorry that the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce has changed his opinions.

Canada to-day is better able to defend herself and the Empire than in 1909. We do not find the amount proposed at all excessive, but we do ask that, instead of giving this money to a nation rich, prosperous and more than able to take care of herself, it be spent at home, and that the greatest possible portion of it may find its way into the pockets of our mechanics, our labourers, our foundrymen, our builders; then later into the pockets of our sailors, our officers, and through all these to our traders and farmers.

With our navy will grow our national pride and our loyalty to Canada, as part and a precious part of the British Empire. Instead of comparing the plans of the British Admiralty with her own plans and adding three more dreadnoughts to her fighting force to keep pace with the British navy, Germany and the other nations of the world will see a rising young nation on the northern half of the American continent building a navy of her own in order that she may, in the poetic words of the

poetic member for Brandon, say to whoever dares strike at any part of the Empire:

Aggressor, spare that tree,
Touch not a single bough;
In youth it sheltered me,
And I'll stand by it now.

It was certainly very able of the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce to compare the sister nations of the Empire to one large family:

Six children, grown-up men, we will say, from eighteen to thirty years old, in one family. Two men are sent to the defence of their country; four remain at home. Do you say to the four who remain at home: You have no part or lot in this matter? One of those remaining at home provides a rifle, another a kit, another gives a bible—or perhaps it is the mother that does that—another gives his prayers, his hopes, his good wishes. The whole family is in it—the whole family!

A beautiful word-picture, such as the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce alone can paint. But we on this side of the House do not consider that Canada will be doing her duty by remaining at home, and giving her prayers, her hopes, and her good wishes. We do not consider that Canada will be doing her duty by supplying a kit or a rifle. Australia is getting ready to go to the front when needed and we want Canada to be there too.

We are not in favour of a contribution with a string attached. What will England do with her officers and her men placed upon these dreadnoughts when Canada sees fit to call them back? Will she dismiss them from the service and ruin their futures? Will she place them upon a pension list? Or will she build new vessels to be manned by them? The Prime Minister of Great Britain was not far wrong, if he made the statement, attributed to him by certain newspapers, that Canada was killing England with kindness.

An argument, considered by some to be a weighty one, in favour of the contribution is that the British Admiralty, with its years of experience, knows better than this Parliament, how to spend the money to the best possible advantage. If an emergency really exists, why not give the money instead of the lifeless dreadnoughts?

The right hon. leader of the Opposition said he would be in favour—that the Liberal party would be in favour—of donating four times thirty-five millions if an emergency really existed. It would be a gift of good Canadian money, and not three lifeless war vessels. In a few years from now, it would be a powerful Canadian navy. But the Lords of the Admiralty say there is no emergency. Let me refer again to their report or memorandum. Paragraph seven reads as follows:

At the present time, and in the immediate future, Great Britain still has the power, by making special arrangements and mobilizing a portion of the reserves, to send, without courting disaster at home, an effective fleet of battleships and cruisers to unite with the Royal Australian navy and the British squadrons in China and the Pacific for the defence of British Columbia, Australia and New Zealand. And these communities are also protected and their interests safeguarded by the power and authority of Great Britain so long as her naval strength is unbroken.

And paragraph nine:

Whatever may be the decision of Canada at the present juncture, Great Britain will not in any circumstances fail in her duty to the overseas dominions of the Crown. She has before now successfully made head alone and unaided against the most formidable combinations, and she has not lost her capacity by a wise policy and strenuous exertions to watch over and preserve the vital interests of the Empire.

That is why we are not in favour of giving millions to-day, but, on the other hand, we are anxious to assume our share in the protection of our country and the Empire, in order that the next memorandum issued by the British Admiralty at the request of a Canadian prime minister, may refer not only to the Royal Australian navy, but also to the Royal Canadian navy as well.

We are anxious to comply with the so-called request of the Admiralty contained in the last paragraph, which reads as follows:

The Prime Minister of the Dominion having enquired in what form any immediate aid that Canada might give would be most effective, we have no hesitation in answering after prolonged consideration of all the circumstances that it is desirable that such aid should include the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest ships of war which science can build or money supply.

I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will notice that the request is that such aid will 'include' and not that such aid will 'consist of' the provision of a certain number of the largest and strongest men-of-war that science can build or money can buy. The amendment supported by the Liberal party includes two of the largest and strongest men-of-war, and the boats required to form two fleet units. In my opinion it complies with the so-called request much better than the boats to be built and loaned by the Borden policy.

I referred a few moments ago to the real speech made by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. I did not mean to infer that no other speeches have been made on the other side. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) made an excellent speech, but he must have forgotten that in his own province he has over 500 miles of an undefended, many islanded shore. He may learn in the near future, if he still

holds the opinion expressed in this House a few weeks ago, that the view taken by Sir Richard McBride that the prime duty of Canada is to defend the coasts of British Columbia, is more popular with the right-thinking sane Canadian of to-day, than the give-and-take back, borrow-and-lend policy of the right hon. the Prime Minister. There have been other able speeches supporting the resolution, but we have not yet heard from the hon. the Secretary of State. Will he repeat in his speech, if he makes one, the statements made at Longue Pointe in the province of Quebec, in August, 1910? According to Le Devoir, he then said: :

> Speakers are touring through our counties blaming not only the Government who voted the nefarious navy law, but also the Federal Conservative opposition, who supported a still more nefarious policy. We rally to the principles of Mr. Monk, refusing to contribute either in boats or in money, until the people have been consulted, and we believe that this attitude, not that of the Government or that of the Opposition, is the truly patriotic policy. In 1776 and 1812 our ancestors defended our country: We ourselves would be ready to repel an invasion, but we refuse to go out to fight for motives which we ignore or even for motives we know too well, take those at the bottom of the South African war, provoked by speculative financial interests, and we are convinced that if the electors could voice their opinion, the majority would condemn both the Government Bill and the Borden policy.

The province of Quebec is awaiting with anxiety to hear and read the speech to be delivered by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Nantel).

He is a member of the Government; he was consulted by his colleagues before this policy was adopted, and his opinion probably had great weight in the framing of this policy. He was obliged to disagree with his former colleague, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). He felt obliged, I am sure, from no other motive than the good of his country and the welfare of its people, to retain his seat in the Cabinet, and the people of Quebec are anxious to hear from his own lips, in his own inimitable language, the reasons why he is right and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is wrong. They will compare this speech with much interest and curiosity, with the words used by him in the county of St. Jean-Iberville in the autumn of 1910, when, always according to Le Devoir, he said:

> I will now define the three attitudes taken by Messers. Laurier, Borden and Monk in the House of Commons. . . . Mr. Laurier wants at any cost, a navy which will be Imperial in time of war and Canadian in time of peace. Mr. Borden, instead of a navy, wanted us to immediately give to England a contribution of $25,000,000, Mr. Monk asked that the people be consulted before anything was done in connection with this policy. . . . (cheers). The first thing to be expected from a politician is that he should preach in power the same doctrine that he preached in opposition. Those who occupy the Government benches to-day are not the men of 14 years ago, they are not those of 10 years ago, they are not even those of two years ago. For this reason we ask you to banish them from power. If ever our party takes the reins of government in this country, I, for one, promise that I will remain true to my principles of to-day. And if I did not, well, I would ask those who placed us in power to drive us out again.

These hon. gentlemen who have accepted portfolios in the Borden Government have not retained all the liberty of action of the brilliant young member for Nicolet (Mr. Lamarche), who voted against his leader upon the Mondou amendment to the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, but who did not forget to say, as reported in 'Hansard' page 593:

> I may say that I have to follow the duties of my conscience before the duties of my party, and to support this amendment. It is with great sorrow I affirm that I have again to differ with many political friends whom I very much esteem, and whose views I hope I will in the future have reason to support. I wish hon. gentlemen also to understand that by voting for this amendment I do not look for a plank to cross over to the ranks of the Liberal party.

How nice it must be to belong to a party where it is so easy to agree to disagree in order to retain the reins of power and the fruits of victory. The hon. the Postmaster General is not in this class, although a member of the same political family. He admits that he disagrees with his leader and allies of yesterday to agree with his friends of to-day. His transformation from a Nationalist to a jingo is not quite complete. He fears that he will not be recognized by his electors if he goes clear over with one bound, so, in addressing this House upon the resolution under discussion, he blamed the Liberal party for proposing to man the ships which we want to build, and he had not spoken five minutes before he imagined himself back among the Nationalists of Quebec and took up his old refrain about the shedding of our blood. Is it any wonder that the jingoes left him talking to empty benches?

Mr. LEMIEUX: His paper said that the House was full, that the benches were packed.

Mr. BOIVIN: He said that if the Laurier navy law were adopted conscription would be necessary. Does he mean that loyalty is dead in Canada? There was loyalty at the time of the South African war as attested by monuments in cities and villages to the boys who were killed upon the veldt. There are others ready and will-

ing to serve the flag. Patriotism is not dead. There will be men to serve in the Canadian navy. I know a young man, a cousin of mine, from the town of St. Johns, Que., who has enlisted in the United States navy, simply because he had no navy of his own in Canada in which to enlist. No, loyalty and patriotism are not dead. There is nothing in the Naval Act or in the amendment under discussion which even suggests conscription, and if ever Great Britain is involved in a maritime war, if ever our Canadian navy takes its place in the firing line, the hon. Postmaster General can remain at home, as he did in the Richelieu by-election, where he placed some one else behind the guns which so far have been unable to capture any large number of seat from His Majesty's loyal Opposition.

One of the marvels of the relationship between the self-governing dominions and the Mother Country has been that as every tie was removed there was more loyalty and more attachment. Britain learned in the infancy of her empire building that to give freedom was to gain loyalty; to release a people was to bind them tightly; to bestow power was to have it more abundantly. She won Canada and set her free; she peopled Australia and gave her liberty; she subdued New Zealand and sent her on her way rejoicing; she conquered South Africa and then returned her to her foes. With every extension of freedom to these great young nations the tie that binds became stronger and more enduring. We are willing to sacrifice for her, not only a paltry sum of money but in the words of the hon. leader of the Opposition, 'our hearts, our brains and our brawn.'

What England does not dare take; what England does not ask for Parliament has no right to give, without at least first obtaining a special mandate from the people of Canada. Other grave and important questions have been decided by an appeal to the Canadian public. Sometimes we have won; sometimes we have lost, but we have always respected the verdict rendered. When we fell it was with our face to the sun, wounded but not dead nor disheartened. And to-day we are ready to fight again for what we consider to be the birthright of our Canadian nationhood. We are not guided in this matter by a small Canadianism, nor by a jingoistic Imperialism, but are jealous of our rights and liberties. Confident of our present position and of our future, true to the interests of the Dominion, recognizing the interests of the Empire, let us all, as Canadians, whether French speaking or English speaking, place ourselves in a position to defend our own shores and meet any and every emergency as it may arise by placing the Royal Canadian navy built, paid for, equipped, manned and controlled by Canada, at the disposal of the Empire.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the very carefully prepared essay of my hon. friend the member for Shefford (Mr. Boivin). I congratulate him on the brevity of his deliverance and the cleverness with which he has arrayed the arguments of the various speakers whom he has introduced to our attention. But, he will perhaps pardon me, as I do not wish to occupy too much of the time of the House, if I proceed at once to debate the question of the naval assistance that is proposed at the present time to the British Empire by the proposition which has been laid before the House by my right hon. friend the leader of the Government. The proposals that have been made by the First Minister mark an epoch in the history of Canada and the Empire as a whole. I had the honour, Sir, for some years, of being a fairly close student of the question of Empire unity, particularly in regard to trade and defence. Therefore, I trust that I may be excused if I go over some of the ground that may have already been traversed by some of the speakers and give in my own words what I conceive to be the present position of the question of the naval defence of the Empire. There has been, during this discussion, an attempt made to fasten upon various members upon both sides of the House views that were held in the year 1909. On that occasion you will recall that there was a resolution submitted to the House of Commons that received what we were told was the unanimous support of both sides. That resolution, Sir, called, I believe, for a Canadian navy. There is little doubt but what the members who were in the House on that occasion were pretty well united on the principle of a Canadian navy to assist in the defence of the Empire. There was, however, in the Dominion of Canada and in the province of Ontario, particularly, a very large element that was opposed to the principle of that resolution and that openly expressed its dissatisfaction with it; in fact, so strong was that feeling in Ontario that Sir James Whitney was requested from one part of the province and another to go over the heads of the House here and himself make from the province of Ontario a contribution of one or two dreadnoughts. In other words, the people of Ontario held, in 1909, the views that are held by the Premier and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House to-day. The people of Ontario who had that view at that day were right and that is what the country wants to know now. It is not so much what were your views in 1909, but are you right to-day.

That is what the country is concerned in, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that in my judgment, the Premier of Canada has submitted, in his proposals to the House, a measure that covers, to the best of his ability and to the best of the ability of the men who surround him, the requirements of the British Empire to-day. There has been a long amendment moved to which I shall take occasion to refer from time to time during the course of my remarks.

Some of the reasons that are given why we in Canada should assist at the present time have already been enumerated to-day by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards). We have a large sea-borne commerce, we have a long coast line to defend, we have the ability to pay, we have threathening armaments among the nations of the earth and there is greater safety in a strong united fleet than in scattered fleets. For all these reasons we should contribute at the present time a sum of money to produce certain vessels that will take their places in the firing line of the Empire fleet and which, at the same time, will remain the property of the Dominion of Canada and can be recalled should we ever set about the placing of a navy of our own upon the high seas. It is all very well to be consistent and, as I have said, in 1909, there was a widespread feeling that a contribution should be made rather than that a Canadian navy should be built.

I had the honour in the year 1909 of attending a distinguished Imperial gathering in the city of Sydney, Australia. The question of the defence of the Empire was one of the principal subjects under consideration and on that occasion the following resolution was submitted:

That this congress views with much satisfaction the interest shown by the colonies in the recent discussions relating to the maintenance of the naval supremacy of the Empire, and desires to record in its proceedings the valuable assistance which they voluntarily proffered on that occasion; and further expresses the hope that either before or at the next Imperial Conference some practical scheme may be elaborated which will result in an active and organized co-operation between the Mother Country and the dominions beyond the seas for the defence of the Empire, its commerce, and trade routes; that this congress hereby affirms the principle that it is the duty of the self-governing colonies to participate in the cost of the defence of the Empire.

That is the resolution which was submitted to this great British gathering which was assembled from all parts of the Empire. On that occasion I had the honour of representing the city of Toronto and in order that I may show, Sir, that in that day I held the view which is now being presented to the House—that is that a contribution is the proper thing—I desire to call the attention of the House to what I then said. I find that I then spoke as follows:

There is no subject attracting more attention than this one at the present time within the Empire. Little short of a crisis has suddenly arisen. What is to be done to adequately meet the emergency? It is, I think, evident to all that the Oversea Dominions must shoulder their share. This they are all ready to do, at least to some extent. Without adequate defence nothing is secure, and no part is so remote as to be exempt from danger. It has been made evident that all our dominions are ready to answer to the call. The fabric of our Empire rests solely on the strength of the British navy. Let the British navy be wiped out, and the Empire will fade away like mown grass under a tropical sun. It is, therefore, imperative, that the fleet on which our Empire depends should be invincible under any probable or even possible condition. This load has become too heavy for the Mother Country. How will the Oversea Dominions assist? The proposition that each unit should build a small navy to defend its own shores seems to me quite insufficient to meet the crisis. Small and widely-scattered fleets will be of little use as before they could possibly mobilize, the great fight would be over, and the transcendent issues of the struggle would be past the possibility of recall. It is, therefore, evident in my opinion that each dominion or estate must contribute money or ships. The Empire navy must speak with the voice and power of the Empire. Should the main fleet be too weak or inefficient to cope with the enemy, it would be a fatal mistake that could never be rectified. The main and almost sole objection to this contribution is that we cannot have a voice in the expenditure and control. This is a very serious objection, and brings to the forefront the question of Empire organization, a great problem, too, that must be grappled with and solved.

I read that to show that in 1909 I was, as I am today, in favor of a contribution of men and money and ships to the British Empire. I believe thoroughly in the unity of the British Empire and one fleet with full co-operation in trade and for defence.

There is a very sharp line drawn between the naval policy of the Conservative party, as announced by the Prime Minister and the naval policy of the Liberal party, as set forth in the resolution of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. The Conservative policy follows the line I have suggested of making contributions to maintoin the supremacy of the British fleet upon the high seas, and the Liberal policy of today seeks to enlarge somewhat on the Liberal policy of 1909 as embraced in the Naval Service Act of Canada. In my judgment, the Liberal policy, is not warranted by the success which has attended the fleet known as the Laurier Navy which the late Government tried to set in motion.

An unfortunate blot upon the character of Canada, as being competent to carry out great undertakings, is the lamentable failure of the Naval Act of 1910. The Liberal Government set out with a flourish of trumpets; we were to have a navy of our own, and the Rainbow and the Niobe were purchased, and one was placed on the Pacific and the other on the Atlantic Coast. That fleet has been very well described as being too weak to fight and too slow to run away. What has become of the Laurier navy? Some two years ago the Niobe being sent to a political picnic somewhere in Nova Scotia, struck upon a rock, was laid in dry-dock for six months, and it cost us a quarter of a million dollars to repair her. Since then she has been lost track of. The Rainbow on the Pacific coast is, I am informed, tied up at her dock, unable to navigate the seas for want of hands to man her. In face of their experience in this line, gentlemen opposite tell us that Canada should man these three great dreadnoughts which we propose to give to the navy of England.

The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) grew eloquent in declaring that it would be a disgrace to Canada if a battle should be fought upon the high seas and if there were no Canadians manning our ships. Of course, it is a very fine idea to have these ships manned by Canadians, but it is not likely to be realized in the very near future. Any hon. member of this House who has seen a modern dreadnought will easily understand what skill and knowledge is required to sail such a ship and to operate these immense guns which can hit a target several miles away and penetrate nickel-steel armour over one foot thick. There are several difficulties in the way of providing men for the ships in such a country as Canada. One difficulty is that Canadians cannot be found to give their services for fifty cents a day which is the usual pay of a British seaman. Another difficulty is that Canada is not what you would call a seafaring country and we have not a very large element in our population who are accustomed to take to the sea as a calling. Another difficulty—and I shall dwell upon it for a few moments, because it has not been touched during the present debate,—is that Canadians have not been encouraged by our public speakers and by those who ought be leaders of thought in Canada, to take part in either the military or the naval defence of their country. I could give the names of some who have actually gone about this country preaching that men should not learn the art of war, that this is the day of universal arbitration, and disarmament, and that it is little short of a crime for a man to enlist either in the army or the navy of his country. If any hon. gentleman opposite doubts that I can give him the names of men, prominent in the Liberal ranks, who have preached this unpatriotic doctrine throughout the land. Indeed, to such an extent has this gone, that in some cases if a man should dare to declare that he was in favor of his country being ready for self-defence, he has not only been called a brute, but branded as being unfit for church membership. Even since this debate began, a notable figure in the Liberal party in the City of Toronto has put himself on record that war is legalized murder, and that those who engage in war are legalized murderers. This, is one reason why men are slow to enlist in our militia and naval forces. I have seen the fences throughout the country placarded during the Laurier regime with big posters asking for men to enlist in the Laurier navy. How many men enlisted in all those departments? A mere handful, and most of those have already got tired and are out of the service; many have deserted from the ships that they enlisted upon. Why is all this? It is because wrong ideals are set before the people. I make the statement that, in my judgment, the men of this country will never rally to support Canada either on land or on water until there is a different spirit of patriotism inspired in the people of the Dominion of Canada. It is time that this sort of thing ceased in a country such as Canada. I have sailed the Atlantic many times; I have visited all the principal countries of Europe; I have also sailed around the world; and I make the statement here to-night, without any fear of contradiction, that there is no country in the world to-day that has so much to defend and so little to defend it with as the Dominion of Canada. Anyone who knows anything about the nations of the earth knows that that is true. Yet we have in our midst men who call themselves patriotic, who call themselves religious, that go about this country advocating that men do not do their duty by enlisting in the army or the navy. I say that it is time, in my judgment, that this sort of thing ceased. I believe that it is possible for a man to be both a Christian and a soldier or a sailor; and I am prepared to state that, in the face of both the Church and the State. The pages of history, both sacred and profane, will bear out that statement. You may travel round the world; you may visit all the great countries of the earth; and you will find the men who have left a lasting reputation and have stamped their race and day and generation upon humanity, have been the men who have been ready to defend and die for their country and their home. Visit the various countries of Europe and what will you find? Go to France the home of the ancestors of my hon. friend opposite; what do you find in France? Visit the picture galleries;

walk about the streets of Paris or of any of the great provincial cities and what will you find? Monuments to the great prowess of that tremendous leader of men, Napoleon. All honour to him who won the battles and who fought on many a bloody field and won many a decisive victory, that made the hills and the dales of the country of France resound with pæans to the praise of a man who had brought such acclaim to French arms and to French dominions in the then know world. Visit Germany; what do you find there? Monuments to such men as Bismarck, Frederick the Great, the great Emperor William, and others who have fought the battles of their country and have won on many a bloody field. Come home to our own native land, the Mother Country. What do you find there? When you go to London, observe the great central figure in that metropolitan city of the Empire. Everyone knows Trafalgar Square and what do we see there, the very highest monument in that great city of London, containing seven millions of people, erected to whom? A thin spare man, who led the naval forces of the Empire upon the high seas and who brought fame to England, such a victory that down to the present time we have been partakers of that great and glorious victory of Trafalgar which settled the destiny of the Empire upon that occasion. There that monument stands to-day, the topmost peak of London, and on top of it the thin spare figure of Admiral Nelson, with these words, 'England expects that every man this day will do his duty.' I want my hon. friend to drop the word 'autonomy' occasionally and use the word 'duty.' This country is sick and tired of the word 'autonomy'; it has been worked to death; nothing can be done without disturbing our 'autonomy.' Here we have it now; we are jeopardizing our 'autonomy' by making this gift. I ask that this nobler word of 'duty' be inscribed on the banners of this country and that Canadians rise to the dignity of occasionally doing their duty. I can see that the proposition that is laid before you by the right hon. the Prime Minister is a measure of our duty.

I have not yet got through with what constitutes the glorious part of the British Empire; it is not alone in her monuments outside. I am sorry my friend the member for Red Deer is not in the House, because I think he would be able to follow me in this. I want to take you for a moment within the precincts of the church, because I have said that I believe it is competent for a soldier to be a Christian also. I want to take you within the few cathedrals that stand out prominently in the national life of Great Britain, those two cathedrals that every man who visits the Old Land never fails to enter, Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's Cathedral. Enter these sacred edifices and what do you find? As you pass down the aisles of these two grand churches erected to the worship of God, what do you see? Pass along. You read tablet after tablet and memorial after memorial, to whom? Not to the saints departed who from their labours rest, not to the great speakers who have filled the pulpits of those churches, but you read on monument after monument and tablet after tablet these words, 'Died gloriously fighting for his country.' That is what you read upon the monuments in the Church of England in Great Britain. Our church is doing wrong if it does not hold up to the gaze of mankind, and pose before them as men to be emulated, those men who fought for their country and bled and died that we might have the privilege and freedom and salvation that we have to-day in Canada and throughout the broad Empire. What the Church of England has inscribed both in St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey, are words such as these, Nelson, Wellington, Sir John Moore, Napier, and others, every one of them with this inscription: 'Died gloriously fighting for his country.' There are hundreds of such memorials in those two great cathedrals; whereas to the speakers who occupied the pulpits you can scarcely find one. Therefore, I say that the national church of Great Britain has set its seal to it, that a man may be a saint and also a soldier, a Christian and also a fighting man. I say that the sooner that this country gets some of that idea into its mind, the better for our defences both by land and sea. These things have been deprecated in the past; and it is time I think that we have a little plain speaking on these two particular points, because every one knows that a man who enlists either in our militia or in our navy must be of a self-sacrificing and patriotic disposition; he must take, in other words, part in dollars and cents and part of pay in patriotism and self-sacrifice for the good of his country and his Empire. That is what will reward them; and for this reason I think that every member of this House both here and in the country at the present time should hold up the cause that asks for the defence of the Empire in a way that will lead it to be supreme no matter who the enemy may be that assails it. I have in my heart not the slightest feeling against any nation in the world. But I do say that, in my opinion, it is time that we should consider very carefully what we are going to do under the circumstances. Those to whom I have already referred, those who go about preaching disarmament and arbitration, found very poor encouragement for their views in the year 1912. What has happened in the year just closed? Six

or seven of the nations of Europe have been involved in a most bloody war, which is not yet finished by any means. The little country of Bulgaria, with not half the resources of Canada—not one-quarter—and with a population much less than ours, placed within a month 400,000 men in the field; and in this war they have lost nearly as many men as Great Britain lost in the South African war. There is a sample of a country that was ready for an emergency. I shall have a little to say about this word 'emergency' in a minute or two. But now I draw the attention of the House for a few moments to the fact that European nations have been involved in war during the past year. Twelve months ago he would have been a bold man who would have ventured to give the opinion that any war would be going on in Europe at the present time. Arbitration and disarmament were being preached throughout the world, and universal settlement of disputes by arbitration called for. Still, we find within twelve months, six or seven of the countries of Europe have been involved in a most bloody war, a war that is going to change the whole map of Europe. And no one can tell where it will end. Before another twelve month runs by, it may be that several of the great powers of Europe will be involved in the worst war the world has ever known. Talk about disarmament for a country like Canada, where we have a comparatively small number of militia—scarcely a thousand regular troops probably in the whole Dominion—and not a ship that could meet an enemy on one coast or the other, not a fortified position on the left or on the right, on the east or or on the west, why, to preach, disarmament in a country like this seems to me little short of suicide. What we want in Canada to-day is the spirit of patriotism, for patriotism will lead the people to enlist, will make them ready to exhibit a spirit of self-sacrifice; and it will call into play all those elements of the human mind that enter into the construction of the best man the world knows—the true patriot. War, I say, calls out all those elements in mankind, and we in Canada should not be slow to encourage both the military and the naval spirit at this time. But, unfortunately, we cannot do it in time to assist the great Mother Country if we believe that this national emergency is as close upon us as it appears to be. Therefore it is that the Prime Minister of the Dominion of Canada has come forward with the proposition that we should vote $35,000,000 to help to construct three of the best ships that science can build and that money can buy. This vote, Sir, will be passed

in this House, without a doubt, and it will be passed by a large majority. It is to be regretted that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) is not in line on this proposition. This proposition was submitted to the House on December 5, about five or six weeks ago. The right hon. gentleman asked time for reconsideration, and that was granted. Everyone thought that, for once, the leader of the Opposition was going to show himself a patriot, a statesman, a man who stood for Empire unity. But, again, everyone was mistaken. As the Mail and Empire of Toronto so well put it—and nobody could put it in better words, I think: 'He thought long, and he chose wrong.' That is exactly what he did. Instead of rising in his place as every one hoped he would do—every one on both sides of this House, probably—and as every one expected, and stating: 'We will make this unanimous,' he got up and read a long rigamarole of an amendment containing several suggestions, suggestions to do everything but the right thing, everything but what is immediate, everything but what will assist the British Empire in this emergency.

We have heard a good deal about that word 'Emergency.' At the present time, this House is divided into two classes—those who recognize an emergency when they see it, and those who do not; and hon. gentlemen and the right hon. gentleman and those who follow him are among the 'do nots.' That emergency is just as plainly set forth in the documents which have been sent from the Admiralty as words can make it.

This is not the first time that hon. gentlemen opposite have failed to recognize an emergency. Two years ago this month reciprocity was proposed in this House, being brought down with a flourish of trumpets by Hon. Mr. Fielding and Hon. Mr. Paterson. At the moment when they brought that treaty down in this House an emergency arose. But Sir Wilfrid Laurier and those who followed him did not see it. The country did see it. The debate went on in this House for months, and still these hon. gentlemen did not recognize that there was an emergency. But there was. After many months of conflict over it in this House, they decided to go to the country. Still they did not see the emergency. They said, 'We will come back with a bigger majority than ever.' The ex-Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux), whom I am glad to see arrive in the House, was among those deceived. He did not see the emergency, and no more did his leader. And up to the very morning of the 21st of September, they declared that there was no emergency. Hon. Mr. Paterson, one of the negotiators of the treaty, said on the streets of Brant-

ford only about three days before the election, 'We are going to come back with a bigger majority than ever; our majority will be sixty.' No emergency, you see. They failed to see the emergency then as they fail to see the emergency now, because they do not wish to see it. But it is there. No man who understands English words can read the document that came from the British Admiralty and not see that there is an emergency. Not only is there an emergency now but there has been an emergency for several months past. The principal countries of Europe to-day are armed camps.

Ship-building is being carried on in the navy yards, both of Great Britain and Germany, with feverish haste—and why? Because the fires that are smoldering will soon burst forth; of that there is not the slightest doubt. Suppose you have a friend who is an elderly man. He has, under one roof, the savings of a lifetime. It is a frame building, not very large, but it contains all his worldly goods. You begin to question him as to how he has succeeded in life, and he says: I have done fairly well, and all that I have is in this building. You say, I hope, my friend, you are insured. He says: Oh, no, I have no insurance. I do not think that is necessary; in fact, my neighbour carries enough insurance for both of us—I am saving that much money. That man is standing on the verge of absolute ruin, he does not realize the existence of an emergency. He says: I am a very careful man: I know that fire will not break out in my premises, as I watch them diligently. But what about his neighbour? He may not be so careful, and the fire may spread and devour his house and all its contents, wiping out the product of the labour of a lifetime. That is a pointed illustration of the position of Canada to-day so far as her defenses are conerned. We depend solely upon the British naval forces; the safety of Canada and the Empire at the present moment rests only upon the British navy and its supremacy. It is said there is no emergency, but can anything be more acute than the position to-day of the great powers of Europe? Talk about disarmament; talk about arbitration for the settlement of disputes; does any man who travels think that disarmament and arbitration are making the headway that it is sometimes claimed for them? If he does, I am sorry for his powers of observation.

During the past year I had the pleasure of visiting Germany, and I saw a midsummer review by the Emperor William in the city of Berlin; consequently I know something of what is going on in that country. I saw 25,000 picked German troops and 4,000 horse being reviewed in the streets, and on the fields adjacent to the city of Berlin. I also visited France, and other countries. To-day Europe is an armed camp; six or seven European nations are at present engaged in a life and death struggle. Canada is the most unprotected country in the whole broad world—and in this statement I defy contradiction—if we wipe out the protection afforded us by the British navy. This I say after having visited most of the principal countries in the world. Never since the days of Adam have there been so many armed men as there are in the world to-day. At the present moment Germany can, within two or three weeks' notice, put in the field 2,000,000 trained men, skilled in arms, and with whom soldiery is a trade. Besides this Germany has in reserve 4,000,000 men, making in that Empire alone 6,000,000 men quickly avaliable in time of emergency. They are in close alliance with Austria and Italy, and it must also be remembered, in debating the strength of the different navies of Europe, that Germany, Austria and Italy are united in the Triple Alliance, and England, France and Russia in what is known as the Entente Cordiale. The three nations making the Triple Alliance are constructing a fleet that in the very near future will equal that of the British navy. As I have said, we depend for our safety upon the supremacy of Britain's navy; have we done anything towards its maintenance? Up to the present, nothing but talk. Not a single dollar has gone from Canada, nor has help been given given in the way of ships, and, in the proposition submitted by hon. gentlemen opposite, nothing would be done for years to come. How long would it take to carry out the proposition of my right hon. friend? Ten years at the very least, and probably fifteen.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No more than six.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: And before six years have passed, you will probably see the conflict—yes, in less than half that time. My hon. friend says it will take six years, but I do not think he is competent to judge as to the period of time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I have obtained the knowledge from those who know.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: And I have also. I think the hon. gentleman would not like to take the contract of building a dreadnought in ten years.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Will the hon gentleman tell me how long it will take to equip a shipyard suitable for the construction of a super-dreadnought? Will he venture the opinion it will take more than two years to do it?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I should say it would take four or perhaps five years. In Britain or Germany—and in Germany the ships are built just as quickly as in Britain—it would take from two to three years to build

a dreadnought—two or three years, at the earliest, after the keel is laid. So that even if my hon. friend is right, it will take five years to make a dreadnought ready for launching in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is right.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: But I am going to double that time, as I think I am well within the mark, if hon. gentlemen opposite should not proceed faster than they have done with the Laurier navy. They were in power some three years after they passed their act, and they did not accept a single tender, even for a small boat. Will it pay this country to build a shipyard, to construct the dreadnoughts, and then let it stand idle for years to come? I may remark also that the tenders of hon. gentlemen opposite allowed six years to build the Bristols, which are small boats compared to modern dreadnoughts.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Has the hon. gentleman visited the shipyards of Great Britain, and, if so, does he not know that the same plant, the same ship house, the same machine shops, and the same machinery of all kinds are used to build cruisers as are employed in the construction of dreadnoughts?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. gentleman cannot convince me that a very large ship can be built in a very small yard. You may build a small ship in a big yard, but you cannot build a big ship in a small yard. I have visited the British as well as the American shipyards, and about this I shall have something to say presently. I have also visited the big gun factories, and I want to remind the hon. gentleman that not only does he require to build the dreadnought, but it will be necessary to put guns on board, he will require to equip the ship with the necessary appliances of war. Where will he get them? Will he build them in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEEY: They will be obtained at the proper factories.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Where are the proper factories?

Mr. PUGSLEY: In England.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Then you will build your dreadnoughts here and send across the water for the armaments?

Mr. PUGSLEY: Bring the armaments here.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, the hon. gentleman is giving us the information that they will send to Great Britain for the armament. Very good, but I do not think they are going to have the opportunity to build a dreadnought in Canada for some little time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do not be too sure.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think this country will appreciate the fact that the policy which our esteemed First Minister is proposing, is vastly superior to the one that my hon. friend from St. John thinks should be adopted.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is not a made-in-Canada policy.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am sorry that my hon. friend has reminded me of the made-in-Canada policy. I think nobody who knows me in this House will deny that I am a stronger upholder of that policy than he is, but not on this question, because I know the limitations of the people of Canada, and I know that we are absolutely unequipped to build a big warship in this country.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How did you begin your own firm?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend says we ought to build those warships in Canada because 'made-in-Canada' is a good policy. Well, there is one thing in this discussion that has greatly pleased, and that is that we have discovered one article which the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) is favourable to having built in Canada. It is the only article I have heard him say should be built in Canada. I had not the pleasure of being in the House when the hon. member for Red Deer spoke, but I understand that he suggested that if we only sent a canoe to Great Britain it should be built in Canada. I might remind the hon. member that the canoe was built in Canada long before the National Policy came into existence. It was built in Canada even before the white man set foot on our shores, but I presume our friends opposite mean a war canoe. However, that is altogether aside from the question. I am showing you now, Sir, that it is necessary that we should assist the British navy to keep on top. My hon. friends opposite say that Great Britain does not need any assistance, that we had better keep our dollars and sympathy at home, that they have not asked for them. I say that we have kept our dollars at home much too long. I make the statement without fear of contradiction, that, man for man, in Canada we are able to subscribe as much for naval and military matters as the average citizen of Great Britain, and it stands to our disgrace that up to the present time we have accepted the protection of the British fleet without subscribing one dollar towards its maintenance. It is true that our friends opposite suggest certain ways out of the obligation. We were reminded of one of these to-day by the hon. member for Frontenac. The late Minister of Militia suggested that if trouble arose, we should rely on the

Monroe Doctrine, that Canada should trust her fate to the hands of the United States. Did ever anyone hear of a more humiliating proposition than that? It is enough to make the British blood in the veins of every true Canadian boil.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That was the doctrine of Canning.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, my hon. friends had better keep it canned. The Minister of Militia in the late Government made the proposition that we should rely on the Monroe Doctrine.

That brings me to a phase of the question with which I have not yet dealt, and on which I am going to say a few words. The Monroe Doctrine is hardly worth the paper it is written on so long as the United States have not got an army and navy sufficiently strong to back it up. It is a doctrine which is not accepted by any power in Europe, and it is not likely to be accepted. And yet, the ex-Minister of Militia would like us to rely on that doctrine for protection in time of danger. Now, there is one astonishing omission in this memorandum which has been furnished by the Admiralty, an omission which I have not yet heard explained. I think it mentions almost every country in Europe, great and small, and it gives the number of their ships, the amount of their naval expenditures, the number of men in their service and so on. But the third greatest naval power in the world, for some reason or other, is not mentioned. What is the third greatest naval power in the world today? It is our neighbours to the south. Experts tell us that if Great Britain and Germany came to conclusions in the North Sea, the victorious fleet would be depleted by over fifty per cent, while the defeated fleet would be annihilated. Who would then be on top? The third greatest naval power in the world would be on top.

Mr. PUGSLEY: England would be on top.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: No, the United States might be on top after the battle.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You have no faith in England.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: If my hon. friend has not any faith in England I am sorry for him. I have faith that the British will stand to their guns and probably win the battle, but they would lose so heavily in men and ships that they would not be equal in strength to the navy of the United States.

An hon. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friends laugh, but I would remind them that not two months ago there were assembled in New York harbour 178 American war vessels.

Mr. BELAND: What kind?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Battleships, cruisers, torpedo boats, destroyers, all that go to make up a fleet. I want to draw the attention of this House to the fact that the Americans are building a fleet at almost the same rate as Germany.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not know whether my hon. friend assents to the suggestion, but to me as a Canadian that means danger.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I applaud the truth, that is all.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: What did the Government of which my hon. friend was a member, do? Under the Rush-Bagot treaty the Americans were allowed to have two war vessels on the great lakes and these of about 100 tons each, but by the permission of the Laurier Government they got through our canals nine war vessels, some of 1,300 tons, instead of 100.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Only training vessels.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: But they will have their guns trained on us and we have not got a boat to defend ourselves when the trouble arises. That is the way Imperial unity and Imperial defence were treated by my hon. friends opposite. They let the enemy practically into the heart of the country, because the United States may at any time be against us on some question. What about the Panama canal at the present moment? That might bring on a conflict at any time. Look at our Pacific coast as well. What did we read only one month ago, that the Americans at present are making the Hawaiian Islands another Gibraltar, and that it is practically completed.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In speaking of the United States navy, does my hon. friend forget that two years ago when the First Lord of the Admiralty in Great Britain mentioned the fact that England would have a two-power standard against all nations in Europe, he specifically omitted mentioning the United States. He said we never take into consideration the United States when we speak of the two-power standard.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It may be that our friends over the water do not understand the United States as we do on this side. I have just drawn the attention of my hon. friends to the fact that the United States navy is omitted from this document issued by the Admiralty. I say it is a very important omission, one that requires explanation, and I am endeavouring to give the explanation.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What is the document?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think, Mr. Speaker, I have allowed these hon. gentlemen to interrupt me often enough; I am going to make my own speech.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like to remind hon. members that rule 223 says: when a member is speaking no other member shall interrupt him except on a point of order. I think it would be for the benefit of the debate if that rule was a little better observed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is always subject to the consent of the member who is speaking. The hon. member has referred to a document as being extraordinary. I merely asked him what the document was.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The document is the one that the Admiralty has prepared and which is the basis of the resolution before the House. I say that it entirely omits mention of the American fleet. That is the point. The Americans have to be recognized in our position here. We are so close to them that we cannot afford to ignore their position. I have pointed out that if two of the great nations of Europe clash, the third navy in the world will be the one that will be superior in numbers after the war. Experts tell us that over half of the navy of the victorious power will be wiped out, and that will leave the Americans, being the third in point of strength, superior on the seas. My hon. friend opposite is thirsting for information and I want to give him all the necessary information because I understand he is going to follow me and I trust that he will do so in the same spirit in which I am endeavouring to discuss the matter. I am endeavouring to lay before the House my reasons for saying that this contribution of $35,000,000 should be immediately granted, and why I think it should be granted by the unanimous voice of this House and the country as I believe it should be. I do not believe it will be by the unanimous voice of this House, but I do believe the country is very largely in favour of the proposal. My hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Boivin), who has just spoken, seemed to be spoiling for a fight at the polls rather than on the field of battle. I do not think he would gain very much by a battle at the polls at the present time.

Mr. PUGSLEY: We will try.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think we would be quite prepared to try conclusions in that respect.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Come on.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am ready if my hon. friend is. Come on! I think we are quite ready for it, and I believe that we would have a great many more followers from the province of Quebec than we have at the present time. The province that would not stand for the Laurier navy is not surely going to stand for two Laurier navies. The Laurier navy now proposed is one double the size of that which Quebec did not want. It is useless to think that Quebec is going to stand for the doubling of a navy that it did not want. Within a few days we have seen an interview with one of the local members of the House in Quebec who says that he would advise the right hon. leader of the Opposition to think a good while and to think slowly before he asks for a dissolution of the House because he says: I think it is very doubtful if he could carry a majority in Quebec. This statement was made by one of his own followers in Quebec. He said: The people there who did not want one Laurier navy are not likely to ask for two.

Mr. BELAND: They want one.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: They do not want it very badly.

Mr. BELAND: Forty out of sixty-five.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Forty out of sixty-five; well, that is going back a good long way, and it will go back a good deal further if the people were asked for two navies. My hon. friends will not be rejoicing so much when they get out in the field and see the ballots coming in. In my judgment the proposal that my right hon. friend the leader of the Government has submitted to this House is one of the most popular proposals that has ever been submitted in the Dominion of Canada. There is not a single vulnerable place in the whole proposal from the economic and strategical standpoints. The supremacy of the navy of Great Britain to-day means the stability and unity of the British Empire and, that being admitted, it must be also said that we must pay for the cost of sustaining the supremacy of the British navy.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Send a cheque across.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend does not like to see cheques going across. I can tell my hon. friend why and I do not think he will laugh so much. When did his party, during the whole of the fifteen years that they were in power, ever expend $35,000,000 without one dollar of graft in it? I will give him time to answer that if he can. Can he answer that question? If he cannot let him keep quiet. I say that the Laurier Government, during their fifteen years of power, never spent $35,000,000 without a great amount of graft in it. Here is $35,000,000 going across the Atlantic in a cheque and that

is what hurts our friends across the way. If they had been spending that $35,000,000 on a navy, it would have been fifty per cent ship and fifty per cent graft, it would have been fifty per cent navy and fifty per cent barnacles. It is the same brand of barnacle that the Globe said must be scraped off with an iron hand; we are going to scrape it off, that $35,000,000 is going over without one per cent of discount, the actual cash, and that is what hurts our friends over the way. They have not been accustomed to spending money without getting a rake-off. Look at their Transcontinental railway costing four times what they promised, look at the dredging contracts of my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) which, we are told, were almost half graft, and that will be shown up. That is the reason these gentlemen do not want this $35,000,000 cheque to go over. But, we are going to send it over and we are going to get $35,000,000 worth of the best ships that money can buy, we are going to put them in the front line of attack and with these will go our best thought and our best prayer that they may be successful against any enemy that attempts to attack the British Empire and the British flag.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend does not like that. It does not sit well on his stomach.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not like the prayer.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It would be worth the cost of a small flagship if it would steal up and take away some of the pomposity out of my hon. friend. He has apparently set himself up to boss the House very frequently lately. But, I want to tell him that there are other men in this House beside the hon. member for Rouville.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know that.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: He has not recognized that. He came back from Japan with a swelled head. His negotiations with Japan did not do him any credit, and will not help him if he wants to establish a Laurier navy. Let him ask any of our friends from British Columbia what has happened. The House heard the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) —and I am sorry he is not in his place to-night; what did he tell the hon. member for Rouville? He told him that the policy of the Laurier Government, resulting in the admission of Japanese, holus bolus, into the Dominion of Canada, had driven out every white man from the fishing fleet of British Columbia. What did that mean? If you wanted to man a single ship, not a dreadnought but a small Bristol cruiser even, or a Niobe or a Rainbow, you would not have a single white man there with which to do it. Why? Because my hon. friend and his colleagues, although they were warned in the House by one of their own friends that they were making a dreadful mistake in negotiating that treaty, let down the bars, and flooded British Columbia with Japanese with the result that Japanese labour has driven out every white man from every fishing boat in British Columbia and it is impossible to get a single seaman to man vessels on the whole of that coast. Let the hon. gentleman take that home and think it over and if he does he must come to the conclusion that he and his Government made a mistake. That is the reason we find it difficult to man ships in Canada. These men might be against us in time of danger instead of for us. The Japanese does not often change his skin, the Japanese remains a Japanese whether he lives in Canada or in Japan, and I fear that if we ever had any trouble with Japan, instead of these men assisting us as they should, they would be found among the enemy.

Now, I have been drawn aside somewhat from my address, but I do not propose to be diverted from the line of my argument because hon. gentlemen opposite have interrupted me They have told us that no emergency existed and that no crisis is at hand, and they have quoted Mr. Asquith and Mr. Churchill to sustain their contention. Let me read two lines from what Lord Roberts said in his speech at Manchester. Lord Roberts has been a man of war from youth, and he knows what he is talking about, which a good many of these gentlemen opposite do not. Lord Roberts, the greatest authority in the British Empire on military and naval defence matters, says:

> Arm and prepare to quit yourselves as men —for the day of your ordeal is at hand.

These are the solemn words of Lord Roberts, spoken in Free Trade Hall, Manchester. The people of Manchester are not jingoes, but Lord Roberts gave it to them right off the handle, straight goods, no beating about the bush. Will you take Lord Roberts or the hon. member for Rouville as our authority upon such a matter? For my part, I would prefer one word from Lord Roberts on such a subject to ten thousand words from these Liberal gentlemen opposite, and the people of the country, I believe, will agree with me in that opinion. We cannot send men to help Britain to-day but we can send money, and I am sorry the Liberal party has endeavoured to diminish the value of that contribution by endeavouring to make out that it does not come from the whole people of Canada.

That contribution, Sir, should have gone as the gift of a united people, and look at the moral effect it would have had throughout the world if tendered as such. Well, the money is going all the same, but unfortunately it is not going as a unanimous gift, owing to the great blunder of the leader of the Opposition in not electing for once to be a patriot, and an upholder of Imperial unity. I have watched the career of the right hon. gentleman. For twenty-five years I have kept my eye on the right hon. the leader of the Opposition, and I am sorry to have to say that whenever he had an opportunity of choosing between greater unity or separation, he has always chosen separation. He objected to an hon. gentleman on this side of the House saying that he pursued a separatist policy, but I say that is a mild phrase to describe his conduct. On the occasion of the last Imperial Conference, did not the London newspapers state that the presence of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was a wet blanket on everything Imperial.

Mr. LEMIEUX : That is not what Lord Grey said.

Mr. COCKSHUTT : Unfortunately for Lord Grey he has made a break, but it will take more than one letter from Lord Grey, esteemed though he be in this country, to restore the shattered fortunes of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his party.

Mr. LEMIEUX : Poor Lord Grey.

Mr. BELAND : You have fixed Lord Grey now.

Mr. BENNETT (Simcoe): Poor Laurier.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend from Rouville need not waste his sympathy on Lord Grey. Lord Grey is above criticism, he is our superior ruler and we delighted to honour him when in Canada, but in taking up the cudgels for Sir Wilfrid Laurier after the fashion he has, we may be excused if we entertain the opinion that Lord Grey has let his zeal run away with his judgment. We know Sir Wilfrid Laurier from twenty-five years experience of him, and the statement I have made is a statement that holds good in the province of Ontario at any rate, and that is, that whenever he has had an opportunity of choosing between greater Imperial unity and a separatist policy, he has always chosen the separatist policy, as he is doing now in connection with this very resolution. I say that the policy proposed by the Liberals makes for the separation of Canada from the Empire, and I may say that advisedly I say that the contribution of Canada should go to Great Britain at the present moment, as the united contribution of the Parliament of Canada, and of the people of the country, irrespective of political leanings. And, Sir, if the right hon. leader of the Opposition is not sorry for his conduct to-day, he will be in the near future, because there is no doubt at all about it that the people of Canada are strongly against his policy and that the more it is discussed and understood in the country, the greater will be the resentment against it. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition proposes to spend probably fifty million dollars on a navy, and an annual upkeep costing ten millions or more. On the other hand, the Prime Minister says we will send thirty-five million dollars immediately to contribute to the supremacy of the British navy, and the permanent naval policy of Canada will be later on decided upon and submitted to the people. The Liberals tell us that we should man these three dreadnoughts, but I have demonstrated that it is not possible to get crews for them in this country, even if we purposed doing so. It is an undeniable fact that it would take five years or ten years to build the ships as proposed by the Liberal party, and then they could not man them when built. I doubt if gentlemen opposite have realized what it takes to man one of those great men of war. Why, the engine power alone of such a ship is more than enough to turn every wheel in every factory in the city of Montreal. They carry armament that has only very recently been manufactured in the world at all, guns of immense power, the reverberations alone of which would be sufficient to dislodge the hon. member for Rouville from his position, and that is saying a good deal. These guns are of such type that even to touch them off men have to be trained, and no doubt in the hands of such men as the hon. member from Beauce would put on board the ships, they would be more dangerous to friend than to enemy. And yet, these gentlemen opposite who could not get the Niobe safely to a political picnic would undertake to man our dreadnoughts and place them in the forefront of the fight with Germany. I do not believe that any hon. members on this side of the House would deem themselves competent to control and manage such great ships, and so we will have to resign the control of them to the gentlemen opposite who made such a mess of the management of the Niobe and the Rainbow. I say the thing is preposterous, and everybody knows it. What we want is the greatest amount of efficiency for the least expenditure of money, and that is what this policy proposes. That $35,000,000 that is going to be given will, every dollar of it, be expended to build and equip the best ships that can be built. My hon. friends, whether they agree with that policy or not, must admit it is a policy that will give a good account of itself in the long run.

Before I sit down I wish to refer to another authority. I hold here a few extracts from a book that is being circulated in the German Empire to-day with great success, and I think, in order that we may understand the aspirations of the German people, it will be well that I quote from a book recently issued and translated into English. The author of it is General von Bernhardi. The Crown Prince of Germany is a devout scholar at his feet, and he is the successor to the German Emperor on the throne. It is therefore important that we know what kind of a doctrine this general is instilling into the minds of the people of Germany. I want to read you just a few samples of what he says:

He describes aspirations for peace as threatening to poison the soul of the German people. Accordingly I must try to prove that war is not merely a necessary element in the life of nations, but an indispensable factor of culture, in which a true civilized nation finds the highest expression of strength and vitality. I must endeavour to develop from the history of the Germans past in its connection with the conditions of the present, those aspects of the question which may guide us into the unknown land of the future. The historical past cannot be killed; it exists and works according to inward laws, while the present, too, imposes its own drastic obligations. No one need passively submit to the pressure of circumstances; even States stand, like the Hercules of Legend, at the parting of the ways. They can choose the road to progress or to decadence.

That, Sir, is the first statement he makes. Then he passes on to say:

The motive which influences each member is prominent in the whole body. It is a persistent struggle for possessions, power and sovereignty which primarily governs the relations of one nation to another, and right is respected so far only as it is compatible with advantage. So long as there are men who have human feeling and aspirations, so long as there are nations who strive for an enlarged sphere of activity, so long will conflicting interests come into being and occasions for making war arise. The social system in which the most efficient persons possess the greatest influence will show most vitality in the intra-social struggle, while in the extra-social struggle, that nation will conquer which can throw into the scale the greatest physical, mental, moral, material and political power, and is therefor the best able to defend itself. War will furnish such a nation with favourable vital conditions, enlarged possibilities of expansion and widened influence.

Then he passes on to say that might is right,—in this enlightened age,—might is right.

Might is once the supreme right and the dispute as to what is right is decided by the arbitrament of war.

That is the statement he makes. I have not time to read many of these quotations. I shall read a few of them to show what the German people are reading at the present time.

During a prolonged period of peace petty and personal interests force their way to the front, selfishness and intrigue run riot and luxury obliterates idealism. Money acquires an excessive and unjustifiable power, and character does not obtain due respect. Wars are terrible, but necessary, for they save the state from social petrification and stagnation. It is well that the transitoriness of the goods of this world is not only preached, but is learned by experience. War alone teaches this lesson. We are told that war, in opposition to peace, does more to arouse national life and to expand national power than any other means known to history. It certainly brings much material and mental distress in its train but at the same time it evokes the noblest activities of the human nature. After emphasizing the insignificance of petty private interests beside so grave a decision as war, and the unifying effect of common effort against common danger, it is pointed out that the brutal incidents inseparable from every war vanish completely before the idealism of the main result. All the sham reputations which a long spell of peace undoubtedly fosters are unmasked. Great personalities take their proper place; strength, truth and honour come to the front and are put into play. War opens the most fruitful field to all virtues, for at every moment constancy, pity, magnanimity, heroism, and mercy shine forth in it; every moment offers an opportunity to exercise one of these virtues. At the moment when the state cries out that its very life is at stake, social selfishness must cease, and party hatred be hushed. The individual must forget his egoism, and feel that he is a member of the whole body. He should recognize how his own life is nothing worth in comparison with the welfare of the community. War is elevating, because the individual disappears before the great conception of the State. The devotion of the members of the community to each other is nowhere so conspicuous as in war. What a perversion of morality to wish to abolish heroism among men.

Then he goes on to elaborate the point which I spoke of in the first place, that it is possible to be a Christian and a soldier.

Mr PUGSLEY: The same opinion that my hon. friend holds.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am more or less of a student, and I admire General von Bernhardi, because he has laid before the people a patriotic mind and a spirit of self-sacrifice that is worthy of every Canadian and of every citizen of the British Empire. I only wish that as many men in Canada and as many men in Great Britain were as ready to lay their services on the altar of their country as are willing and ready to do so in the country of Germany. Why should hon. gentlemen opposite brand us as jingoes or men who are unchristian? It is the duty of every one, be

he Christian or be he Pagan, to defend his land when it is attacked, and to meet the enemy in the gate like a man who is not afraid to live and who is not afraid to die.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friends say hear, hear. I hope they enlist in the cause. I hope that when the next call is made for the Rainbow that some of my hon. friends who call 'hear, hear' will enlist. If they are not worth more on the Rainbow than they are in this House in carrying on the affairs of this country, I am sorry for the Rainbow and for the country. I am not going to be side-tracked in giving my friends these few plain truths; they know that what I say is the gospel truth. If they bother me much more I will name those men who brand Canadians that join our militia and those who enlist in our navy as murderers, because they are prepared to step into the ranks and defend their country against the agressor. We know the names of those men and some of them have been noted for going about the country preaching that doctrine. I want to read some other quotations.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Don't read them, because we do not want to hear them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. gentleman has too long lived on what is not altogether good. My hon. friend's reputation throughout the Dominion of Canada is not so good, but that it might be improved. His administration of the Public Works Department was not above suspicion, as he very well knows. I think that if he will listen to the remarks of General von Bernhardi, it will not do him any harm, and I hope that when he speaks on the subject in this House he will let some of the patriotism shine forth which is taught by the German general whom I quote.

Christian morality is based on the law of love.

My hon. friend, cannot say anything against that.

Love of God above all things and love to our neighbours.

I think that he will recognize that there is a high authority for that.

Such doctrine can claim no significance for the relations of one country to another, since its application to politics would lead to a conflict of duties. The love which a man showed to another country as such would imply a want of love for his own countrymen. Such a system of politics must inevitably lead men astray. Christian morality is personal and social, and in its nature cannot be political. Its object is to promote morality of the individual, in order to strengthen him to work unselfishly in the interests of the community.

It tells us to love our individual enemies, but does not remove the conception of enmity. Christ himself said: 'I am not come to bring peace on earth, but a sword.'

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is something new.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am afraid my hon. friend has not been a good student of the Scriptures. If he had been, I think that some of the mistakes he has committed in his public life would not have been committed. This statement, he says, is new. It was written about two thousand years ago.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Give us the reference.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That reference is the New Testament. I am afraid our friends opposite have not, in recent years, made a very close study of the scriptures. Another hon. gentleman asks me what this has to do with building dreadnoughts? It has this much to do with it—it teaches the gospel of patriotism, and if we are going to have three dreadnoughts, whether you pay for them or whether you man them it is patriotism that is going to send them forth. And I say as a man who has not only studied the Scriptures, but tried to practice them—though I know my hon. friend does not give me credit for that—that I believe the Scriptures themselves warrant me in saying that it is one of the highest callings of mankind to be ready to sacrifice one's self to save his country, his home, his family. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) gave us a very nice exposition about peace on earth. My hon. friend did not call him to task for dwelling on the Christian spirit, though he went a good deal further in that speech than I have ventured to do. The hon. gentleman says my speech is far from the Christian spirit. But the doctrine of self-preservation, the doctrine of patriotism, is good for all the year round—as good on Christmas day as any other day. Let it never be forgotten that the price of our liberty, the price of our national existence, the price of the British race being on top is the eternal vigilance of the citizens of the Empire. The doctrine, I say, is borne out by the Scriptures in the passages I have read from the New Testament, spoken by our Lord himself. 'I came not to bring peace on earth, but a sword.' I say that this doctrine of patriotism preached to the German people to-day has made it possible to place six millions of men in the field. Yet we are told, there is no emergency. I wonder what these gentlemen would call an emergency. Not until the very last shot has been fired and every ship had gone down, I presume, would they recognize that there was an emergency—unless they happened to be on one of the ships, which is not likely.

They speak of the possibility of enlisting these men in Canada. The other day, when I heard the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Graham) speak, I thought surely he would go out next morning and enlist on one of these ships. But he did not; he came back to this House. I do not know if the hon. gentleman is wiser than he was when he made that speech, but I can tell him that in it he did not speak for his own province of Ontario. The province of Ontario is solidly at the back of the Borden Government in this proposition. Further, I believe the men of the West, who have not been with us on this side lately, will say that this proposition is a good one. They will say: We want our foodstuffs defended on their way across the ocean to feed the Mother Country and the various countries of Europe. They will say that it is proper to pay an insurance on this commerce. The property of the Dominion of Canada is probably worth at least $5,000,000,000;—I think it is worth nearer to $10,000,000,000, but I wish to be on the safe side. A premium of one per cent a year on this property would be $50,000,000 annually. But we in Canada have not been ready to pay even one per cent of insurance on our enormous wealth. Is it not time we got into the firing line so far as cash is concerned? Is it not time we came to the rescue of the Mother Country in this matter? For years, as we know, the weary Titan has struggled with his load, and we have not been burdened to the extent of a single dollar.

Mr. LEMIEUX: You opposed the British preference.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is true, we made a sacrifice to the Mother Country of dollars and cents in duties. But it would have been better to have done our duty to the Mother Country before we became generous; it would have been better to contribute to defence than to throw away duties to the advantage of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. We have had the benefit of defence by the Mother Country and have paid nothing. That hon. gentleman knew as well as I do that there is nothing between us and destruction to-night but the British fleet. I stated in the first part of my address and I repeat now, there is no country in the world to-day that has as poor defence as the Dominion of Canada with so much to defend, and I say that after having visited all the principal countries of the world. We owe it to our day and generation, we owe it to our race, to see to it that Great Britain has assistance in this, her hour of danger and need. I say that advisedly, that it is an hour of danger and of need. And we shall never know what we have lost until we have lost all, if we allow the British fleet to be wiped out from control of the sea. Let me point out to those who say that there is no emergency that it is quite possible for supremacy to pass without a shot being fired. Let the German Empire surpass Great Britain in the building of a fleet and as soon as the German fleet is superior in power to that of Great Britain, that moment, the triumph, the power passes from Great Britain to Germany. Are we willing that should come to pass? No! To allow that to happen, Mr. Speaker, is, in my judgment, to put back the hands of civilization and to retard the advancement that has taken place in this world for many years past. We believe in the Christianizing of the uttermost corners of the earth. Many of us have subscribed money to send out to all parts of the world missionaries of the various churches of the Dominion. What has made that possible? Simply the strong arm of the British navy, ready at the call of every subject in distant parts of the world should he be in trouble. Look at the missionaries in China and Japan. On several occasions in recent years they have had to run to cover under the protection of British guns; that is what gives security to the British subject the round world over. Any man travelling in distant lands knows the sense of security imparted by the possession of a passport bearing evidences of the soverignty of our King, and his guarantee of safe convoy through distant and dangerous lands. I have carried one of these in my pocket in the course of my travels, and I felt it as my only salvation when absolutely alone among men with whose language I was unacquainted, and whose appearance did not indicate their lack of a desire to strike me down at any time. There is no force on the high seas to-day superior to the navy of Great Britain, and that is the sense of security which stands at the back of every Canadian, no matter what his colour or creed. Shall we, then, be wanting in our duty when asked to contribute this small sum of money? I say it is a small sum of money, and the Finance Minister has told us we will be enabled to send it out of this year's surplus. Let that not be forgotten—that this $35,000,000 can be taken out of this year's surplus, and therefore we shall not feel it to a very great extent. We are well able to pay it; Lord Roberts has told us the emergency exists—are we going to rest upon our oars and see the fatal shot fired without sending a dollar or a man to help fill the gap? Before I sit down I want to mention one man in Great Britain, whose name is not well known in Canada, but whose opinion is an authority hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House might well consult—that of Mr. Maxse, who edits the National Review. In his writings during the last three years Mr. Maxse has done

more to turn the attention of the British people to the immense danger that is threatening our race than any other writer in any land over which the British flag flies.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the hon. gentleman acquainted with the opinion of the First Lord of the Admiralty regarding Mr. Maxse?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I am not aware of the opinion of the First Lord of the Admiralty in this respect, and I do not presume to speak for him. I know, however, that no man is so great that my hon. friend would not challenge his ability—that is quite within his general conduct. I am aware that he thinks he is the biggest man on earth, and that all others are very small indeed.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not wish to unduly interrupt my hon. friend, but he has stated that this $35,000,000 would be paid out of the surplus for this year. Can my hon. friend inform the House as to what the actual surplus is, and as to whether he means by that that the expenditure upon the Transcontinental railway and other great works will also be paid out of current revenue?

Mr. HAZEN: Wait for the budget speech.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend is giving the information beforehand, and I wish to know if he has the requisite knowledge in regard to the matters to which I refer.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend has asked a question which I did not expect to be called upon to answer, but I may say that I think I have the authority of the Finance Minister in stating that he expects a surplus of about $35,000,000 this year.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Then what is to become of the twenty or thirty millions to be expended on the Transcontinental railway, which has hitherto been largely paid out of current revenue?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend is foreshadowing difficulties. I said the surplus this year would probably be sufficient to pay the amount of the proposed contribution. That is my statement, but perhaps my hon. friend would like to spend $20,000,000 in rectifying the blunders of the late Administration regarding the Transcontinental railway. I am not unmindful of the fact that the implement hon. gentlemen opposite put into the Transcontinental cost this country quite a sum of money, and that the Quebec bridge, which my hon. friend knows is now at the bottom of the St. Lawrence, swept away another large sum. As I have said, this $35,000,000 surplus is expected this year, and it is possible to pay from current revenue the whole amount the Prime Minister proposes to contribute.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that this contribution will take the whole of the surplus?

Mr. HAZEN: Does the hon. gentleman imagine that the entire expense of building the three dreadnoughts is to be paid in one year?

Mr. PUGSLEY: You are asking for a vote this year.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think no good purpose will be served by the effort of my hon. friend to involve the discussion with other matters. My statement is as plain as it can be. This $35,000,000 we are asked to contribute is about equal to the surplus we expect this year, and, if we so elect, the contribution can be paid out of that surplus. I know he is not favourable to contributing this amount, but this House is favourable, and it will be sent over whether my hon. friend is favourable or not. I am sorry my hon. friend is not going to contribute a dollar toward it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: If it goes I shall have to contribute as a citizen of Canada.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well then my hon. friend will contribute against his will, I presume, and that is always unfortunate. The Lord loveth a cheerful giver, and I am sorry my hon. friend is not a cheerful giver. I thought from his open countenance and from the way he generally smiles when he is in perplexity, that he would be a cheerful giver, and that he would contribute his share of the $35,000,000 without a murmur, but I am disappointed. He wants to devote $20,000,000 to the Transcontinental, and to several other purposes, and he does not want to take it out of a current revenue.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I want to have the ships built in Canada.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend knows that before these ships can be built in Canada the fatal gun may have been fired, and that the emergency which we are trying to meet will be over, and we will not have contributed our part.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What I said was—

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I ask my hon. friend to keep silence, and to give me a chance to close my remarks. He is going to speak after me and he will have his chance. An American statesman replying to a man who interrupted him to ask a question said, 'I confess that a fool of his calibre can ask more questions in five minutes than I can answer in a thousand years.' I do not wish to imply that my hon. friend is in that category, but if he goes on as he has

been doing I shall have a poorer opinion of him than I entertain at present, which I may say is not too high on some points.

Now, my hon. friend challenges my statement that the $35,000,000 should be taken out of current revenue. I suppose he is going to have a place to put these $35,000,000, and he may tell us when he gets up. But I believe that these $35,000,000 are going over to Great Britain with the majority of this House and with the majority of the people of Canada at their back, and if my hon. friends opposite want to challenge this side of the House to meet them on the hustings throughout the country, so far as I am concerned, I am ready to meet my hon. friend from South Renfrew

Mr. GRAHAM: Give us a chance.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I come from the same province as my hon. friend and he was spoiling for a fight the other day. He went about not with one chip on his shoulder, but with two chips on each shoulder, crying to Heaven to give him a chance to get on these ships and to fight in the front line when the German navy attacked Britain. But I do not see that he enlisted; I do not see that he is proposing to enlist, and I have been endeavouring to instill into him and into my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Pugsley) and my hon. friend from Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) the idea that perhaps a little love for the hardships of the soldier, and a taste of endurance on the battlefield would take out of them a little of that pomposity that has been too evident during the past few weeks. Whether my hon. friends are in favour of this policy or not, I think they will agree with me in this, that it is desirable that the people of Canada should do something, and something effective. I think my hon. friend will agree with me in that.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not suppose he is suggesting that we should build two fleet units that would not be of any use, or that would not be effective in battle. I presume he means business.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Ships equal to any in the world.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: My hon. friend has very strong faith in the capacity of Canadian ship-builders if he thinks they can build Canadian dreadnoughts to equal the British or the German, or even the American dreadnoughts. I am a man who stands up for every kind of Canadian industry; I have stood up for it often, but I know the limitations of the people of Canada, and I say that to-day we are not qualified to build those ships in Canada, nor are we qualified to put the armaments upon them after they are built. Therefore, as a business man, I say it appeals to me as good business to go to the men who can build them, and then we shall not be taking a chance, or making an experiment that might prove a failure. It might be that the dreadnoughts of my hon. friends would be top-heavy, and would turn turtle.

Mr. PUGSLEY: They would be designed by the British Admiralty.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Then you would get your designs from over the water? That means that you have not confidence in the Canadian designers. I thought it was going to be all Canadian, but now it appears they are going to get the designers from Britain and also their armaments. Perhaps my hon. friend will tell us when he speaks where he is going to get the materials with which to build those ships.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Yes.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Where is the armour-plate coming from or the other materials necessary for the construction of a dreadnought? They are not made in this country to-day, and all the subsidiary industries must be established in Canada before you can build those ships. It is not mere child's play building those great ships, it is one of the most scientific works of man, one of the most powerful and wonderful works of man. No one who has seen an up-to-date battleship can have failed to wonder at what science can build and money can buy in these days of advanced civilization. I have had the privilege of seeing many big ships in many waters, and nothing has inspired me so much with wonder at the vast intelligence and scientific knowledge of man as the sight of one of those leviathans. It is a most awful and inspiring work, and yet my hon. friend thinks those ships can be built in Canada. Well, in that respect I do not agree with him, but we do agree in this that we believe that the time has come when something effective should be done, and done quickly; and if my hon. friend believes that, then he believes that an emergency is at hand. I believe that an emergency is at hand, and I say to-night with all sincerity, that in my judgment Canada cannot act too soon. I regret that our proposed contribution is not larger. I know I am a more advanced Imperialist than some of my friends, but I would rather have seen it $50,000,000 or $75,000,000. I do not think that would have been too much. But whether or not we agree on that, what we give should go with the united voice of this Parliament and of Canada. I regret that the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition has not seen fit to

decide on this occasion to stand for the unity of the Empire and for one fleet to defend that empire. I believe in the final analysis that it will be found that one fleet to defend the Empire is more economical and more effective than several units scattered throughout the world, and that it is far more likely to meet the enemy successfully than any units that would be thousands of miles away when the battle was fought, and we trust our friends opposite will be with us, to vote with heart and soul for this proposition of $35,000,000. Let us send it with our blessing and trust that it is invested in ships that will have such an effect on the nations in Europe that they will see that Great Britain is backed up by all her great dominions overseas, that Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, yes, and India and the Malay States will all be be in line when the time comes. And if any nation is so bold as to touch the British lion or endeavour to down the old Motherland, that country will find every cub along the line, every colony, distant or near, will be in the battle line, standing for the greatest Empire, the greatest civilization, and the greatest freedom that the world has ever seen.

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

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, January 17, 1913.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

IMPERIAL DEFENCE COMMITTEE.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): I beg to lay upon the table of the House a despatch dated 11th December, 1912, respecting the Committee of Imperial Defence and other matters. I will send to the leader of the Opposition a copy of the despatch, which reads:

Canada—Confidential.

Downing Street,
December 11, 1912.

Sir,—I have the honour to transmit to your Royal Highness for the information of your ministers, copies of despatches which have been addressed to the Governors General of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Union of South Africa and the Governors of New Zealand and Newfoundland, on the subject of representation of the self-governing dominions on the Committee of Imperial Defence.

In view of the proposed publication of this despatch at an early date I telegraphed a text to you on the 10th instant.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your Royal Highness'
Most obedient humble servant,
(Sgd.) L. HARCOURT.

Governor General,
His Royal Highness
The Duke of Connaught and Strathearn,
K.C., &c., &c., &c.

Commonwealth of Australia,
Union of South Africa,
New Zealand,
Newfoundland.

Confidential. Downing Street,
December 11, 1912.

My Lord:

Sir,—I am forwarding by post for the confidential information of your ministers, a record of the proceedings at the Committee of Imperial Defence on May 30, 1911, (during the Imperial Conference), and on August 1, 1912 (during the visit of the Canadian ministers to London). This record deals solely with the question of the representation of the dominions on the Committee of Imperial Defence. (Your ministers who were present on the first occasion will remember that) the matter arose out of a resolution by Sir Joseph Ward on the agenda of the Imperial Conference, asking that the high commissioners of the dominions should be summoned to the Committee of Imperial Defence when naval and military matters, affecting the overseas dominions were under consideration. The unanimous view of all those present on May 30, 1911, was that the representations of the dominions should be not by the high commissioners, but by ministers who would be responsible to their own colleagues and Parliament, and, at the same time it was decided that a defence committee should be established in each dominion which would be kept in close touch with the Committee of Imperial Defence at home. The resolutions ultimately put forward by His Majesty's Government and accepted unanimously by the members of the Imperial Conference at the Committee of Imperial Defence, were as follows—

(1) That one or more representatives appointed by the respective governments of the dominions, should be invited to attend meetings of the Committee on Imperial Defence when questions of naval and military defence affecting the Overseas Dominions are under consideration.

(2) The proposal that a defence committee should be established in each dominion is accepted in principle. The constitution of these defence committees is a matter for each dominion to decide.

The Canadian Government having changed in the autumn of 1911, it was necessary, when Mr. Borden and his colleagues visited England this summer to put these proposals before them as they were of course unaware of the previous proceedings. Subject to consultation with his colleagues in Canada, Mr Borden provisionally accepted the resolutions as passed, and stated that he saw no difficulty in one of his ministers, either with or without portfolio, spending some months of every

year in London in order to carry out this intention. Mr. Asquith and I had, subsequently, several private conversations with him, at which he expressed the desire that the Canadian and other dominion ministers who might be in London as members of the Committee of Imperial Defence, should receive in confidence, knowledge of the policy and proceedings of the Imperial Government in foreign and other affairs. We pointed out to him that the Committee of Imperial Defence is a purely advisory body, and is not and cannot under any circumstances become a body deciding on policy, which is and must remain the sole prerogative of the Cabinet, subject to the support of the House of Commons. But, at the same time, we assured him that any Dominion ministers resident here would, at all times, have free and full access to the Prime Minister, the Foreign Secretary and the Colonial Secretary for information on all questions of Imperial policy. In a public speech which I made a short time ago I used the following words:—

There is, on the part of Canadian ministers and people, a natural and laudable desire for a greater measure of consultation and co-operation with us in the future than they have had in the past. This is not intended, and it need not, to open up those difficult problems of Imperial federation which, seeming to entail questions of taxation and representation, have made that policy for many years a dead issue. But, speaking for myself, I see no obstacle, and certainly no objection, to the governments of all the dominions being given at once a larger share in the executive direction in matters of defence and in personal consultation and co-operation with individual British ministers whose duty it is to frame policy here. I should welcome a more continuous representation of dominion ministers, if they wish it, upon the Committee of Imperial Defence; we should all be glad if a member or members of those cabinets could be annually in London. The door of fellowship is always open to them and we require no formalities of an Imperial conference for the continuity of Imperial confidence.

The foregoing accurately represents the views and intentions of His Majesty's Government.

From Mr, Borden's public speech, in introducing the Canadian Naval Bill, it appears that he accepts the proposals which we have made. The same offer is of course open to all the other self-governing dominions, if and when they wish to adopt it, but the proposal is not one of necessary or strict uniformity and can be varied in the case of each or any dominion to suit their wishes or the special circumstances of their case. I should be glad to know, at their convenience, whether your ministers desire to adopt some such method of more continuous connection in naval and military affairs with the Committee of Imperial Defence in the United Kingdom.

I have, &c.,
(Sgd.) L. HARCOURT.

The Officer Administering
The Government of ——

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 24, to amend the Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act.—Mr. Borden.

Bill No. 27, to amend the Canada Shipping Act.—Mr. Hazen.

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Borden for the second reading of and concurrence in the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole for increasing the effective naval forces of the Empire, and the proposed amendment of Sir Wilfrid Laurier thereto.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY: Mr. Speaker, I take it for granted that all the members of the House have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks which were made by my hon. friend who represents the city of Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). His speech was of a very refreshing character; and it contained some new ideas, ideas which have not been advanced heretofore on the floor of this House. I hope that the hon. gentleman, who I regret is not in his place, will not think that those of us on this side of the House who asked him certain questions had any desire to interrupt or embarrass him in any way. The hon. gentleman seemed always ready with a reply, and did not appear at all to object to the questions asked him. The hon. gentleman treated the House, amongst other things, to a disquisition upon the beauties and the desirability of war from a national standpoint; and to those of us who long for universal peace, the hon. gentleman's remarks came somewhat as a surprise, because he sought to throw around war, which we were accustomed to regard as having horrible surroundings, a glamour of beauty and of pleasantness. I regret very much that my hon. friend who last addressed the House, as well as other hon. gentlemen, including my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster), seemed to feel it to be necessary, in order to have this resolution commend itself to the people of the country, to make attacks upon the good faith or the desire for peace on the part of the German Empire. They seemed to think it necessary to convey the impression that the German nation was only waiting for the opportunity to make an attack upon Great Britain and to destroy the British Empire. I do not think that language of that character is befitting a great representative assembly, such as this is, of one of the most important nations comprising the British Empire. Language of that kind would not be tolerated in the British House of Commons, it would not be expected from an ordinary member of Parliament, let alone from a responsible and important minister of the Crown. After these warlike remarks of hon. gentlemen opposite, it is well perhaps that we should bear in mind that the governments of Germany and Great Britain

to-day are engaged earnestly and sincerely in the laudable desire of bringing about peace between the Balkan allies and Turkey, and of preserving permanently the peace of Europe. I have no doubt that to the people of this country generally it was a matter of gratification to read, not long ago, as recently as the 2nd day of December last, the remarks of the Chancellor of Germany in the Reichstag in reference to the disturbance in Europe. His remarks were as follows:

These remarks offer a welcome occasion to state that during the whole late crisis our relations with Great Britain have been especially marked by mutual trust, which has not only brought about a most gratifying intimacy in our relations, but has also performed good services towards a common understanding among all the powers. I can express the certain expectation that they will continue to do this.

Remarks of a similar character were made by the Prime Minister of Great Britain in the British House of Commons. I see therefore no reason to fear but that the friendly relations now existing between Germany and the Mother Country will continue for a long time to come. But in discussing the question of naval defence, I am not influenced, and I do not think the people of this country should be influenced, by what is spoken of as the German scare. I look upon the question in this way, that Canada, as one of the great overseas dominions of the Empire, has arrived at such a state of development, has attained such a large population and has such a vast trade upon the land and upon the oceans, that the time has come when she ought to take her part in making preparation for whatever eventualities may result in the future. Therefore it does not become necessary for me to discuss this question as it has been discussed by many hon. members of this House. I, as one of the representatives of the people, am prepared to take the position that Canada ought to do everything which is reasonably necessary in order to place herself side by side with the rest of the Empire for its future defence, and for the future defence of Canada. The hon. member for Brantford made a statement which I think is very important in the consideration of this question. He is one of the most important members from the province of Ontario on the Conservative side of the House; and I take it for granted that any statement which he makes on his responsibility as a member of this House ought to have considerable weight, so far as he speaks of the policy and the intentions of the Government of which he is so prominent a supporter. The hon. gentleman referred to what he called an emergency some three years ago, and he says that in addressing a large gathering assembled from all parts of the Empire he made the following statement.

The Empire navy must speak with the voice and power of the Empire. Should the main fleet be too weak or inefficient to cope with the enemy, it would be a fatal mistake that could never be rectified.

He was speaking in favour of giving a contribution to the Mother Country. He said:

The main and almost sole objection to this contribution is that we cannot have a voice in the expenditure and control. This is a very serious objection, and brings to the forefront the question of Empire organization, a great problem, too, that must be grappled with and solved.

I read that to show that in 1909 I was, as I am to-day, in favour of a contribution of men and money and ships to the British Empire. I believe thoroughly in the unity of the British Empire and one fleet for trade and for defence.

There is a very sharp line drawn between the naval policy of the Conservative party, as announced by the Prime Minister, and the naval policy of the Liberal party, as set forth in the resolution of the right hon. leader of the Opposition. The Conservative policy follows the line I have suggested of making contributions to maintain the supremacy of the British fleet upon the high seas, and the Liberal policy of to-day seeks to enlarge somewhat on the Liberal policy of 1909 as embraced in the Naval Service Act of Canada.

The hon. gentleman states that the policy of the Government is to make contributions for the defence of the Empire, while the policy of the Liberal party is to have a Canadian navy. Why does not the Prime Minister come before this House, and, with the same frankness, tell this House and tell the people of this country that the contribution which we are asked to make to-day is likely to be but the beginning of a policy of contributions which we shall be called upon to make in the future? There is no question in my mind but that the intention of the Prime Minister is, having got this noose around the neck of the people of Canada, having got the people to make this contribution, then, if he is in power in a few years from now, when the same state of affairs shall exist as it exists to-day, to ask for another contribution. What, Sir, is the whole argument made by the Prime Minister? His whole argument, and the whole argument of hon. gentlemen with him, with the single exception of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, has been that it is useless, absurd, out of the question, for Canada to think of building a Canadian navy. The Prime Minister told you, Sir, and the members of this House, that it would take from twenty-five to fifty years to secure a naval organization in this country. And he asked: After all, what is the use of doing it,

when we can avail ourselves of the fine naval organization which exists in Great Britain? He said that it would be much more expensive to build ships in Canada than to build them in the Mother Country. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) ridiculed the idea of Canada having her own navy because, he said, we should have to pay larger wages to the men than the British Government is compelled to pay. He said, in effect: If we arrange with Great Britain to take the ships and man them, and to fight our battles, they will be able to get sailors for two shillings a day to stand behind the guns, while Canada would be obliged to pay a wage of seventy cents a day. He was followed by my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), who gave us in detail the figures of cost of maintaining a Canadian navy, as compared with the cost of maintaining these ships in Great Britain; and the result of his argument was strongly against a Canadian navy. At last my hon. friend from Brantford let the cat out of the bag by telling us that the policy of this Government was to make contributions as contrasted with the policy of the Liberal party of having a Canadian navy.

Well, we welcome the issue. I for one would rejoice if the Government would advise His Royal Highness the Governor General to dissolve this Parliament that the decision of the people on that issue might be given.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Why should the people of this country not approve of a Canadian navy? They have before them the fact that in 1909, this House, by common consent and animated by a lofty desire to take the naval question out of party politics altogether, passed a unanimous resolution in favour of a Canadian navy and against contributions. All over this country that policy has been approved of. And, when the people see that this Government, drawn in one direction by the Nationalists represented by the Postmaster General, and drawn in the other by the jingoes of Tories as represented by the gallant knight who is not now in his place—when they see that the Government of the day is drawn hither and thither by this conflict of ideas, and that they are afraid to tell the people what is to be their policy, can you wonder if I should express the opinion that the people will say: Stand by the policy unanimously agreed upon by the House in 1909?

Hon. gentlemen on the other side say: But what is the use of calling attention to the opinions of hon. gentlemen of three years ago; what is the use of quoting to the House what the Minister of Trade and Commerce said three years ago? Well, I think it is important. We have the right to assume that, even though these gentlemen have changed their minds, their opinions of three years ago were their sincere and honest opinions. In 1909, we all listened with great interest to the eloquent speech of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Foster). I was not surprised, Sir, that it was an eloquent speech. I have had the pleasure of knowing my hon. friend since the time, when, as boys together, we entered the University of New Brunswick. I knew him then intimately, and in those early days, when he was only a boy of seventeen, he could make almost as eloquent a speech as he can make to-day, and that is saying a great deal for him as a boy. It has been said by an hon. gentleman who sits on this side of the House that my hon. friend missed his vocation when he abandoned the idea of becoming a lawyer. My hon. friend did, I believe, enter as a law student; and I think he made a great mistake when he did not continue, because his ability would have commanded many thousands of dollars per annum as an advocate on whatever side of a cause he preferred to act. I was sorry to hear the other day that my hon. friend had been taken ill. But it was not surprising; because he had to go thro' a very serious performance. Those were mighty, and big, and strong, and brave words that he uttered in 1909; and he had to swallow them all a few days ago. I do not wonder that this swallowing process did not agree with him. It has been said that the other day he made the speech of his life. Well, Sir, it required him to make the speech of his life to make this House and the people of this country forget the admirable speech he made in 1909 in support of a Canadian navy. In addition to the ordinary people who applauded most warmly the action unanimously taken by the House in 1909, there have been some gentlemen of great distinction, gentlemen who have gone out of political life, and particularly one whom I have in mind, who referred with strong feelings of gratification and patriotic enthusiasm to the resolution that was then adopted. I refer to that distinguished statesman, Sir Charles Tupper, and I would like to read to the House what he said in reference to that resolution:

> Regarding as I do British institutions as giving greater security to life, property and liberty than any other form of government, I have devoted more than half a century to increasing efforts to preserve the connection of Canada and the Crown. When Great Britain was involved in the struggle in the Transvaal I led the van in forcing the Canadian Government to send aid. But I did not believe then, and I do not believe now, in taxation without representation. The demand which will soon be made by some that Canada

should contribute to the Imperial navy in proportion to population, I regard as preposterous and dangerous.

I read with pleasure the resolution passed unanimously by the House of Commons which pledged Parliament to proceed vigorously with the construction of the Canadian navy and to support Britain in every emergency, and all that in my opinion is required is to hold the Government of the day bound to carry that out honestly. Navies are maintained largely to promote the security of the mercantile shipping of the country to which they belong.

Then after some remarks regarding the reciprocity movement in 1891—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will read it, and if my hon. friends will give the same attention to all the remarks of Sir Charles Tupper, I shall feel that I have made some converts in favour of our views.

When I remember that in the general election of 1891, the friends of British institutions after a desparate struggle, which cost that great and patriotic statesman, Sir John A. Macdonald, his life, we only secured a majority of about 25, and I have no hesitation in saying that had the principle of a contribution to the Imperial navy according to our population then been in operation that majority of 25 would have been in favour of continental free trade and the adoption of the tariff of the United States against Great Britain.

How does my hon. friend like that?

Who can question the accuracy of that opinion who remembers that in 1896 my Government was fiercly denounced in Quebec by the Liberal candidates and Liberal newspapers on account of its militia expenditures, when they declared that an expenditure of $3,000,000 to buy rifles for the militia was a danger to the country and that the military programme of the government was 'frightful.'

Mr. FOSTER: How does my hon. friend like that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I do not like that at all, because it is not true. He said further:

I do not forget that all parties in the United States agree in the desire to obtain possession of Canada. Under existing circumstances it was of immense importance to have Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his party committed to the policy which secured the unanimous consent of the House of Commons on a question of such vital importance, and a great responsibility will rest upon those who disturb that compact.

I cannot understand the demand for dreadnoughts in the face of the fact that the Admiralty and British Government have determined that it was not the best mode of maintaining the security of the Empire, and arranged with Canada and Australia (the latter of whom had offered one or two dreadnoughts) for the construction of the local navies to keep open the trade routes in case of war.

All difficulty as to the question of autonomy is now removed, as it is fully recognized that the great outlying portions of the Empire are sister nations, and that means are adapted to secure uniformity in the naval forces of the Empire in the design and construction of the ships, and the training of the officers and men. They are also to be interchangeable and thus secure uniformity in every respect, so as to act as effective units with the British navy.

Of course the Government of the day will be held accountable for carrying out of the policy thus agreed upon in a thoroughly effective manner, but I cannot avoid thinking that a fearful responsibility will rest upon those who disturb or destroy the compact entered into on this vitally important question.

Mr. MORPHY: What is the date of that letter?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The letter is dated November 20, 1909, and it was written some months after what was known as the German naval scare in 1909, and was referred to in this House in March of that year. Seven months afterwards Sir Charles Tupper wrote that letter to the Prime Minister, in which he stated, as I have said, that a fearful responsibility will rest upon those who disturb or destroy the compact entered into on this vitally important question.

One of the hon. gentlemen who last addressed the House said that it was to be greatly regretted that the right hon. leader of the Opposition had not risen in his place to pledge himself to support the resolution presented by the Prime Minister. Let me say to my hon. friend that the leader of the Opposition is not such an acrobat as some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and he thought he was best discharging his duty to his country by standing firmly behind the policy agreed upon by this House in March, 1909. Hon. gentlemen have said: oh, you did not proceed effectively to carry out that policy. Sir, this Government has been in power for upwards of fifteen months. Why did they not carry it out? Why have they brought upon themselves what Sir Charles Tupper states to be the fearful responsibility of refusing to carry out that compact? They have had every opportunity of doing so, but, instead, they have rested idly during all of this long period, and all they have done is to send some of their ministers to England for the purpose of trying to discover, if possible, an emergency which will, on the one hand, enable them to satisfy their jingo supporters, and on the other hand, be the means of preventing their National allies from breaking away from them. And what did we do? When that policy was unanimously agreed upon by this House, at the following session of Parliament, the Government introduced a Bill providing for a naval service, under which

the Government would be authorized to call for tenders for vessels to form part of a Canadian navy. The Admiralty, it is true, had recommended that we should provide for a fleet unit, and at the head of that unit there should be an armoured cruiser. In view of the heavy financial responsibilities resting upon the country at that time; in view of the Transcontinental railway being far from completion, and the many millions of dollars which would be required to finish it; in view of the other great public works urgently required throughout the country, we did not think the people would at that time sustain us in at once incurring the large expense involved in meeting the views of the Admiralty by providing immediately for the completion of a fleet unit. But, after consultation with the Admiralty, we decided to build four cruisers, two of which could be stationed upon the Pacific coast and two upon the Atlantic and in addition to that, we decided to build four destroyers. The Admiralty was communicated with and this Government was led to believe—and led to believe correctly, I think—that when a fleet unit was established, or when two fleet units were established, these vessels would form a part of that unit, or of the two units, as the case might be. The Admiralty was requested to have complete plans and specifications prepared. They did so, and they undertook that task in co-operation with the Department of Naval Service of Canada. When the plans and specifications were completed, tenders for the building of these ships were called for. A number of people in England, shipbuilders and others, thought it would not be practicable, just as some people think or profess to think to-day, to build the war-vessels in Canada, but we determined that they should be built in Canada and the British ship-builders were informed that in tendering for the construction of the vessels they must undertake to establish ship-building plants in our own country. We were then, as we are to-day, of the opinion that whatever monies the people of Canada devoted to the Naval Service ought to be expended, as far as possible, in our own country, to give employment to our own labouring people, that the material should, as far as possible, be secured in this country and that the ships which we should provide should be Canadian ships. We called for tenders upon these specifications and I shall place upon 'Hansard' and before the people of this country the conditions upon which tenders were invited. The original advertisement concerning the building of war-ships, which was dated July, 1910, was in part as follows:

The vessels will be built according to the plans and specifications of the British Admiralty, which, being of a confidential nature, will only be exhibited to approved firms. The Department of Naval Service would, therefore, be glad to hear from any Canadian or British firm who would wish to tender for the building in Canada of these war-ships.

It would be necessary for such firms to show that they have, or propose to put in, a ship-building plant that will be considered sufficient for the building of cruisers of the Bristol class, and that they have had such experience as will enable them to guarantee the building of such ships according to the Admiralty specifications.

It should be borne in mind that the Rush-Bagot Convention provides that no war-ships should be built on the Great Lakes, and there, ship-building firms should arrange for establishments elsewhere than on these lakes.

Further information can be obtained, by parties who propose to tender, on application to the undersigned.

G. F. DESBARATS,
Deputy Minister of the Naval Service.

Let me read to the House the names of the firms who responded to this advertisement and asked for the specifications. The Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, a very enterprising and successful ship-building firm at Collingwood; the Polson Iron Works, also a very successful and responsible ship-buildng firm at Toronto; Hawthorne, Leslie & Company, John Brown & Company, Vickers, Sons & Maxim, Ltd., Armstrong, Whitworth & Company, Harland & Wolfe, Thorneycroft & Company, Fairfield Shipbuilding Company, Swan, Hunter & Wigham Richardson, Ltd., Beardmore & Company, Palmer Shipbuilding and Iron Company, British firms; the British Columbia Marine Railway Company, a very successful Canadian firm operating at Esquimalt; J. S. White & Sons, also I think a British firm, Yarrow & Company, London and Glasgow Engineering and Shipbuilding Company, Cammell, Laird & Company, Thames Iron Works Shipbuilding and Engineering Company, and Denny Bros., all British ship-building firms.

To those ship-building companies who replied to the original advertisement the Deputy Minister of the Naval Service, on October 6, 1910, wrote as follows:

Gentlemen,—With reference to your application to have the name of your firm noted as desirous of tendering for the construction of cruisers and destroyers for Canada, it does not appear to be generally understood that it is the intention of the Canadian Government that firms tendering shall be prepared to establish a ship-building yard in Canada for the construction of the vessels required, and that the hull, boilers, and propelling machinery shall be actually constructed in Canada, Canadian Material and machinery being utilized as far as possible generally in the construction of these vessels.

In order to save delay and expense, I should be glad to know if your firm is prepared to tender under these conditions.

G. F. DESBARATS,
Deputy Minister of the Naval Service.

Thirteen firms asked to be furnished with specifications in reply to that letter and on the 4th February the Deputy Minister wrote as follows:

Gentlemen,—In accordance with your request I hereby invite you to tender for the construction of the vessels required for the Naval Service of Canada.

Four vessels of the Bristol class of the improved 'Weymouth' type and 6 torpedo boat destroyers of the river class of the improved 'Acorn' type are required to be built in accordance with the requirements laid down in the accompanying contract.

Then he proceeds to speak of the specifications, where and when they can be seen. He says further:

As stated in the conditions laid down in the first schedule, the delivery of the first cruiser is required in three years from the date of the signing of the contract, and a subsequent cruiser each following year.

Two torpedo boat destroyers are to be delivered in three years from the date of the signing of the contract and an additional destroyer at the end of each subsequent nine months. The whole programme is to be completed within six years of the signing of the contract.

That would mean that, from the very day of the signing of the contract, one vessel must be provided about every 18 months. The Deputy Minister proceeds to say:

The conditions of the contract involves the building of the vessels in Canada, and the firm who undertakes the contract must guarantee to establish and equip a shipbuilding and engineering yard in Canada to undertake the work in accordance with the conditions embodied in the contract documents forwarded.

Arrangements will be made to supply the guns and mountings, and also the torpedo tubes, which are to be fitted in the vessels during the construction, in accordance with the requirements of the specification.

In vessels under construction for the British navy, it has been the custom for the Admiralty to separately obtain and supply certain articles to the contractors to be fitted on board during the construction of the vessels.

He then gives the specifications of the hull containing these particulars. On page 3 of the letter he says :

As the Admiralty has been good enough to lend the necessary copies of the specifications and plans of these vessels for the use of the Canadian Government in obtaining tenders it is particularly desired that great care be taken by the contractors tendering, who may borrow these documents, to ensure their safe custody and return, and also that they are only examined by authorized persons engaged in the preparation of the tenders.

Special attention is drawn to the provisions of the Official Secrets Act of Great Britain, 1889, and also to section 85 and 86 of the Criminal Code of Canada, which will be strictly enforced.

The drawings, specifications and all contract documents should be returned by hand direct to the office from which they were obtained as soon as the tender is compiled and a receipt obtained acknowledging their safe return.

The tenders should be endorsed 'Tender for Ships' and forwarded direct to this office addressed to 'The Deputy Minister of the Naval Service' in order that they may be received not later than the 1st day of May, 1911, and should be accompanied by a certified cheque for $100,000 payable to the Minister of the Naval Service.

In response to that advertisement a tender was received from Armstrong, Whitworth & Company. They are among the leading ship-building firms of the United Kingdom. They offered to build in Canada. A tender was received from the British-Canadian Ship-building and Dock Company Limited. That was a company organized by Sir Henry Pellatt, of Toronto, and associated with the Canadian company were two of the largest and most experienced ship-building firms of the United Kingdom. They proposed to establish a dry-dock and ship-building plant at Sydney, Nova Scotia. There also was a tender from Campbell, Laird & Company. They proposed to build at St. John in conjunction with the company which is building the dry-dock there. They submitted a plan of the proposed shipyard and offered to proceed under the terms of the contract to establish a ship-building plant and build these vessels at St. John. There was also a tender from the Thames Iron Works Ship-building and Engineering Company Limited, who proposed to build at the port of Halifax. There was one also from Vickers, Sons & Maxim who proposed to build at Montreal where they had already contracted to build a dry dock and ship-repairing plant. There were also tenders from another great ship-building firm of the United Kingdom, Swan, Hunter, Wigham & Richardson, Limited, who also proposed to build in Canada in accordance with the specifications. The mere reading of these names, names which command the confidence of the British Admiralty, the names of ship-builders who, every year, are turning out the greatest battleships which plow the ocean, under contracts with the British Admiralty, the names of ship-building firms who have built some of the greatest floating docks to be found in the world, ought to be an assurance to the House and to the people of the country that if the Government of this day was determined, as our Government was determined, that these ships should be built in Canada, there would be no difficulty in

getting English ship-building firms to establish a plant in Canada and give to the Canadian people, in the construction of these vessels, the benefit of their organization, the benefit of their expert knowledge and the benefit of the skilled labourers whom they would send over here to take part in the work and to teach Canadians to do the work also.

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Hazen) made the statement, in the speech with which he favoured the House, that I had done him an injustice by having made the statement in St. John and elsewhere that he had, after he became minister, struck a blow at the city of St. John and a blow at Canada by returning the deposit of Messrs. Cammell, Laird & Co., and abandoning the contract which they were prepared to enter into for the construction of these vessels. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not content himself with referring to my remarks in regard to his conduct, but, I think, in the opinion of all the members of this House, he lowered the tone of the debate by dragging in the provincial election in the province of New Brunswck and referring to the fact that the Fleming government had been sustained. I thought it was unworthy of my hon. friend to do that, particularly in view of the fact that one of the most prominent members of the provincial government is a Liberal who fights in Dominion elections upon the same side as I and my other friends from New Brunswick, who has taken part for many years in federal contests and who has always been on the Liberal side. My hon. friend ought not to have done that in view of the fact that the provincial government had the support in that contest of so old and well-tried a Liberal as the hon. Mr. Ellis, now a member of the Senate, and of the newspaper of which he is the owner, the St. John Globe. They take a certain ground in Federal politics, but, like many hundreds and thousands of Liberals, they supported the provincial government simply upon provincial grounds. Yet, my hon. friend attempted to induce this House to believe that, because the people of New Brunswick had supported the provincial government, they had justified him in abandoning the proposed ship-building contract at the port of St. John. I am sorry that my hon. friend is not present, but I will repeat in this House, and I would gladly repeat in his presence, the statements which I have made elsewhere.

What are the facts? After a careful examination of all these tenders, made by the late Government upon the initiation of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it was found that the tender of Cammell, Laird & Co., was the lowest. Cammell, Laird & Co. are most reputable ship-builders, they enjoy the confidence of the British Government, they have turned out many war vessels for the British Government as well as one or more very large floating docks and, in their tender, they said: We are prepared, according to the terms of the specification which you have submitted to us, to build ten vessels in the period of sx years, we are prepared to establish our shipyard at the port of St. John and we are prepared to do the work to the satisfaction of the Board of Admiralty and of the Minister of the Naval Service of Canada.

Mr. CROCKET: Why did your Government not acept the tender?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I will come to that in a moment. What took place after these tenders were received? They were due on the 1st of May, 1911. These specifications had been prepared by the British Admiralty. The Government was working in entire harmony and under a clear and perfect understanding with the British Admiralty and the minister and members of the late Government thought that it would be desirable to take these tenders to England, submit them to the British Admiralty, confer with them in regard to the responsibility of the tenderers and then decide as to what tenders should be accepted. They were received on the 1st day of May, 1911, and on the 11th day of May my right hon. friend, now the leader of the Opposition, and then the Prime Minister, together with the then Minister of Marine and Fisheries, went to England and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries took these tenders and specifications with him. He conferred with the British Admiralty. They left England upon the 2nd day of July, they would arrive about the 9th or 10th of July and on the 29th of July as you will remember, Mr. Speaker, Parliament was dissolved. I would ask you whether, in view of the magnitude of this contract, that was an unreasonable delay. Then, let me ask you if, after Parliament had been dissolved and in view of the fact that in one of the provinces of Canada at all events, the naval question was playing a most important part, it would have been proper for the Government to have let a contract of this magnitude for these war vessels? At all events, the Government thought it would not have been proper to do so and they acted accordingly. You know the unfortunate result, as far as this country is concerned, of the elections of September 21, 1911.

Mr. FOWLER: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: My hon. friend reminds me of Nero who fiddled while Rome was

burning. I do not think that any misfortune that could happen to this country would prevent my hon. friend from showing his boisterous hilarity. Well, Sir, we were defeated.

Mr. FOWLER: Hear, hear.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Would it have been right for us, between the date of the election, and the time of our resigning office, to let that contract? I can imagine what a how lwould have gone up from the Tory press and from the Tory public men of this country if we had ventured to do such a thing, and very properly. There was one contract for the dry-dock and harbour works of St. John. We took the same view in regard to that. It was a contract of great magnitude and we thought that it would be proper for us to leave that contract for our successors to deal with. We took the same view with reference to the building of war vessels, but in what position did we leave the matter? We left the tenders for the work at St. John with a memorandum calling attention to the fact that the Norton Griffiths Company were the lowest tenderers but that in view of the magnitude of the work it was deemed proper to leave the subject for our successors to deal with. So also with respect to the war vessels. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries had returned the deposits made by all the other tenderers, but he had retained in his hands the deposit of $100,000 which had been made by Messrs. Cammell, Laird and Company as security for the carrying out of the contract to build these war vessels in the port of St. John. We left the tender, we left the money and when this Government came in it was in the hands of the department over which my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries presides. Had he chosen to stand on the resolution passed by the House in 1909, he then had an opportunity of saying to his colleagues: the late Government has in pursuance of the policy agreed upon by Parliament, called for tenders for these war vessels; a great shipbuilding firm proposes to build them at St. John; they are the lowest tenderer; here is a deposit which has been in the hands of the Government for many months, and I ask you my colleagues to award this contract and let the work go forward. But he did not do that. He returned the $100,000 deposit to Messrs. Cammell, Laird & Co., and allowed their tender to be abandoned. I repeat what I have said elsewhere, that in doing that the Minister of Marine struck a blow, not only at his own constituency, which aspires to become a great shipbuilding port, but he struck a blow at Canada from which it will take it many years to recover. And, what is the excuse given by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries? He says, as it would take six years to build all these vessels, some of them would become obsolete before the entire programme was completed. What would you think of the wisdom of the German Government which has a naval programme which runs along until 1920, not building any ships at all because many of the vessels constructed in the earlier years of carrying out that programme will, according to the Minister of Marine, become obsolete? I have no doubt it is true, as was said by Mr. Churchill, that from the day a war vessel is laid on the stocks she begins to become obsolete because of the changes and improvements that are consantly being made; but is that to prevent you beginning to build ships? If the Japanese Government had taken that view, they never would have started to build a navy. If, thirty years ago, when the United States undertook to build a new navy, and started upon a policy under which they have since built upwards of four hundred vessels, they had been actuated by the view enunciated by the Minister of Marine, they never would have undertaken a shipbuilding programme at all, because before it was completed some of the vessels would have become obsolete. And what is the spectacle we have now presented to this Parliament? It is suggested by the Prime Minister that if we give dreadnoughts to Great Britain, the British Government will in turn undertake to build small cruisers in Canada.

An hon. MEMBER: Oil tanks.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Oil tanks and light cruisers. Well, some of these light vessels will become obsolete before the programme is completed, and what a foolish thing it is for the British Government to undertake to do that which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says it would be foolish for the Canadian Government to attempt to do. I am one of those who have not a shadow of doubt that whatever war vessels we undertake to build, should be built in Canada. Canada is a great manufacturing country, with thousands of skilled workmen who could work successfully at the building of vessels as well as at other structural steel work.

When my hon. friend from Brantford was addressing the House, I made the statement that these dreadnoughts could be built in Canada within a period of six years; that a shipbuilding yard could be erected and the vessels turned out within that time. That hon. gentleman and others on the other side of the House said that it would take ten or fifteen years to build these ships in Canada. As to whether it would or not, will surely depend somewhat upon what they have been able to do in other parts of the world. The Prime Minister

has not told us how soon these ships can be built in England, and the information we get from the newspapers is that all the shipyards in Britain are fully occupied, and that it will be impossible for them to do more than carry out the building programme they already have on hand. The demand for commercial vessels was never so great in England as it is to-day; the demand for ship carpenters and riveters and skilled shipwrights in all branches was never so great as to-day; wages were never so high in England as they are at present, they have risen I believe at least twenty-five per cent as compared with a year ago. The Prime Minister has not told the House whether under these circumstances he can expect to get these war vessels built in England within the next three or four years; but we do know that in other places they have commenced to build shipyards where there was no shipyard before, and they have equipped the yard and turned out battleships within a period of six years.

I was desirous of getting the fullest information with reference to that, and it occurred to me that in view of what has been done in the United States it would be desirable to visit one of the great shipyards of that country; and during the recess, in the discharge of my duty, went to Quincy, Mass. There on the banks of the Fore river I found one of the greatest shipyards and one of the greatest shipbuilding plants in the world. In 1900 the site of that shipyard was an open field. This company purchased in the early part of the year 1900 eighty acres of land, fronting on that river, and they started in to establish a shipyard, and within four months of the date of the purchase they laid the keel of a protected cruiser, and in one year after they bought the property they entered into a contract with the United States Government for the building of two battleships, the largest of any vessels then forming part of the United States navy. Two years after that, the vessels were launched and the keel of another battleship was laid. Of course, the vessels were not entirely completed because it does not mean that a vessel is completed when she is launched; it takes a year or more to equip her with armour and guns. But the vessels were launched in 1904, two years after the keels were laid, and four years after the property was bought, upon which this company erected their plant. In 1902 they laid down these two battleships side by side under the great ship's house which they had erected. And what have they accomplished since they started the shipbuilding industry there? In the short period of 12 years this company has, including vessels which are now upon the stocks, built five battleships for the United States Government, one battleship for the Argentine Republic, seventeen submarines, seven torpedo boat destroyers, three cruisers, in addition to a large number of commercial vessels, and several marine engines for the Japanese navy. That is convincing testimony as to what can be done with modern machinery and proper organization, not an organization extending over, as the Prime Minister says, fifty or a hundred years, but with that organization which modern skill and modern ingenuity can provide. This company has, in that short period of twelve years, in the shipyard which was an open field in 1900, built altogether 114 vessels. The gentlemen who are the executive officers of that company treated me with very great courtesy and gave me every information, and any hon. gentleman can go there and see for himself. I was desirous of obtaining absolute facts, so as to lay them before Parliament, and when I returned from Quincy, I sent this telegram to the president of the company, not being sure with regard to one or two points:

St. John, N.B., Jan. 12-13, 1913.

Francis T. Bowles,
President F. R. S. Co.,
Quincy, Mass.

As I want to be absolutely accurate in my statement, I shall be greatly obliged if you will look up records and let me know month and year when your company began work of equipment yard; also month and year when keel of first battleship was laid; also month and year when keel of second battleship was laid, likewise the names of the two ships. Please write me to-morrow to House of Commons, Ottawa.

(Sgd.) WILLIAM PUGSLEY.

In reply to that telegram I received this letter:

Fore River Shipbuilding Company,
Quincy, Massachusetts,
January 13th, 1913.

Hon. William Pugsley,
House of Commons,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir:—

Your telegram of yesterday from St. John was received this morning. We enclose herewith a booklet which was issued by the company in 1902. On page 3 is a reproduction of a photograph taken of breaking ground at our new plant on April 29th, 1900. The works up to this time had been operating in East Braintree, two miles up the river.

The keel of the first vessel, the U.S.S. Des Moines, was laid on August 28, 1900, in the new yard, and the machinery and buildings of the old plant were moved during November, December and January following, all work being under way in January, 1901, at the new plant.

The contracts for the first battleships, the New Jersey and Rhode Island, were signed on February 15, 1901, the keel of the Rhode Island being laid May 1, 1902, and of the New Jersey on April 2, 1902. This delay was caused more by the non-receipt of re-

vised plans from the department than any other reason.

We also enclose a booklet giving list of vessels which we have constructed, and beg to inform you that since this list was compiled we have contracted for five additional submarines, the torpedo boat destroyer Cushing, submarine tender Niagara, and battleship Nevada, for the U. S. Government; an oil steamer, a sulphur steamer and a molasses steamer for private parties; four steel car floats, and three steel steam trawlers; making a total of 114 hulls contracted for or under way at these works during the past twelve years.

If you desire any further information, please command us.

Very truly yours,
Fore River Ship-building Co.
By F. T. BOWLES,
President

I may say that at Braintree they had a little yard where they were building yachts, tug boats and craft of that kind. You have there the actual facts as to what can be done. What is there about a ship-building yard which makes it so difficult to equip? Nothing whatever. The ship house consists of structural steel. Of course for the building of battleships, that house must be larger than if it was intended merely for cruisers; it must be higher so that when the battleship is finished, the vessel may still be underneath the roof of the house. In order to do the work economically and efficiently, the house must be equipped with cranes so that the plates and other materials for the vessel may be moved from time to time to the places where it is necessary to deposit them for the purpose of constructing the vessel. The yard must also be thoroughly equipped. In this American yard there are magnificent cranes, one of them I remember being capable of lifting 150,000 pounds; this goes to show the magnitude of the works they have there. Then there are the machine shops, forge shops, blacksmith shops, carpenter shops, moulding shops and the great yards where all the material is deposited; but it is only a matter of organizaion, and with money and expert skill a shipyard could be equipped, I venture to say, just as was the case with this company, within a period of two years easily. It must be borne in mind that when a shipbuilding yard is once equipped for the building of battleships, it is suitable for the building of smaller vessels, cruisers, commercial vessels, and all kinds of vessels for which the company might obtain orders. In addition to these six battleships which have been turned out in this yard in twelve years, they have utilized the yard for the building of a large number of commercial vessels which go to complete the total number of 114. Now you may think that the expense of such an undertaking must have been enormous. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister said that the expense of building a shipyard for the construction of these large vessels would be simply enormous, and sought to convey the idea that it would be beyond the ability of the people of Canada or of any company to establish a ship-building yard in the Dominion of Canada. I was favoured by the president of the company with their last year's financial statement, from which it appears that the total cost of the plant and machinery was $1,318,568.78, including all improvements up to the present time; the cost of the real estate, buildings, &c., was $2,389,805.27, or a total cost of the land, buildings and plant up to the present time, with all improvements chargeable to capital account of $3,708,374.05. I ask you if that is beyond the financial ability of the people of Canada or a company which might be induced to establish such a plant, if it had the contract for the construction of those war-vessels. I say it is not; I doubt if it is nearly as much as the cost of the Angus plant which has been established by the Canadian Pacific railway at Montreal; I doubt if it is any more than the plant of the great car building company in the city of Montreal has cost. It is a moderate sum of money, and would be quite within the means of this country and of companies which could be organized. Take the Sydney Steel Works; those works have cost many, many millions more than this American plant has cost. Is it not humilitating to us, who take a pride in Canada and in its marvellous industrial development during the last fifteen years, to be told that we cannot in Canada do what other countries in the world have done and done very easily, i.e., that we cannot build war-vessels? My hon. friend who last addressed the House says, 'Oh, we would have to buy the guns elsewhere.' Supposing we did, the guns furnished to these battleships which have been built at Fore River are supplied by the United States Government from their arsenals, and the armour is supplied by the steel works at Bethlehem. I might say to you that that armour is largely composed of nickel which is taken from the nickel mines of Canada, because Canada owns the best nickel deposits of the world. I am also told that at Sydney, in view of what they supposed was going to be the permanent naval policy of this country, they had the plant all ready for the rolling of plates, for the building of war-vessels, so that they could be fitted to turn out the plates at very short notice for the building of those ships. Let me say this to hon. gentlemen, who used those words which were introduced for the purpose of fireworks, I assume at the request of the Prime Minister, that 'these ships are to be of the highest class which skill can design or money can buy,'

that this Fore River Shipbuilding Company at Quincy, Massachusetts, has now submitted to it by the United States Government specifications for the building of a war-vessel which is to be of the highest type which science can devise or money can buy. This vessel is to be called the Pennsylvania, and is to be one of the newest and one of the greatest war-vessels of the world. This ship building yard is perfectly well equipped to undertake the construction of that vessel, as it is thoroughly equipped to undertake the construction of the largest war vessel afloat. I have also a further confirmation of the statement I have made that a ship-building yard suitable for the turning out of battleships can be equipped in two years; I have it from a gentleman who is very prominently associated with that company which, in conjunction with Vickers Sons Maxim and other great ship building firms, have undertaken the building of battleships for the Spanish Government at Ferrol in Spain. They have taken over the Spanish arsenals, and in considering the time in which battleships could be turned out, he informs me that it would be necessary for Canada to give two years longer to equip the yard and make it thoroughly suitable for the building of battleships. Considering that all the ship-building yards of the Mother Country are fully occupied, and considering that even if they were not occupied, it would take at least three years to build these battleships in the Mother Country, considering that the whole three could be turned out, or in case our policy is adopted, the two super-dreadnoughts which would form the head of these units could be turned out inside of six years, and allow a number of cruisers and smaller vessels to be under way at the same time—I ask you if there is any such emergency—I ask you: has it been shown that the Empire is in such peril for the want of $35,000,000 that we should violate the policy agreed upon by this House, the true Canadian policy, of having the ships built in our own country, and should instead send money to the Mother Country for the purpose of having these vessels built there? Every member of this House knows there is not a greater emergency to-day than there was in 1909. There is no greater emergency to-day than there will probably be three, five or ten years from now. We have to meet what appears to be a permanent condition of affairs, likely to exist for a good many years to come, until that blessed day shall dawn when all international disputes shall be no longer possible between the civilized nations of the world.

My hon. friend the Prime Minister says that the question of expenditure ought to stand in the way of our building these ships in Canada. He says it will cost, as I recollect his statement, $12,000,000 more to build in Canada than in England. Upon what does he base his figures? As I understand it, upon the tenders received in 1911. At that time, as I have said, the cost of labour in the shipyards of the United Kingdom was 25 per cent less than it is to-day, and the cost of material was very much less than it is to-day. But, on the other hand, there is another fact which the hon. gentleman did not take into consideration. All these tendering firms, having only in view a contract for the limited period of six years, took into account—and most of them mentioned it in their tenders—the cost of the plant which would be required for the purpose of building these vessels and smaller vessels. This cost was estimated at from a million to a million and a half of dollars. They distributed this over the six years, of course, and charged it to the cost of the ships. But if a contract were let in Canada for these fleet units, it would mean a very large expenditure. And the cost of the shipyard probably would not be more than $4,000,000, which would be distributed over the whole period during which the construction would go on. Because, if we should reaffirm the splendid resolution of March, 1909, it would be recognized that that resolution expressed the permanent policy of the country and that the question of contributions to the British Government would not again be raised, and these ship builders would come here relying upon the permanency of that policy.

As to this question of the relative cost of warships in Canada and Great Britain at the present time, let me call attention to a few facts. About two years ago the Argentine Republic called for tenders for two battleships. They are not a manufacturing country as Canada is, they have not as great an industrial population as Canada has; and they did not appear to have the ambition which the people in Canada have to build ships in their own country. They called for tenders for the building of two of the greatest battleships at the time afloat with a displacement of 27,000 tons. They invited tenders from the whole world. The result was that the contracts for the building of these great ships were obtained by United States firms—one by the Fore River Ship Building Company, and the other by the New York Shipbuilding Company which has a shipyard near Philadelphia. These firms were the lowest tenderers even though the shipbuilders of Great Britain had been invited to compete. Not long ago one of the large steel vessels plying on the great lakes was destroyed, and it was found necessary to have a new one built to take her place. Tenders were invited

from British shipbuilders and also from the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, and the tender of the latter company as well as its terms of delivery were found to be more favourable than those of the British shipbuilders.

But suppose it did cost more to build ships in Canada, would it be too great a price to pay for the encouragement of a great shipbuilding industry, or industries, in this country upon the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts? Shipbuilding is the one great industry in Canada which is absolutely without protection. Not only do ships from Great Britain come in free of duty, but all their fittings, furniture and supplies come in free also. Would it be too great a price, I ask, to pay a few millions for the purpose of having these war vessels built in Canada thus giving employment to our own labourers and leading to the development of a great shipbuilding industry? We do not think it wrong to make the people of Canada pay from twenty-five per cent to thirty-five per cent upon the articles that they eat or wear or use. Why should we object to a comparatively small expenditure to encourage a great shipbuilding industry in this country?

Perhaps I may be pardoned for digressing for a moment to emphasize this idea that the Government is not encouraging shipbuilding as it ought to do. The Prime Minister says that he looks forward to the time when there will be a revival of shipbuilding in this country. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries, in a beautiful passage in his speech, spoke of coming from a city by the sea and of having the smell of the sea in his nostrils; and he longed for the day when shipbuilding in this country would revive. Mr. Speaker, the way to build ships is to build them—not to talk about them, not to make flowery speeches about them or about what you would like to have or hope to have; the way to begin building ships is to begin. Consider what this Government has done. Not long ago, there was required for the Customs Department a large steamer that would cost in the vicinity of $300,000. Tenders were called for, and among the tenderers was that great concern, the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, employing Canadian labour, using Canadian material as far as possible. Their tender was $315,000. Another tender was that of the Thorneycroft Company, Limited, whose tender was £56,300, or $273,000—a difference of about 15 per cent as between the two tenders. And yet the contract was given to the British firm, and the Canadian firm was refused the opportunity to build the ship. Bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, a great deal of the material to be used by the Canadian firm in building this ship would be imported and the duty would have to be paid, which would go into the treasury of the country. Much of the material we would be obliged to use in the vessels would have to be imported into Canada, and the duty paid thereon would go into the treasury of the country; so that while on the one hand we would be paying a larger price, we would be receiving back from the Department of Customs a considerable portion of the extra amount paid. It seems to me it would have been worth while for this Government, for the purpose of encouraging shipbuilding in Canada, to have paid this additional 15 per cent for the purpose of having this vessel constructed in Canada. The policy of the late Government was to award the contracts for building ships in Canada in cases where the cost was not over 25 or 30 per cent more than the tender of the British shipbuilder. But the tender of the Canadian company was turned down and the contract given to a British firm, for the reason that their price was about 15 per cent below that of the Canadian company. That is a poor way of encouraging shipbuilding in Canada, and I think my right hon. friend the Prime Minister and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will be obliged to revise their intentions in order to demonstrate their sincere desire of encouraging the building of ships in Canada.

Before passing to another subject, I want to say I have been asked a question in regard to the number of men employed in the shipyards at Fore River, Massachusetts. At the present time the yards are fully employed, and there are in the vicinity of four thousand people obtaining employment in connection therewith. The average number employed is somewhere between 3,500 and 4,000, but at the present time there are no less than 4,000 in steady employment. It is a great stimulus to the national pride of the country that the people of the United States are enabled to turn out these enormous battleships in their own shipyards.

As a sort of sweetener to the bitter pill which the people of Canada are asked to swallow in the sending of this vast sum of money out of the country, we are told that the British Government will, in all probability, undertake the building of light cruisers and oil-tank vessels in Canada, on condition that Canada will pay a portion of the cost. In other words, it is proposed that these little vessels shall be built in Canada, and that we shall pay a portion of the extra cost, the ships belonging to the British Government. Is that not a peculiar proposition to submit to a self-respecting and ambitious people, as are

the people of Canada? Hon. gentlemen on the other side will derive litle comfort from Mr. Churchill's statement in regard to the matter, for he says it must be understood that the number of vessels cannot be guaranteed, and therefore there is no assurance of permanency in regard to this work. How are you going to establish shipyards suitable for carrying out work of this kind unless you give to the contracts a certain degree of permanency? I believe that the people of the country, in spite of this sweetener to the bitter pill, will not so readily swallow the dose as hon. gentlemen on the other side seem to think.

It has been said that it is absurd for us to think these ships could be manned by Canada, for it would be impossible to get Canadians to undertake this work. I am free to admit that at first we would be unable to secure a sufficient number of trained Canadian seamen for the purpose. We would probably obtain some, but we would not for a number of years be able to secure the required number of trained seamen. But, Sir, what was the arrangement made between the Government and the British Admiralty upon this question? I wish to call attention to what I consider a most important agreement made in June, 1911, between the representatives of the governments of Australia and Canada, and the British Admiralty. That agreement was solemnly entered into between the two great overseas dominions and the Mother Country; that agreement was one to which Australia has adhered in good faith; to which the British Admiralty was prepared to adhere in good faith, and to which this Government is seeking to have broken! This is what the agreement was:

The naval services and forces of the Dominions of Canada and Australia will be exclusively under the control of their respective governments.

Did the British Government think that was a separatist proposition? Not at all. And may they not be supposed to know just as well as hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House what would be a separatist proposition, or what would be in the real interest of the Empire? (Reading):

2. The training and discipline of the naval forces of the dominions will be generally uniform with the training and discipline of the fleet of the United Kingdom, and, by arrangement, officers and men of the said forces will be interchangeable with those under the control of the British Admiralty.

3. The ships of each dominion naval force will hoist at the stern the white ensign as the symbol of the authority of the Crown, and at the jack-staff the distinctive flag of the Dominion.

Hon. gentlemen on the other side have loudly claimed that they are for one empire, one king, and one flag; and they seek to arouse the patriotic feelings of the people by that declaration. Here we have the British Admiralty and the overseas dominions agreeing that upon the ships of both Canada and Australia, the white ensign, the flag of the British Empire, shall always fly, as a symbol of the authority of the Crown, and that, in order to distinguish the respective ships of the overseas dominions at the jack-staff shall be hoisted the distinctive flag of the Dominion. The agreement further states :

4. The Canadian and Australian Governments will have their own naval stations as agreed upon and from time to time. The limits of the stations are as described in schedule (A), Canada, and schedule (B), Australia.

5. In the event of the Canadian and Australian Government desiring to send ships to a part of the British Empire outside of their own respective stations, they will notify the British Admiralty.

6. In the event of the Canadian or Australian Government desiring to send ships to a foreign port, they will obtain the concurrence of the Imperial government, in order that the necessary arrangements with the Foreign Office may be made as in case of ships of the British fleet, in such time and manner as is usual between the British Admiralty and the Foreign office.

In order to bridge over the time during which seamen for the Canadian navy may be thoroughly trained, paragraphs 12 and 13 provide as follows :

12. The British Admiralty undertakes to lend to the dominions during the period of development of their services, under conditions to be agreed upon, such flag officer and other officers and men as may be needed. In their selection preference will be given to officers and men coming from, or connected with, the dominions, but they should be all volunteers for the service.

13. The service of the officers of the British fleet in the dominion naval forces, or of officers of these forces in the British fleet, will count in all respects for promotion, pay, retirement, &c., as services in their respective forces.

That is to say, pending the development of the service, all men or officers needed shall be furnished by the British Admiralty, and paid for by the Canadian Government.

We did not propose to send unmanned ships. We did not propose to ask the Mother Country to pay the men who are to stand behind the guns in case of battle, but we are prepared to pay English sailors in the meantime, to obtain Canadian sailors as soon as possible, and pay them for their services.

Paragraph 15 is as follows:

It is desirable, in the interests of efficiency and co-operation, that arrangements should be made from time to time between the British Admiralty and the dominions for

the ships of the dominions to take part in fleet exercises or for any other joint training considered necessary under the senior naval officer. While so employed, the ships will be under the command of that officer who would not, however, interfere in the internal economy of ships of another service further than absolutely necessary.

Paragraph 16:

In the time of war when the naval service of the Dominion, or any part thereof, has been put at the disposal of the Imperial Government by the Dominion authorities, the ships will form an integral part of the British fleet, and will remain under the control of the British Admiralty during the continuance of the war.

I have heard it stated that after the Government had placed a ship at the disposal of the British Admiralty in case of war, Parliament was to be called together and Parliament might recall the vessel. Sir, the only reason why it is provided that Parliament shall be called together is the reason which exists in Australia, that Parliament is entitled to be called together to vote the monies which are necessary in order to defray the expenses connected with the conduct of the ships in war, but when a vessel is once placed at the service of the British Admiralty in case of war there is to be no power to recall, it remains under the control of the superior naval officer, and under the entire control of the Admiralty until the war is concluded.

Then paragraph 17 reads:

The dominions having applied to their naval forces the King's Regulations and Admiralty instructions and the Naval Discipline Act, the British Admiralty and Dominion Governments will communicate to each other any changes which they propose to make in these regulations or that Act.

By that agreement between the British Admiralty and the representatives of the two great overseas dominions you have a solemn arrangement and one which was satisfactory to the British Admiralty in respect to the fleets of the overseas dominions. I agree with Sir Charles Tupper that a fearful, a tremendous responsibility rests upon these gentlemen opposite who would disturb the agreement of 1909, destroy the agreement made between the representatives of the British Admiralty and the representatives of the overseas dominions. These gentlemen say: Oh, we want one flag, we are not satisfied that there shall be a distinctive flag of the Dominion flying even at the jack-staff of the navies of the Dominion of Canada and of Australia. Are hon. gentlemen opposite in a position to take this stand? On the 19th of December, 1911, they found they could not think of any other arrangement respecting the flag which would be more symbolic of the authority of the Crown and at the same time evoke the national pride of our country in its own fleet and, two months after they came into office, they ratified by Order in Council the arrangement which had been made between Canada and the Motherland. I find in a return submitted to Parliament, dated December 19, 1911:

Certified copy of a report of the Committee of the Privy Council, approved by His Royal Highness the Governor General on December 19, 1911.

The Committee of the Privy Council have had before them a report, dated December 7, 1911, from the Secretary of State for External Affairs, stating, with reference to paragraph 111 of the memorandum of conferences between the British Admiralty and representatives of the Dominion of Canada and the Commonwealth of Australia, laid before the Imperial Conference at its last meeting,—that the naval ships of the Dominion of Canada will hoist at the stern the White Ensign as the symbol of the authority of the Crown, and will fly the White Pendant.

The minister observes that it is proposed also to fly as a distinctive flag of the Dominion the Blue Ensign with the Canadian Arms in the Fly.

The Committee, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State for External Affairs, advise that Your Royal Highness may be pleased to forward a copy hereof to the Right Honourable the Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies for the information of His Majesty's Government.

All of which is respectfully submitted for approval.

RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

So when this Government were called on to deal with this question of the flag, and when they saw the agreement which the late Government had made conjointly with Australia and with the Admiralty that the white ensign should be flown from all vessels and there should be also the distinctive flag of each overseas dominion they properly recommended that arrangement for approval, and it was accordingly approved by His Royal Highness the Governor General. Let us hear no more about our wanting on this side two flags and upon that side one flag. Every Canadian wants but one flag, that flag to be symbolic of the authority of the Crown and symbolic of the unity of the British Empire. That is what we agreed upon with the Admiralty conjointly with the Government of Australia. That is what this Government approved of two months after they came into office.

A number of gentlemen on the other side of the House have said: Oh, see what has happened with regard to the men who were placed on the Niobe and Rainbow, you could not get men for them. In view of this it is interesting to read the report submitted to Parliament by the Minister of Marine for the year ending March 31,

1912. It first speaks of the course of training at the Naval College and says: It has been very satisfactory and the cadets have made rapid progress. Then it proceeds to speak, over the signature of Admiral Kingsmill, Director of the Naval Service, of the recruiting. It says:

Owing to the uncertainty of the future naval policy, and to the accommodation being limited, no special efforts have been made to obtain recruits; postmasters are still acting as recruiting officers and have forwarded candidates who come up to the standard of physical and educational requirements.

The report speaks of the desertions and says in conclusion:

The large number of desertions is attributed to the fact that the larger number of recruits are drawn from cities and towns remote from the sea; candidates present themselves who are totally unacquainted with the conditions of life in a ship, which differ much from that to which they are accustomed.

An important paragraph relating to manning the vessels, which is worthy of the consideration of the House, was omitted by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro).

Up to the present the fishing population has not been exploited, and it is anticipated that recruits can be obtained therefrom who are inured to a sea life and who would find themselves in congenial surroundings in a man-of-war.

I believe every word of that to be true. How can you expect young men to take up life on board a war-vessel if there is no certainty as to the future naval policy of the Government? They would be liable to be discharged at any time, having simply a temporary employment. Young men would not enter such an employment. Is it not true, too, that among the hardy fishermen of this country recruits could easily be obtained? The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) says that the Canadians are not a maritime people. That I deny. There are 80,000 fishermen in Canada, 80,000 men engaged in the fisheries. Along the coast of the Maritime provinces and the coast of Newfoundland there are many thousands of young men who would be glad to engage in the naval service. Every year from the coast of Newfoundland there go from 16,000 to 18,000 fishermen away up to the coast of Labrador and endure hardships of the most severe character in order to earn a livelihood. They leave their families and they have no reasonable certainty that they will return. They are willing to endure these hardships to earn a livelihood. The sea has its attraction for them and they would be glad to engage in the naval service. The naval service could be made wonderfully attractive to the young men of this country if we adopted the plan which they have adopted in the United States. There they invite young men from sixteen to twenty-five years of age to engage upon the war vessels of the United States for a period of four years. They undertake to give them a trade, to instruct them in electricity, engineering, carpentering, or machine work of various kinds according to their adaptability and their desires and, at the end of four years, they, if they do not desire to remain in the service, can go ashore and work at the trade which they have learned on the ship. The service is attractive and I am told it is true that many hundreds, nay, I believe I may say many thousands, of young Canadians are now in the naval service of the United States. They go there because of their fondness for sea life and because there is no opportunity to engage in naval service at home. I hope that I have disposed completely of the arguments that it would not be possible to have these ships manned.

But suppose that for a few years we were obliged to avail ourselves of the offer made by the British Admiralty in 1911 and pay for British sailors, surely that would be a better thing for Canada to do than to say to the Mother Country: This great Dominion with its large population, with its vast resources, its wealth and rapidly increasing revenue, will give you these ships, that is all we will do for you, you must man them yourself, you must pay the wages of the men, you must pay for the upkeep and if you are prepared as the Prime Minister suggested in England, to come to such an understanding with us as will give us a measure of control in the affairs of the Empire, we will consider what we are going to do in regard to a permanent policy; or, if you should happen, three years from now, to get into a condition which would make us believe that we might safely ask Parliament for another contribution, perhaps we will give you another number of dreadnoughts and so satisfy you until the time comes when we may attain our desires. That is not the view which the members upon this side of the House take on this question, or of the duty which we owe to the Mother Country. We believe that whatever we do we should do as the work of Canada. We believe that the men behind the guns are of more importance than the guns or the ships when the battle rages and we believe that it would be a humiliation to the people of Canada in the future if a great battle decisive of the fate of the Empire should take place and Canadians should be told: You were willing to give the ships but you had not the courage, you had not the patriotism, to send your young men sailors to man the ships, to stand

behind the guns and to fight for Canada and the Empire. We believe that the course which is oulined in the amendment of my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is the one which is best for Canada and best for the Empire.

Now, I want to say, in conclusion, that in my judgment my right hon. friend the leader of the Government, in suggesting, as he is reported to have suggested in England, that if Canada is to take any large part in Imperial defence it must have a voice in the foreign policy of the Empire, proposed a course which is not a wise or patriotic one for the people of Canada to take. I think that whatever we do to-day for Canada or the Empire we should do voluntarily and we should leave it to the Mother Country in future to do what it thinks best for the Empire and for the overseas dominions. We should not bargain upon this question of naval defence any more than we bargained when the question of giving a preference to the Mother Country came up and when the Government, led by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, voluntarily offered to the Mother Country to admit its products at a preference of 33⅓ per cent as against those of the rest of the world. We say that it is our duty to act and the best way we can act is by providing for the creation of a Canadian navy, the ships to be owned, manned and controlled by Canada, to be under the control of the Government of Canada, but to be always available for the service of the Empire when the Empire needs the services of the Canadian ships.

Now, Sir, one other word in regard to this supposed condition which my right hon. friend the leader of the Government suggested. I find it is the very condition which was put forward by Mr. Bourassa at a Nationalist meeting which was held at St. Eustache, in the province of Quebec, and it shows the influence which the Nationalists are exerting upon this Government and upon its actions with reference to the naval question. I find that these very ideas were put forward at a meeting held at St. Eustache on the 17th of July, 1910. The report in the newspapers is as follows:

> At a Nationalist meeting at St. Eustache, July 17, 1910, a resolution embodying their platform was adopted after a vigorous speech by Henri Bourassa. Dealing with Imperial issues, the resolution proceeded as follows:
>
> 'But confident in the greatness and efficiency of the principles of centralization and of autonomy as solemnly proclaimed and recognized since more than half a century by the authorities of Great Britain and those of Canada, we are opposed to any new policy which would entangle us in distant wars, foreign to Canada, so long especially as the autonomous colonies of the Empire do not share with the Mother Country upon a footing of equality the sovereign authority in matters relating to the Imperial Army and Navy treaties of peace and alliance, foreign relations, the Government of India, and the possessions of the Crown.'

That language is almost identical with the language which was used by the Prime Minister upon several occasions in the city of London, as reported in the Canadian newspapers, and it breathes the same spirit. It shows to what a marked, to what a lamentable degree, the utterances and opinions of Mr. Bourassa and his Nationalist allies are influencing the course of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister on this question. But, Sir, it was said by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce: Suppose there was a contest; the Nationalists were opposed to a contribution; they said: Hang a contribution, or damn a contribution—I forget which.

Mr. WILCOX: No.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The minister, I think, used the expression that the Nationalists said: 'Damn a contribution.' Perhaps I am mistaken in that.

Mr. WILCOX: No, he did not.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What did he say?

Mr. WILCOX: He said that the Nationalists did not have their own way.

Mr. PUGSLEY: What did he say in regard to the Nationalists' view of a contribution? Perhaps he did not say that; at all events he said that or something very like it, and he said that the Nationalists did not get their own way. I do not know as to that——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: But we do.

Mr. PUGSLEY: But our friends from the province from which my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition comes do know in regard to that matter. But there is no question, and there can be no question, from what we know has taken place in Quebec during the last two years, that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, the late Minister of Public Works (Mr. Monk), did, for a considerable period, influence and control the opinion of the members of the Government upon this question.

We know that when he moved his resolution in the House that there should be an election upon the question of contributing to Imperial armaments (a resolution which the Minister of Trade and Commerce did not find it convenient to vote upon), the late Minister of Public Works obtained upon the Government, so far as this naval policy is concerned, an influence which lasted for a considerable period. At last

the Prime Minister conceived the idea of satisfying a certain portion of his friends by proposing to give this large contribution and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier felt that was contrary to the pledges he had made, to a certain class at all events, of the people of Quebec. He demanded that that contribution should not be given until the question was submitted to the people. The Prime Minister in his reply to the hon. member (Mr. Monk) does not deny that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier made that pledge as the leader of the Conservative party in the province of Quebec; and he does not deny that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) had his authority to make that pledge. But the Prime Minister seeks to evade the responsibility for that pledge by stating that a grave condition of affairs has arisen which now makes it desirable to send a contribution; and as to the main question, he says he is still prepared, when the time comes to submit his permanent naval policy to the country. Is it not important to bear in mind that the late Minister of Public Works, who is one of the leading constitutional lawyers of this country, claims that this contribution is contrary to the terms and to the spirit of the British North America Acts. I take it for granted that what the hon. gentleman means is that under the British North America Act (by means of which the different provinces of Canada came together as a family of provinces to form the Dominion), while this Parliament has a right to legislate with regard to militia and defence, it has no right to make a contribution of this vast sum of money to be sent beyond the confines of Canada, and to be used for the purpose of building ships to be placed at the service of the Imperial Government. I am not prepared to say to-day whether the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is right or wrong; it is sufficient to know that he has raised a constitutional question of great importance. I am not prepared to say whether his view is right, so far as the letter of the statute is concerned, but I do say his view is right so far as the spirit of that statute is concerned. It never was intended by these provinces when they entered confederation, that any Government of the day should take advantage of its majority in the House of Commons to contribute of the hard-earned taxes of the people of this country, a sum of money so vast as this and to place it where the people of Canada would have no control over its expenditure, and no control over what was produced by it or from it.

With the view of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that this question ought to be submitted to the people, I entirely concur. I stand here as representing a majority of the people of one of the family of provinces that went into confederation—there are others on this side of the House representing a majority of the people of three others of this great family of provinces—and I utter my protest on behalf of the people of New Brunswick against this proposal, which is un-Canadian, this proposal which is contrary to the spirit of the British North America Act, the constitution under which we live. I, for one, say that before the Government should exercise its majority to force this resolution into law, they ought to submit the question to the people of this country. The Government must have known since they came into office of the condition of affairs disclosed three years ago; they must have had an idea of the condition of affairs to-day, and, therefore, in view of their delay, they cannot say there is immediate necessity for passing this law. It will not take long to submit this question to the people of the country, and it is the duty of the Government to do so. So far as I am concerned, speaking only for myself—I do not speak for my honoured leader, I do not speak for the gentlemen with whom I am associated on this side of the House—I say that I would go to the people of my province with every confidence that the majority would declare against this proposal and in favour of the amendment moved by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Is the suggestion which I make not reasonable? You are asked that this Parliament should vote away, not your money, not our money; the Government of the country are the trustees of the people, every dollar of this vast sum of thirty-five million dollars which you propose to send out of the country is to be paid out to British labourers and to the suppliers of British material; every dollar of that money has been taken by way of taxes from the people of this country and before this new departure is made, before this important step in what is to be our future relations with the Mother Country is taken, before we depart from the resolution which was agreed upon in 1909, to build in Canada a Canadian navy, to be owned, controlled and manned by the people of Canada, the people of this country have the right to be consulted.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of pleasure to the calm and well-reasoned argument of the hon. member for St. John, and certainly I must at the outset pay him the compliment of having to a certain extent stuck close to the text and given more or less elevation to the tone of the debate. I was struck with the vast knowledge the hon. gentleman seemed

to have. Coming from a province by the sea where he has spent his lifetime, I wondered whether or not that fact constituted him such a great authority on ship-building plant, docks, and wharfs. The argument of my hon. friend was largely one of an anticipatory nature. He attempted to speak not only for himself and his own side of the House, but, in addition, to lay down a policy for the Prime Minister and the Government of this country. He seemed to be rather more elated than one would have expected in a man of his astuteness and great experience, and I must also say smoothness, when he seized upon the remark made by the hon. member for Brantford in his speech last night, in allusion to the policy being a policy of continual contribution. The point seemed to enthuse my hon. friend's supporters greatly, and the hammering of desks at that particular period indicated that they were very easily pleased. It was surprising to me as a member of this House, after reading and listening to the enunciation of this policy as laid down by the right hon. the Prime Minister, which in every essential phase of it is absolutely different from the contention of the hon. member for St. John. I challenge him or any of his supporters to say that there has ever been anything either said or written officially, by the Prime Minister or by any of the speakers who are supporting the Government's contention on this side of the House, to the effect that the policy laid down by the right hon. the Prime Minister was a policy of continual contribution. My hon. friend took great unction in reading from the letter, written some three or four years ago, by that grand old veteran statesman, whom I am sure everyone is pleased to see alive and enjoying in his esteemed old age the benefits of good health, Sir Charles Tupper. The point he made which to my mind he did not intend to make, was one which should have caused the hon. gentleman, and did cause him in his remarks, astute, calm, and collected as he was, to falter in his voice and read with a great deal of trepidation and fear, the statement made by Sir Charles Tupper that during the Boer War he was in the van of those who forced that Government to send the men to South Africa. My hon. friend lowered his voice at that point; he wanted to let that slide by as smoothly and as nicely as possible; but I want to tell the hon. gentleman that that is something in the history of this country which will never be forgotten as long as there is anything in the nature of an Opposition, such as exists to-day in the Parliament of this country. My hon. friend says that the ships he spoke about should be built in Canada. I have before me the report of the Department of Naval Service, from which the hon. gentleman read. It is rather interesting. He slipped by it in a most delightful way. I regret to say that this very report, from which he read, contains in it the most damaging, and, if I might be permitted to use the word, damning argument against the Canadian Naval Policy which he so strongly advocates. He has spoken well, and after apparently a great deal of research, regarding the capacity of the various shipbuilding yards, and he has eulogized in a manner that ought to strike the average Canadian with pride, the fact that Canadians are able to build and do anything that anyone else can do. What do I find in this report? That when the Niobe ran upon the rocks at Yarmouth, it was found that she was very seriously injured and that it was necessary that great repairs should be made upon her. The hon. gentlemen opposite, in the administration of their own naval policy, had so left unprepared the workshops and the plants that they have already got in this country, that this report says it was necessary to send to England for men to undertake the repairs. I do not wonder that my hon. friend slipped that by. But it does seem to me that when men boast of the naval service they have inaugurated, a naval service which they claim is a splendid thing in this country, to leave it unprovided with men even for making repairs is not treating the country fairly, and not rising to the standard of workmanship and business supervision, which any other people in any other country of this world would have had before they would carry out any policy of shipbuilding.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The repairs to the Niobe were made in Halifax.

Mr. MORPHY: The report says that men had to be sent out from England.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I suppose the British Admiralty would send some one out to watch repairs. They would do that in the case of repairs being made in any shipbuilding yard.

Mr. MORPHY: They have the men in England capable of making the repairs, but they do not have them in Canada.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The entire repairs to the Niobe were made in the port of Halifax, with the exception I think of the rudder.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Some mistake was made in the rudder?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes.

Mr. MORPHY: I am reading from the report, and I will leave it to be settled

between my hon. friend and the gentlemen who are responsible for this report whether it is correct or not. It is one report of the Government, I understand, from what is on it. Does my hon. friend undertake to say that report is false?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not object to the statement of fact my hon. friend reads from the report; I object to the deductions he makes from it.

Mr. MORPHY: My hon. friend, who comes from a maritime province, will no doubt have an opportunity of speaking in the course of this debate and he can explain what he means. I will see that he does so on the floor of this House.

The next point I have to make in this particular report, and it seems to stand out in great prominence when one considers the apparently strong position taken by the hon. member for St. John to-day, is this: On the two boats, the Rainbow and the Niobe, these fighting ships, we have the statistics showing the number of recruits during the last year as follows: 'On the Niobe, from Nova Scotia, 37; New Brunswick, 2; Prince Edward Island, 8; Quebec, 11; Ontario, 52; Manitoba, 1; 111 recruits during the last year. The desertions last year were 86 recruits, and of others on the same boat 17, or total desertions of 103 in one year, with recruits of 111.' My hon. friend endeavoured to make a point in that regard that it was because things were going bad, the uncertainty of the naval policy and so forth. What are the figures? Let some of the hon. gentlemen opposite show the figures since the inception of the naval policy. They are afraid to show the figures. I challenge any one of the Opposition to get up and tell the history from the point of view of recruits and desertions since the beginning of the naval policy, since the purchase of the Niobe and the Rainbow. Let us come to the other boat, the Rainbow, which is on the Pacific. The recruits last year on the Rainbow were 15; the desertions in the recruit class were 25; the desertions other than recruits on the same boat were 21; in other words, 46 desertions and 15 recruits on your expenditure of $1,300,000 or upwards on two boats, costing $784,000 for maintenance. You have practically evened up desertions with recruits, but not quite. In reading this report, I cannot but wonder, as a Canadian, what kind of administration was back of it. My hon. friend declares for the principle of building ships in Canada, manning them with Canadians and paying Canadian money to Canadian workmen, recruits and sailors. How can hon. gentlemen opposite expect a people of the intelligence of Canadians to listen to such arguments when everybody knows that the very first thing those who initiated those views and boasted of them did, was to violate their own obligations to the country as honourable men, by going outside the country to buy two ships, instead of having them built in these great plants which the hon. gentleman said exist at Collingwood, Montreal and other places. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen, especially for the hon. member for St. John, to be very enthusiastic about where the ships should be built. But I take particular notice that when the right hon. Prime Minister brought down his measure, the only time the hon. gentleman did not look solemn throughout the whole of the Prime Minister's speech was when that part referred to, that under the British Admiralty English firms might come, and probably would come, to the maritime provinces and build ships there. Then the hon. gentleman pounded his desk splendidly. It was the venal point which struck him, it was the venal point that appealed to him. He wanted the money spent in his own constituency, and he did not care for the rest of the Empire or for any other part of Canada. My hon. friend attempted an argument about the former Prime Minister going to England in May and returning in July and dissolving the House. The statement is clearly made by the hon. member for St. John that when the former Prime Minister went to England he had the figures with him. He went to consult the British Admiralty as to which tenders it would be best to accept. I do not know that this explains why they went. The specifications were all the same, for the tenders were all in the same form. And the hon. member for St. John says they were all good firms capable of doing the work. It was, then, only a question of amount. But what could they consult the Admiralty about, except the question whether they should take the cheapest or the dearest? I do not take much stock in their argument, no matter how much hon. gentlemen may try to gloss over the facts. Why did they dissolve the House? Why not have gone on, accepted the tenders before they dissolved the House, and had the ships laid down? I have not heard from any hon. member on the other side any good and valid reason for their action. The reason I give is this: They themselves knew that they had made a mistake in their attempt to establish a Canadian navy on the plans that they had made. They knew that the conditions were bad, that they could not man their ships, and that the expense of maintenance would be very great. They were sick of their own policy. And, to get out of letting these contracts, they did what no government under British rule has ever done without

disaster, in a time of great prosperity they made a new issue, reciprocity, and went to the country to hide the defects of their policy, in the hope that they could slide through and afterwards let the contracts as they pleased. As I say, no real reason has been given by any hon. gentleman opposite why these tenders were not let. It is all right for these hon. gentlemen opposite now, without the responsibility of Government upon their shoulders, to come here and try to dictate what this Government's policy shall be. The hon. member for St. John is an ardent advocate of a naval policy which shall mean shipbuilding in Canada. But why did not he force that on his own friends? Why did not he try to give shipbuilding in Canada an impetus by accepting some of these tenders and so laying the foundation of an industry that would have been of great benefit to the people of the Maritime provinces?

As to the Quincy plant, costing roughly, $4,000,000, there was a plant already established, a nucleus for the shipbuilding industry. It took two years to prepare the equipment, and, according to my hon. friend's statement, it took from five to seven years to produce a large battleship. Consider the comparison. The United States have been building ships for forty or fifty years. They have been evolving and keeping up with modern lines of vessels. They have a population of nearly 100,000,000 behind them. They have some of the greatest admirals in the world, such as Admiral Mahan. And they have a high type of shipbuilding experience. My hon. friend wishes this House to believe that we, with no experience—or worse, the experience of a bad beginning under our friends opposite—are to go right on to provide shipyards and begin to turn out dreadnoughts as though all that was necessary was to turn the handle of a machine. But figures have been given to show what enormous engines of war these dreadnoughts are. It is obvious that such constructions cannot be turned out in a few days. Another thing that the hon. gentleman forgot to tell the House is, that it takes from five to seven years to train the officers after the ships are built. This is what we are told in naval works of authority. It takes seven years to train a master gunner; it takes three years to train an ordinary sailor before he is fit for war. Add this to the time the hon. gentleman has mentioned,and you find that from nine to seventeen years must elapse before we could have a dreadnought equipped and manned to fight.

The next thing that struck me about the hon. gentleman's remarks was the delightful ease with which he changed his principles—I mean political principles; I say nothing derogatory, and I am speaking only of the argument in this debate. In speaking of the circumstances surrounding the ship-building conditions in his beautiful province by the sea, the hon. gentleman's chest swelled with indignation when dealing with the allegation that nothing had been done. But I have been told that, during the late Administration, men from the provinces by the sea knocked at the door of the hon. gentlemen, then in the Cabinet, and asked for some redress against the decline of ship-building there; but they knocked in vain. Why did not the hon. gentleman then help his native province? But, worst of all, the most heinous offence of my hon. friend appears to be that, ardent free trader as he is, he said to-day he was willing to be a protectionist so far as ship-building is concerned, for the sake of his province by the sea. A protectionist in regard to ship-building—a free trader in respect of everything else—a most delightful spectacle in the Canadian House of Parliament!

My hon. friend referred to a sweetener for some bitter pill. What bitter pill did my hon. friend refer to? For the bitterness of defeat, I should assume, in September, 1911. My hon. friend smiles; doubtless he realizes the bitterness, and I do not blame him for laughter even in such a case; I would say to my hon. friend, as has been said before, that even in laughter the heart may be, sorrowful, but the end of such mirth is sadness.

I come now to a matter which concerns the right hon. leader of the Opposition. I am rather surprised that a gentleman of his astuteness should fall into what I conceive to be—I do not know what to call it, an error he does not often commit; we all admit he is a master, in many ways, of the political game. However, every man is more or less human, and we are all prone to mistakes. I was present when the hon. member for Kingston spoke in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and I noticed particularly what he said in regard to the matter now under discussion. I quote from page 26 of 'Hansard':

> The reason refer to that extract is that it differs so radically from the naval policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite as embodied in their Naval Service Act. I do not wish to precipitate a debate on this question; but, if I understand the debates of last session, two things were made manifestly clear: that the Canadian navy was not a part of the British navy, and that by some constitutional declaration of neutrality, we were, in case of any war, to remove ourselves, so to speak, from the sphere of activity. It is utterly impossible for me, as a lawyer, to comprehend by what declaration Canada, in time of need, can remove herself from the sphere of war unless she declares her independence. That is my objection to the Naval Service Act, and the naval policy of the right

hon. gentleman opposite (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). It has a tendency towards a declaration of independence rather than a tendency towards a closer union of the overseas dominions with the British Crown.

That is a very fair and concise statement, and I have taken the trouble to look up the answer of the right hon. gentleman to these remarks. On page 1063 of 'Hansard,' the right hon. gentleman made use of these words :

I now come to another subject, which I would not have mentioned at all were it not for some observations made during the Debate on the Address by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). During the last electoral contest, I heard it many a time, and I read it many a time, that our Canadian navy was a separatist navy, and that it was, on account of something which was to be found in the Act, liable to be neutral in time of war. I have been too long in the fight——

The right hon. gentleman then goes on to speak eloquently of the Roman senator who said: 'Strike, but hear me,' and then he uses the following words :

In refutation of the charge that the Navy Act was intentionally, on my part, separatist, I think it is sufficient for me to set up the record of my seventy years of life.

The point I make is that the hon. member for Kingston did not charge the right hon. gentleman with intentionally making it a separatist navy. He declared it was, separatist and the right hon. gentleman did not deny the charge in his answer. He says only that 'it was not intentionally on my part, separatist.' It remains for the right hon. gentleman to make himself clear on that point before the people of this country. He said that the Canadian navy is such that if Great Britain is at war Canada is not at war, and our navy is therefore not at war. What is that, Mr. Speaker, but separation ? To my surprise, the right hon. gentleman is trying to make it better, changing his language with that ease and facility he so readily possesses, and he says, in so many words—I am not quoting the exact words, but it is near enough—that when England is at war, Canada is at war, but we are not or may not be in the conflict. Is not that a separatist navy? What else does it mean? This is a point my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has not answered, and he should answer it before the people of this country will give him credit for standing up for the principles of a true Canadian and a true Britisher.

The Naval Service report says the Maritime Provinces have not yet been exploited. What is the apparent attitude of the people of the Maritime provinces in regard to the navy? So little faith is there on the part of the people of New Brunswick, of Prince Edward Island, and of Nova Scotia in that navy, notwithstanding the presence of the Niobe in and around their shores, that the province of New Brunswick has only contributed two people out of the 80,000 fishermen my hon. friend boasts of; Nova Scotia, 37; Prince Edward Island, 8; Quebec, 11; while the most inland province of all, that of Ontario, has sent its quota of 52. Are we to understand that the service inaugurated and carried on by hon. gentlemen opposite is of such a nature that it has to be exploited in the home of the hardy fishermen of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island? Does the hon. gentleman wish the people of the other provinces to understand that they have to be cajoled, exploited, worked with, to take service in what the hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) does not like to hear spoken of, as the tin-pot navy? That hon. member the other day said: I hope we will hear the last of that tin-pot navy. So do I, I do not care how soon it goes, as far as that kind of a navy is concerned.

May I state briefly the position I as a supporter of the Prime Minister see it? The first idea that comes to my mind is the magnificent and splended type of statesmanship displayed by the right hon. gentleman on the introduction of this great Naval Bill into this House. I was pleased as any Canadian should be, no matter upon which side of the House he may sit, to read in the press of Great Britain and of the British Empire the world over the most eulogistic and commendatory remarks upon the splendid type of statesmanship shown by the right hon. gentleman in his methods of introducing that bill to this House. The ex-Prime Minister with a taste and courtesy which I, as a new member of the House greatly appreciated, complimented the right hon. the Prime Minister in very felicitous terms. I hoped that this action of the ex-Prime Minister foreshadowed a different state of feeling from what has since been exhibited in this debate. But the commendation of the right hon. gentleman by the press of Canada and of Great Britain and the other dominions did not surprise me. No member on this side of the House was surprised at the manner of the right hon. gentleman's introduction of the Bill and, as I have said, his calm, moderate and splendid presentation met with eulogistic encomiums throughout the world. We on this side take great pleasure in testifying to the abilities of our right hon. friend the Prime Minister as a statesman with a full grasp of all the great questions, and, with the helm of state in his care, we have no fear of the consequence of his leadership. We have splendid evidence that he knows what he

is doing, that he will do it fairly, that he will satisfy not only his friends on this side but the best minds on the other side of the House and throughout the country.

The confederation of the dominions beyond the seas with Great Britain and Ireland is something that should not be offensive to any man in this House. It seems to me that the principle of the unity of the British Empire is one that will appeal to all classes.

The issue between the two parties is now clear-cut and well-defined. The naval policy of the Government, in brief, to give $35,000,000 for the purpose of constructing three dreadnoughts to be part of the Royal navy and separatist in any way, manned by England, built in England and paid by England. Some of our friends opposite seem to take great umbrage at the fact that we are going to allow England to pay these men. The point has already been made in this debate how the late Government treated the soldiers who went to South Africa. Personally I do not believe very much in that kind of recrimination; the fact that hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House did wrong is no reason why we should ask friends on this side of the House to do wrong also. The fact that they were right in one case is no proof that they were right in another. The fact that we did so and so on the naval question should stand by itself in view of conditions that exist at the present time. The Opposition policy is practically the retention of the Canadian navy taking the words of the ex-Prime Minister, if there is need or emergency—and in this he was supported by his followers—instead of giving $35,000,000 to build dreadnoughts he would give $140,000,000 for that purpose, the vessels to be manned in Canada by Canadians, paid in Canadian money, the ships built in Canada out of Canadian materials. Hon. gentlemen opposite, one and all, apparently say there is no need, no danger. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition says there is no danger. Then they say that the Government policy interferes with Canadian autonomy, and here I wish to correct the statement of members on the other side that the present policy of the Government is a permanent one.

The objections to the Government's policy by the Opposition, as I see them, are: No need, the country pays tribute, we are a nation of substitutors, (using the word of the hon. member for South Renfrew), Canadian money to be spent but no blood and the wrench to Canadian autonomy. The hon. member for South Renfrew dwelt very long on the question of autonomy, and with apologies to the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux), I have consulted an encyclopedia and will briefly read what the Encyclopedia Britannica says in reference to autonomy. I must confess that I cannot learn it from the speech of the hon. member for South Renfrew because although he spoke long, he said very little. His quotations were not aposite, he furnished us with no light at all on the subject, and I was forced to go to the Encyclopedia Britannica to see exactly what it meant. In general the term means 'freedom from external restraint, self-government.' The term is usually coupled with a qualifying adjective. Thus political autonomy is self-government in its widest sense, independence of all control from without. Local autonomy is 'a freedom of self-government within a sphere marked out by some superior authority.' Administrative or constitutional autonomy, such as exists in the British colonies, implies an extent of self-government which falls short only of complete independence. The last phrase is one which should be considered, I think. That is the kind of autonomy which we enjoy under our constitutional government and it is the kind of autonomy that the hon. member for South Renfrew suggests is going to be ruined, torn asunder, absolutely ripped up the back and frazzled at the edges. That is the horrible catastrophe that is going to happen to our autonomy as the question is viewed by the hon. member for South Renfrew.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 52, to incorporate the Bankers Trust Company.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 53, respecting the Brazilian Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill No. 54, respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Currie.

Bill No. 55, to incorporate the New Westminster Harbour Commissioners.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 56, respecting the Hull Electric Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill No. 57, respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. Beattie.

Bill No. 59, to incorporate the North Fraser Harbour Commissioners.—Mr. Taylor.

Bill No. 60, respecting the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 61, respecting the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—Mr. Middlebro.

Bill No. 62, to incorporate the Western Canada Mortgage Corporation. — Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 63, to incorporate the Wetaskiwin, Yellowhead and Revelstoke Railway Company.—Mr. Bennett (Calgary).

NAVAL FORCES OF THE EMPIRE.

Mr. MORPHY: Mr. Speaker, prior to the adjournment at six o'clock I had reached the point with reference to certain arguments of the hon. member for South Renfrew on the question of Canadian autonomy, where I desired to say that the hon. member had failed to grasp the real significance of the present naval proposal bearing upon Canadian autonomy; that he had failed to see, or had failed to admit he sees, that the proposal to do something in aid of the Imperial navy as laid down in the resolution before the House, namely, the purchasing of three dreadnoughts to be placed in the battle line of the Imperial navy, with distinctively Canadian appellations, was a pure gift to the Mother Country coupled with a provision that if Canada requires the same that they shall be at the request of Canada returned to Canadian waters to give greater local security by virtue of their fighting qualities in time of need. I would like my hon. friend—who I am sorry is not in his seat now—to feel with me as a Canadian that this proposition is one which enriches Canadian autonomy and brings it closer and closer to the heart of the Motherland, and at last puts Canada upon a base where she can hold her head up erect and say that though she has been recreant in the past to her plain duty as an overseas dominion of the great British Empire, at last, under the guidance of the right hon. the Prime Minister and his Cabinet, measures have been taken which will enrich Canadian autonomy more than anything which has happened within the lifetime of any living Canadian.

One other objection from gentlemen on the other side to the policy of the Government is that the country by this gift pays tribute. Fortunately the hon. member for Red Deer, as well as the hon. member for South Wellington, have both gone on record, one in this House and one in his own county, speaking to his constituents, and both have taken a position which could not very well be otherwise than taken, namely, that there is no tribute in the matter at all, that it is purely a free and spontaneous gift by the people of Canada acting through their lawfully constituted Parliament. The situation from my point of view is happily cleared up, unless one is to express the thought that hon. gentlemen on the other side may change their minds. In regard to the hon. member for South Wellington, whom I am sorry not to see in his place, we have the statement made on the floor of this House a year ago that the great cause of reciprocity was dead. This session he came back and told us he did not mean what he said and that it is still alive. We will give him the opportunity later on of saying whether it is still living or not, but no need to arge about that.

The hon. member for South Renfrew particularly spoke of 'Canadian money but no blood.' Do hon. gentlemen opposite pledge themselves to this country that they wish to introduce into Canada a form of naval conscription? The figures to-day show clearly, as quoted in the Naval Service Report that so far as the navy which has been established for some two or three years is concerned, no response was made by the people of Canada to man the ships which the last Government bought and put into Canadian waters. The word 'exploit' was used, 'Provinces by the sea have not been exploited to get men.' What I contend is that you cannot get men trained here under the present conditions of the growth of this country unless conscription is introduced; and that is the logical policy of gentlemen opposite. I for one do not see quite clearly that we have reached the stage in our political and constitutional development when conscriptiin is either necessary or advisable. Hon. gentlemen opposite, however, take that ground, and they have got to answer to the country for it. Let that answer be what it may, I for one say that it will not be propagated throughout the province of Ontario that this Government will force men to go on the ships of war, especially seeing that our men are not trained for the service, and have no desire to serve. England has plenty of men; she has tens of thousands and hundreds of thousands to man her warships and to colonize in addition; they come here by the hundreds and thousands.

I see by a report from South Wellington that some persons in that county rather resent the fact that men of English, Irish and Scotch stock, among the best in the world probably, at all events equal to any in the world, are not welcome in that neighbourhood, because at a meeting at Aberfoyle, my hon. friend's henchmen and friends urged them to go back where they came from, that they had no business in Canada, or words to that effect. As a Canadian I want to take the ground right here, that in the county I have the honour to represent, we have a large number of British born people, splendid tradesmen, drapers' clerks, ironworkers, &c., the great Grand Trunk shops in the city of Stratford employ a thousand men, and many of them are splendid mechanics from the Old Country; they are coming here with the best tradi-

tions of English public life, and it ill lies in the mouth of Canadians to tell them we do not want them. I say that we should give them the right hand of fellowship and hope that they may be as our forefathers were, among the future builders up of this country.

The next thing we have is lack of men. It is undeniable and no one will seriously contend otherwise that while England has a plethora of men, we have a scarcity. We lack labour on the farms, in the workshops, in the market places, for railway construction and on the transportation systems. All these facts are well known to hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is no argument to say under those circumstances that Canadians have no courage. That argument has been thrown across this House. I resent it; it is a pusillanimous argument, unworthy of the members on the other side of the House who advocate it. It does not lie in the mouth of the Canadian born on the other side to ridicule his own country, and I hurl it back with some warmth to the gentlemen opposite. We all know that courage was not lacking in the South African war. Just here I should like to make this point. A great deal has been said, such as 'Oh you may put the officers on with their top feathers; Canadian officers can go but men cannot go.' Let me point out that under the British Army system and the King's regulations, the army of Britain is open to any Canadian and there is nothing in the law to prevent Canadians going into the British navy if they so desire. Let that be understood, and do not attempt to draw a herring across the trail. As an hon. gentleman has just told me there are numbers of Canadians there already. Sir Percy Girouard, whose name ought to inspire men of French descent in this House, has made a name for himself in the British army which will never fade. I glory in that; I glory in all the achievements of every Canadian who rises to a point of fame, and sheds renown and lustre on the country that gives him birth.

At the expense of just a little time, I want to quote an excerpt from this message that comes from England. The first is:

> The Admiralty set the greatest store by the important material, and still more important moral, assistance which it is within the power of Canada to give to maintaining British naval supremacy on the high seas.

What is the effect of the two words 'material' and 'moral' assistance? This Government has brought in a Bill to give material assistance. I am not going to waste time to quibble whether this message means what this side of the House says it means; I am willing, as a humble member of this House, to let the country judge what it means. The material assistance is something we are giving in these three dreadnoughts which does not exist in the fleet that is proposed, at the best, to be built under the Canada Navy Act. The material assistance that is given will be as the other paragraph says, 'three of the most powerful ships that money can buy or science can devise.'

I will not dilate upon the effect of those ships. The point I wish to make in regard to it is that there is, whether rightly or wrongly, an impression spread throughout the Dominion of Canada that there was no real desire on the part of our friend the right hon. the ex-Prime Minister and his party behind him to give any material assistance; and that behind that lack of desire was the reason and the basis for their refusal to let the tenders. It is for the hon. gentlemen opposite to satisfy the country in that regard. With regard to moral assistance, let us see where we are.

We started this debate with probably one of the finest, calmest, and most judicial pronouncements from the Prime Minister in laying down a policy that did not invite any particular attack; but suddenly, in the twinkling of an eye, the right hon. the leader of the Opposition got up and made an attack upon political lines against the passing of the Bill. That was caucussed deliberately; the intention was plain to drive it into politics; and then an hon. gentleman following the Prime Minister turned round and said that something that happened in the Arthabaska election some years ago brought this question into politics. Supposing it did? Cannot we take it out? Is this nation so threadbare of issues, that where moral assistance is required, we must go with a divided House to the chancellories of Europe? For this mere petty desire they sink Canadianism, they sink British instincts, and declare their readiness to make political capital out of that which should be above political considerations—our gratitude to England for what she has done for us in days gone by.

Now, with regard to the question being in politics, I come for the moment to the autonomy question again. I refer especially to the remarks of the hon. member for South Renfrew and the hon. member for South Wellington. The arguments of hon. gentlemen on the other side teem with inconsistencies and contrarieties. Autonomy is broken, so they say. But the hon. member for South Wellington says: I am willing to break autonomy, and will go you half; we will build one dreadnought without consulting the people if you will put the rest of the money into two fleet units. At first, he demands: What right have you to do it; and then he says: We will do it. What a happy family they must be on the other side. The arguments of these hon. gentlemen refute one another.

Now, as to the position of Great Britain and the British navy, what does Canada owe for the past and what does Britain give now? I do not intend to go into the figures as to the past, but I wish to make a general argument as to the future. British supremacy on the seas is vital to the British dominions beyond the seas; there is no question about that. The sweeping of the seas by England to protect trade routes is a necessity for Canada. Now, we are sending some material assistance in aid of the power of Britain to rule the waves. We would like to send it unanimously; but we are endeavouring to send it.

I am not in a position to know what the policy of the present Government is in regard to a Canadian navy. I wish to be very fair to my right hon. friend the ex-Prime Minister, for I think fairness should be shown in these things. Whatever defects his policy and his carrying out of that policy may have shown, I thought at the time, and think still, that the country owed him something for establishing the principle that we should do something. That principle was recognized in the Naval Act. What I contend is that the principle was the great virtue, and about the only virtue, because there was no material force, or advantage, or effect to be derived from the way the policy was carried out. Now, I am not prepared to commit myself as to what the Government's policy may be, but I put this to the House: The policy of hon. gentlemen opposite involves an expenditure of from $45,000,000 to $55,000,000 for two fleet units, one on the Pacific and one on the Atlantic —two isolated fleet units that cannot get together in time of trouble because they have not the coal capacity to bring them together. So, you have only one fleet unit opposed to the marauding of any nation that may desire to attack them individually and wipe them out in turn. That is a poor policy, to my mind for the defence of four or five thousand miles of coast line. On the other hand, let me, on my own responsibility and without any knowledge of what is to come—but with the understanding, as I read it, that there will be a permanent Canadian policy—put this to the House and the country: If Great Britain rules the sea do not we get all the security that we desire in Canadian waters? If Great Britain rules the seas and is supreme there, what is the use of a Canadian navy? It comes down merely to one point, which will appeal to the hon. member for St. John—the idea of establishing the industry of ship-building in the Maritime provinces. I should be very glad, for my part, to see that done. But here is the point: Under the present arrangement with the Admiralty in England, they have indicated that they will build ships, that they will give contracts for building ships by Canadian mechanics, on Canadian soil, with Canadian materials. Why not utilize these ship-building firms under the present policy? That is not inconsistent with what hon. gentlemen opposite desire.

Now, consider what was spent in 1912 on the Imperial navy. Great Britain spent some $86,835,000; Australia, $1,000,000; New Zealand, $500,000; the little island of Newfoundland, $15,000; India, $500,000; South Africa, $475,000; and Canada—not a dollar. Canada has always drawn away from committing herself to such expenditure, and not one dollar has been given from the treasury of this country to repay the hundreds of millions, yes the billion of dollars spent in the last hundred years or more by the British Empire to protect Canadian commerce in Canadian waters and on the oceans of the world. So, when the argument comes from hon. gentlemen opposite that this country is being asked to pay tribute, let me put it in another, in the way that appeals to me just now, and say that we are not paying tribute, we are paying conscience money; we are paying back but a very little of the great expenditures that have been made on our behalf. And, if I were committing the country to what I think it should do, and the necessity were there for the gift of money to build these ships, I should say that what we are proposing is altogether too little for what we have received in the past.

The concentration of the British fleet in the North Sea has been referred to. To my mind that is the greatest reason why we must believe that an emergency exists. What is Great Britain robbing the seas of the world for, in order to concentrate there? Her great men—and I have no desire to fill the pages of 'Hansard' with quotations —have spoken in no uncertain terms. Lord Roberts, a man renowned for his far-seeing and experienced vision, came out with a speech that startled England and wakened them up. Mr. Churchill the First Lord of the Admiralty, a few days afterwards, spoke on the same line, Mr. Asquith, Mr. Balfour—all these gentlemen have practically set Europe on fire by expressing the danger that exists for England to-day. There is no use in mincing matters. And we must not be too critical of language. The very fact that they have drawn British ships from the waters of the world, the fact that they have practically depleted the Mediteranean except at Gibraltar, and have concentrated in the North Sea, seems to me to put the case beyond question. The German naval law is one of great peculiarity. It seems to me that something strange has happened there. In 1897 or 1898 the first German naval law was laid down at the dictation of the Emperor and

of Prince Hohenlohe, then Imperial Chancellor, who dealt with the question of a navy in the year 1897. In a letter to Prince Alexander in 1900, he put himself on record as follows:

I must, however, await the naval debate. We must not expose ourselves to the danger of experiencing from England the fate of Spain at the hands of North America. (United States.)

This was the first tendency to inflame the minds of the German people. What is the meaning of those words? What construction do they bear? That the standard must equal that of the navy of Great Britain—that is the true interpretation of the statement. He said later, in October, 1897:

I am strongly in favour of the naval measure. I will treat it in the most prudent manner, but I am for a fleet of battleships. There really is no getting on without it.

To the same person he said in 1897:

As to the navy, very many men hold the opinion that the new admiral's demands are not unattainable. What decides me to go in for it is the following: It is always said that the Navy is a whim of the Emperor. And yet it cannot be denied that it is the German people's fault—or, if you like, their merit—that we possess a navy.

Further on, he said:

Then came 1870. Unity was achieved with blood and iron, and the Empire came into being amid the acclamations of the German people. But it soon came to pass that there was no money to set up the State with. The tobacco monopoly was rejected, &c. To obtain money for the State, Bismarck changed his policy of customs duty and renounced moderate free trade. In this, too, the German people stood by him. We now obtained between three and four hundred millions of money, and the State could live. The policy of a protective tariff, however, produced a colossal development of industry. We ceased to be an agrarian State, and became a manufacturing one. Owing to this, our policy had again to be altered, and our aim directed to secure exportation. Commerce developed so much that the Government was called upon to protect it. That could only be done by a fleet—not a coast defence squadron, but such a one as can maintain our communications.

He says further:

It is not to be denied that the Emperor disturbs things by his impulsive nature. It is to be wished that he were more phlegmatic. It is, however, unjust to reproach him with wishing to call a fleet into existence as a whim or for his pleasure. He is doing nothing but carrying out what the German people have desired for a hundred and fifty years.

In speaking in the Reichstag on June 12, 1900, he said:

A powerful Empire without a fleet is inconceivable, and when the idea of the Empire disappeared, the wish for a fleet also died away.

Mr. MORPHY.

In the same speech he said:

The German Empire cannot be dependent upon the goodwill of other powerful nations; it must stand upon a basis of its own and be able to command respect. Hence the necessity for a strong fleet. The history of our own times has taught us the fate of the country possessing an inadequate fleet. In conclusion, I would again remind those who regard the sacrifices which must be made for the fleet as too heavy, that it was the idea of unity, the ambition to become a world-wide power originating in the German nation itself, which directed us to that course whence we now pursue our way, and from which we cannot turn back.

That was in 1900, and in 1897 Prince Chlodwig of Hohenlohe Schillingsfuerst started that propaganda. And what happened? In 1900 he laid down the principle of amending the German Naval Bill of 1898, which provided for 17 battleships and 8 cruisers. They claimed that to be the fixed, immutable law of Germany, and when people later on complained they were diverting from that policy, they were assured that was the same policy propounded in 1898—17 battleships and 8 cruisers. In 1900 it was 12 battleships and 14 cruisers. In 1906 the new naval law provided 38 battleships and 20 cruisers, and in 1908 the result was 58 dreadnoughts. The cruisers on the original naval law of Germany were ships of probably 4,000 tons, and, on becoming obsolete, they were replaced by ships of 27,000 tons displacement—the most powerful ships afloat—and they pursued that policy. This fixed, immutable policy, therefore, leaps from battleships and cruisers into 58 dreadnoughts, and in 1920 they will have 61—a mightier fleet of dreadnoughts than England ever dreamed of; a mightier fleet of dreadnoughts than the world has ever seen.

Let us see how they do things in Germany. In the war of 1870, a staff officer of Prince Bismarck came in and said: There is going to be trouble again with France. How so, said Bismarck. France, he answered, is recuperating very rapidly from the drubbing we have given her, and she is growing fast in wealth. I am given to understand that she will attack Germany in five years. Very well, said Prince Bismarck, we will attack her in three—that was the policy of Germany at that time. Britain is in a peculiar position; here we have lined up against her a nation in Alliance with Austria and Italy, both of the latter countries building ships—not so feverishly as Germany—but building rapidly, and going to make up the mightiest coalition the world has ever seen. Germany has an army of, I understand, about 4,500,000 men, instantly ready for war; and a standing army of 3,500,000 men, ready to mobilize at within a six weeks' notice. Germany is thus absolutely secure on her own soil,—possessing

an army greater than any legions that ancient Rome ever knew; able, I venture to say, to defeat Russia, Austria and Italy put together. Why, therefore, does she need a fleet? England cannot attack her; she has no army, and has no means of getting into Germany if she so desired. England does not desire war; she has been the most ardent supporter of peace the world has ever seen. But England has to be careful; she cannot rest idle in the face of imminent danger. This leads me to the cry of hon. gentlemen opposite to the effect that there is no danger—there is no need. That is a cry that is always heard in time of danger. The right hon. the leader of the Opposition says if there was danger they on that side would give not $35,000,000, but twice, three or four times that, $140,000,000 to aid England with dreadnoughts or in any other way. The question of danger is one that is apt to be considered from a party standpoint with results that are not to the credit of the nation. What is patriotism and what do the dictates of patriotism involve and demand? I have here some extracts from The Valor of Ignorance, of General Homer Lea.

In peace, and not in war, is the time to judge the worth of a man's or a nation's patriotism. Those who are indifferent to their country's welfare in peace will be of no use to it in time of war.

Patriotism in its purity is a political virtue, and as such is the antithesis of commercial vanity.

To boast does not liquidate the debt of duty.

As patriotism does not hibernate in the time of peace, it is by no means difficult to discover the true patriot from the false. He is made noticeable by two characteristics causing him to stand out from among other men. And though he may be humble and unknown, yet these two virtues make him preeminent even among those who are vain of their honours and wealth.

To die for one's country, while not less patriotic than to live for it, is by no means as beneficial. But it is in this proposal to die in battle that cowards, rogues and treasonable men find subterfuge befitting their evil practices. When, in peace, men postpone their patriotic activity to a time of war, their procrastination is only indicative of their worthlessness.

As it is impossible after death to distinguish the coward from the hero, so in national defeat distinctions cannot be made as to the cause of it. The world and the victor take no note of the post-bellum explanations. For a nation to suffer defeat through unpreparedness is, to all practical purposes, as bad as though it were through cowardice on the field. In consequence, the man who opposes, in time of peace, suitable preparations for war, is as unpatriotic and detrimental to the nation as he who shirks his duty or deserts his post in time of battle.

That is a very high standard of patriotism and yet one which, I think, we Canadians ought to emulate.

With regard to the question of peace, let us look at the recent history of Europe, especially to what is taking place in England. When General Gordon, one of the most beautiful characters that English life has ever produced, was penned in, when he was the representative of Great Britain, by the thousands of the rebel Mahdi's forces, what happened? Mr. Gladstone was in power and he was coaxed and pressed by the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Wolesley and Lord Granville, for eigth or ten months, to send a relief force to Khartoum. He was told that if he would only send 200 men the eastern mind would stay true if it were known that England was behind Gordon. He was asked to send the men from Suakim to Berber and on to Khartoum. Gladstone always said: Gordon is safe, there is no danger. What happened? Gordon was left to die, his head was taken and put upon a pole by the rebels, under the aegis of that great British nation. He was killed, his head was paraded upon a pole. He died the death of a brave man forsaken by his government. What happened? It took something like a billion of dollars to crush the rebellion that could have been saved if they had sent 200 men. Do the people of this country wish to repeat that with regard to being ready for all eventualities? Let us look at the history of the South African war. General Butler was in charge of the British forces. He saw difficulties as they had been seen in other countries from time to time. He reported to his government that there were armaments beyond the necessities of these people, that conditions looked bad for England there, that there was going to be an uprising, that the Boers were armed with field guns to out-rival those of England, that there was no question of trouble coming, and the Government of England said: Nonsense, there is no danger, and they went so far as to recall General Butler, they brought him home in disgrace and it was only a few months before the war broke out. What was the result? General Butler's report was accurate, he knew what he was talking about, yet he was recalled in disgrace. After the war the British Government took him, put their arms around him, he was a hero. They knighted him, they did everything they could after disgracing him—and it cost the British Government £205,000,000 ($1,025,000,000) because they did not take warning.

There was a party in England known as Little Englanders—and I hope we will never have a Little Canadian party—who

cried out: No danger, no need, everything is all right and we are safe. I hope the day will not come when history will be repeated along those lines, it is too costly to the country in money to say nothing of the unfortunate loss of life.

When Japan with its new-made navy of thirty or forty years' experience—and some of its best boats made in England—went out to fight the august Czar of Russia, Russia laughed and said: There is no danger, what can Japan, with her small maritime population, do? And one day at Chemulpa in Corea there was a shot fired, the war was on, and Russia was wiped off the face of the waters by that little nation in the Orient. No danger? Russia is to-day feverishly building up her shattered naval forces by the expenditure of millions of dollars after the cry that there was no danger from little Japan. We must take notice of history because the old saying that it repeats itself is as true to-day as it ever was. The offer of Canada therefore makes for peace. If England is supreme there will be no war. It does seem to me that the strongest policy for strong statesmen is to take the ground that where there is doubt the bold course, the good course, the strong course, of action is not to be too faint-hearted,—but to take the safe course and do our duty. It is not a time for critical analysis and we should be careful not to bring down upon ourselves too great a responsibility in failing to act when we should.

I come back to the hon. member for South Renfrew again, not because I think his speech warrants it, but he is the great deputy leader next to my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition; he is the deputy from the province of Ontario, and the people there are looking to see why the right hon. gentleman selected him. He comes up to the point of autonomy again and breaks out into poetry in these words:

> That man's the best cosmopolite
> Who loves his native country best.

We would all agree with that pretty well but it seemed to be quoted without any context and there was no argument in his speech that showed why he said it. I was struck with the light way in which he said it and it did not strike me as being sincere. Therefore, I got my Tennyson and I looked it up. The words are there but I found also that faint heartedness is a characteristic feature of the hon. member for South Renfrew. What do we find? He read that whole poem in order to get a nice thing to say but he overlooked the verses in the poem which I commend to his attention:

> To all the loyal hearts who long
> To keep our British Empire whole
> To all our noble sons the strong
> New England of the Southern Pole.
>
> To England under Indian skies
> To those dark millions of her realm
> To Canada whom we love and prize
> Whatever statesman hold the helm.
> Hands all Round.

He could not get up to that. I felt sorry for my native province to think that a man aspiring to be the leader of a great party, because the Liberal party has been great, when called upon to discuss one of the most momentous questions we have ever had in our history in relation to the British Empire, should be unable to take the hurdle. He could not take the hurdle, he was too faint-hearted. I do not know what my hon. friends from the province of Quebec will think of that kind of an Ontario leader. We do not think much of him. I am sorry that he is not here but the exigencies of debate compel a man to say what he is going to say and I would like to have said it while he was here. Hands all round—that is the government policy. Let us do our duty. We reciprocate the feelings of the Motherland and we reciprocate the thought that comes, not from a separatist tendency, something that is backing up and getting away, but from the idea of one flag, one fleet and one throne which the hon. member for St. John wanted to ridicule to-day. I do not like such ridicule from men of distinction and high standing in a country like Canada, men who have been Ministers of the Crown, yet men who do not scruple to stand up in Parliament and seek to cast ridicule upon our loyalty in that way. It is not something that any one should boast of. I have in my hand the account of a meeting addressed by the hon. member for South Wellington at Aberfoyle, taken in shorthand by some one who was there and he uses this language:

> They talk about their policy and our policy.

And he goes on to say: This is the stuff that they call us disloyal for at Ottawa. This is pretty peculiar language for a man who aspired to a Cabinet position in the late Government. I do not think it is a fair application and again I say it to him that it is not up to his own standard because he is one of the finest young men we have, a credit to the national life, and the only thing I complain of is that the right hon. leader of the Opposition never gave him his due when he had the chance, because he is one of the bright and rising young men of the country. As to this loyalty question, let us have a fair understanding. Is there anybody here who has ever heard anyone on this side of the House aspersing the loyalty of hon. gentlemen

opposite? If so, I have not heard it and if I had heard it I would regret it. I do not believe the charge is well founded and it is up to the hon. gentleman, when he makes a charge of that kind, to make it good.

I am going to pass over the question of ship-building and ship-building plants, because I do not wish to detain the House too long, but there is one thing that I want to point out. The question of the building of plants, whether it comes through the armament or not, is going to be of great importance. If the British Admiralty is going to stick to the offer, and England does not go back on her bargain, we have the Canadian material and we have everything that goes to the construction of warships in addition to merchant ships that ply on the Atlantic, the Pacific and Hudson Bay. If the Government's policy will result in the British Admiralty laying down ship-building plants here, as the hon. member for St. John said, these plants may be employed in the arts of peace as well as in the arts of war and in that way I would approve of that policy. The question of building ships at our ocean ports is an important point in our expanding future. We will need them. It is all right to say that Collingwood, Midland and some other places have ship-building plants, but we certainly believe that we are likely to do something in this way. Hon. gentlemen opposite never worked up to the point that the hon. member would like us to believe they did attain.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Where will my hon. friend find any suggestion that the British Admiralty are going to lay down ship-building plants in Canada?

Mr. MORPHY: I have heard it in this debate.

Mr. PUGSLEY: In no memorandum is such a suggestion made.

Mr. MORPHY: I think it was the Prime Minister who made that statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, I beg pardon. The Prime Minister did not make the statement that the British Government proposed to lay down ship-building plants in Canada.

Mr. MORPHY: I said that I thought he did. Will the hon. gentleman deny that that was stated in this House by some responsible member?

Mr. PUGSLEY: I never heard it.

Mr. MORPHY: Well, I assert that it was.

Mr. PUGSLEY: By whom?

Mr. MORPHY: I do not know. I heard it stated, it has been answered by hon. gentlemen opposite, admitted by the hon. member for St. John and the hon. member for St. John pounded his desk when the Prime Minister said it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Not at all. I did not applaud any such statement because no such statement was made in this House by the Prime Minister, or by any member of the Government, or by any member of this House in my presence.

Mr. MORPHY: I think that there was a statement made in regard to the building of smaller ships or ship-building plants.

Mr. PUGSLEY: That is a very different thing from laying down ship-building plants.

Mr. MORPHY: That is in the memorandum, is it not?

Mr. PUGSLEY: No, but it is in one of the letters.

Mr. MORPHY: It has been stated in this House; does the hon. gentleman deny that?

Mr. PUGSLEY: The only statement made by the Prime Minister was that he had the assurance of the British Admiralty, or of Mr. Churchill, that they would favourably consider giving orders for small vessels in Canada.

Mr. MORPHY: Very well, I choose to rely upon the statement of the Prime Minister as against the opinion of that statement by the hon. member for St. John. If the Prime Minister made that statement in this House, which the hon. member for St. John admits, then I for one stand by that statement and I feel assured that if it was said in this House it was said by the First Lord of the Admiralty to the Prime Minister. So, there is no use quibbling about a thing of that kind. Now, I proceed to repeat the argument that this would give us facilities for building other ships and I do not see why they could not be built on the Hudson bay, and on the Pacific coast, as well as at some of the ports where my hon. friend is so greatly interested. So that there may be no doubt about it. I quote from 'Hansard,' page 710, the words of Mr. Borden:

> I have discussed this subject with the Admiralty and they thoroughly realize that it is not to the Empire's advantage that all ship-building facilities should be concentrated in the United Kingdom. I am assured therefore that the Admiralty are prepared in the early future to give orders for the construction in Canada of small cruisers, oil-tank vessels, and auxiliary craft of various kinds.

That Sir, was the part of the Prime Minister's speech that I referred to and at which the hon. gentleman pounded his desk, because he thought it was a good

thing for his province. I was here and saw him do it and he can not get out of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY: I rise to a point of order. The statement the hon. gentleman made, and which I contradicted, was that it had been stated in this House that the British Admiralty—

Mr. HAZEN: I rise to a point of order; I submit that the hon. member is not stating his point of order.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is in order for the hon. member to state his point of order without entering into an argument.

Mr. PUGSLEY: The point of order I make is that the hon. member stated that the British Admiralty were prepared to lay down a ship-building plant in Canada and I said that there was no statement of that kind made by the Prime Minister, nor was there anything in the correspondence to show it. The giving of orders for small cruisers is a very different thing from establishing a ship-building plant, which the hon. gentleman said the Admiralty was going to do.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member has neglected to state his point of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY: It seems to me it is a point of order if you correct a statement made by an hon. membr and call his attention to the actual point of difference.

Mr. SPEAKER: The point of order in this case is an appeal to the Chair as to whether an hon. member is in order in denying a certain statement which was alleged to have been made.

Mr. PUGSLEY: However, it is all right now.

Mr. MORPHY: Of course when I made the statement I made it without the book before me.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Quite so.

Mr. MORPHY: But I drew what I believe to be a proper inference from the remarks of the Prime Minister. Let me read a little further from what Mr. Borden said:

> I see no reason why all vessels required in the future for our Government service should not be built in Canada even at some additional cost.

Does the hon. member deny that the Prime Minister said that? And further, I quote from the right hon. gentleman:

> In connection with the development of ship-building, I should not be surprised to see a higher class of engineering work which would produce articles now imported and not presently manufactured in Canada.

These are the words uttered by the Right Hon. Mr. Borden.

Mr. PUGSLEY: Very hazy words they are.

Mr. MORPHY: Probably the hon. member will now be fair enough to admit that he did pound his desk at one of these periods, because he thought the announcement suited his province. Just before this House rose for the Christmas holidays the hon. member for South Wellington, with that boldness that characterizes him, having a few minutes to speak, delivered himself of the challenge: get your Redistribution Bill through and we will help you with it, and go to the country. The hon. gentleman went home and he held six or seven meetings and he consulted his constituents, and he came back as tame as a lamb without any of that boldness with which he left Ottawa. What had happened in the meantime? He proposes a compromise now. Hon. gentlemen opposite do not seem to be very anxious to applaud the oozing out of the bravery which the hon. member once possessed. In fact I notice a tameness all through on the Opposition benches. What is the matter? Well, we all know that there are a lot of men on that side of the House from Ontario who will never come back if there was a new election. You can see it in the faces of most of them. I really believe that if there was an election now, instead of eleven or twelve or thirteen Liberal members from Ontario, you would not have more than three. If I had my say, as of course I have not, I know what I would tell hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to an election. And, let me ask, who is working at this election idea? Mr. Fielding is in England trying to show that the Liberals were right on one issue, and the rest of the defeated Cabinet ministers of this lately discarded Government are in Ottawa hobnobbing with men who would like to be Cabinet ministers, but who I do not think in my lifetime ever will be. These are the gentlemen who are sending out to the local papers of this country the idea that in the first session of this Parliament this Government was breaking up, and that the Opposition should hold them up now and force an election. That is the work of these defeated and disgruntled ex-Cabinet ministers whom the people have discarded and whom even hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House do not want to see back here again. The hon. member for Carleton shows right in his face at the present moment exactly what he feels about that; the junior member for Halifax does not want to see any of these men who are now out of the House back to obtain the coveted Cabinet positions they so desire. We on this side of the House are satisfied to have some of these men come back but their own party friends do not

want them; they think they have better men sitting in the House to-day. It is perfectly apparent that the Opposition which has developed in this House is not in fact to the naval policy of the Government but is set up to divert the public mind from their disastrous reciprocity policy. It is gotten up to draw a herring across the trail and if possible to get the people to forget that horrible spectre which rose before them when they woke up on the morning of the 22nd of September, 1911. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said that Great Britain in matters of diplomacy did not always show to advantage, and he stopped right there. I had that same idea after the Alaska Boundary matter, and I got it from Sir Allen Aylesworth. He came back to Canada and he told us that between night and morning Lord Alverstone sold Canada out to the United States on the Alaskan Boundary. I have not Sir Allen Aylesworth's exact words before me, but that was the meaning of them. There was a great tirade of abuse against Lord Alverstone; but I understand that later on Sir Allen Aylesworth took the other side of the field, and praised the British diplomats, saying that they were fine. If his latter statement is true, he sent out a false impression to the Dominion of Canada, which causes me as a Canadian to feel that something was wrong there, because I respected and do respect yet Sir Allen Aylesworth is one of the greatest legal minds we have in the province of Ontario. It is difficult for me to know what these things mean, especially when an honourable member sitting in this House says the same thing but stops short of what he means; that is done to influence some section of this country, I do not know what section; it is practically a charge of deception that, so far as I understand now, is not warranted.

We have one phase of this reciprocity question that enters here as regards an armament for autonomy. The argument advanced in this House with regard to autonomy is that it was wrecked, that it had a set-back for many years, that there was no mandate, as the member for South Wellington says. The right hon. the Prime Minister has laid his policy before this House; it is on 'Hansard'; it has gone to the country and what he said he would do was that if he were returned to power—brought out by a question on the part of an hon. gentleman opposite—he would go to the country after having gone to England to consult the Admiralty, and if he found need existed, bring in a policy; and if he could not pass it through this Parliament, that he would go to the country; then he would take up the matter of a permanent policy, discuss it with his colleagues, put it into shape and produce it to the people, and go to the country upon it before it became law. Yet hon. gentlemen say that that has not been before the country. What brings a measure before the country but a responsible minister, the leader of the Conservative party in this House, putting his plans before the people? The people knew it; it was an issue at the last election; it was used throughout the last election in the province of Ontario at many, many places, and the people voted on it. I have heard it stated here that it was not used as an issue except in the province of Quebec. I deny that. It was made an issue in the province of Ontario as well as the question of reciprocity.

Mr. CARVELL. So was the Ne Temere decree an issue in the province of Ontario.

Mr. MORPHY: I want to say to the hon. member for Carleton that the Ne Temere decree was not an issue in my county, a county which is composed of all nationalities and all creeds.

Mr. CARVELL: Well, that was poor ground for it.

Mr. MORPHY: It may have been poor ground for it; but it is a very enlightened county, and I want to tell my hon. friend from Carleton that I had the pleasure of getting pretty strong support there from all classes and all creeds. I do not think it is fair for a gentleman, living a thousand miles away probably, to make that statement, unless he is prepared to prove the charge.

Mr. CARVELL: I can prove it, prove it anywhere.

Mr. MORPHY: The position is quite plain to me anyway, and I think the interruption was given more for the purpose of disconcerting me than for making any point.

To get back to what I was speaking about; no mandate from the people after what I have explained that the hon. the Prime Minister has done? What did the late Government do with regard to reciprocity? Without a mandate from the people, members of the Cabinet were sent to Washington to make a treaty, a bargain, call it what you will; they made it without consulting a soul, made it without bringing it into the House of Parliament to discuss, made it to bind eight million people of the Dominion of Canada without any mandate whatever, without consulting the people at all, in a matter affecting the whole fiscal policy of this country. There never was in the history of British institutions a clearer case of what might be called an unwarranted initiative. In the initiation of such a pact as that and the referendum upon it to the people and the

recall of the discredited Government, we have one of the best examples of the pure initiative and referendum the world has ever seen. It discredited and recalled one Government, and put in another Government who are carrying on the administration of the country at the old stand in the old way, with the country prospering as it never has been doing before. Hon. gentlemen must not think that because there are no shots fired to-day on this naval question, that something is not occurring. Some gentleman made the point that Britain might lose her supremacy without a shot being fired. There is to-day what I may term a bloodless war on —I hope it may always be so, but no man knows what it will be—there is a bloodless war on to-day in Great Britain affecting the whole Empire, where millions of dollars are being spent. What is Britain spending to-day? The estimates taken from yesterday's Toronto paper point this out:

> The naval programme will then, according to the present information, involve an expenditure of $240,000,000.

In Great Britain alone, nothing to do with Canadian money——

> —and will include five battleships, six light armoured cruisers, twenty destroyers, a number of submarines and an addition to the personnel of 5,000 men, making a total of 142,500 officers and men.
>
> The battleships will be of a new type, the largest and strongest which science can build or money supply. They will displace 27,000 or 28,000 tons, burn oil alone, and steam 23 knots.
>
> Thus, there will be an intermediate between the present dreadnought battleships and battle cruiser. They will be armed in all probability with eight 16 1-4 inch guns, each firing 2,200-lb. shells, or if the 16 1-4 inch gun is not adopted, with 15-inch guns, firing shells that weigh about 1.800 lbs.

The heaviest kind of armament that has ever been known in the civilized world. What is it for? Is it because there is no need? Is it because there is no danger? Is it not rather because there is a need, a danger and an emergency that England wants to ward off? I have taken considerable time with regard to this question, and I want to conclude as soon as possible. To do so I wish to say that Great Britain and Ireland have always been patient, in the face of great combinations, of great danger; and it is quite true as she says, that she will face it alone. It is also true that we have a debt to repay. Canada has reached the point when she has come to the conclusion that she must wake up. Britain stands there, like the old lion that she is, and faces the world She looks across the seas and growls; and the lion's whelps draw closer to her side, while the world stands in awe and admiration at the sight of the mother of nations encircled by her daughter dominions beyond the seas. She holds out the olive branch, and in kindly, yet firm and meaning tones, says to the nations of the earth: We desire no conquest; we wish not war, but peace. And as evidence of that she sends out a message of hope that there may be no 'parting of the ways' with her daughter dominions beyond the seas, and says in the words of the immortal Tennyson:

> Sharers of our glorious past,
> Brothers, must we part at last?
> Shall we not through good and ill
> Cleave to one another still?
> Britain's myriad voices call,
> Sons, be welded each and all,
> Into one Imperial whole;
> One with Britain heart and soul.
> One life, one flag, one fleet, one throne!
> Britons hold your own!

Mr. L. J. GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe): Mr. Speaker, when I consider the magnitude of the problem for the solution of which the Government of the day has brought down the measure which is under consideration, I think that every member of the House should feel it his duty to give his opinion upon it. For to my mind, the question now at issue is probably one of the most important ever debated since self-government was established in this country. In pursuance of the principle I have just laid down, I beg leave to discuss the question. Let me say at the outset that I will not worry my fellow members with quotations from former debates or from newspapers. I will not cite a mass of figures or give the evidence of experts—whether real or would-be experts. I intend to discuss the question with hard reasoning and plain sense, as a Briton, as I claim to be. But before I enter upon the main question, may I be permitted a few preliminary remarks. First, I wish in my own name as well as in the name of my province and of my race, to tender to the hon. member for South Renfrew my most sincere thanks for the kind words of praise that he gave the Frenchmen of Quebec in quoting from our national history. But when the hon. member for South Renfrew spoke of 1774 and of 1812, he was speaking of the consequences of the loyalty of the French race in this country. May I be allowed to say that, if every English-speaking citizen of this country was as conversant with our history as is the hon. member for South Renfrew, there would be less misunderstanding and more harmony in Canada. But I do not wish to discuss the consequence of the loyalty of the Frenchmen of Quebec; I wish to answer a straight question. That question is this: Why were the Frenchmen of Quebec loyal in 1774 and in 1812?—Why did they offer their bodies as living bulwarks to stop the invaders?—Why, in

1849, did they refuse to join the annexation movement with the United States that originated because the Liberal Administration in 1848 had given relief to some people in the province of Quebec and the Bill was to be assented to—and was assented to—by the representative of our late Sovereign Queen Victoria ?—Why did the Frenchmen of Quebec refuse to join this movement for annexation ? For a very simply simple reason. The Frenchmen of Quebec knew what had been the fate of the French population of Louisiana when the land in which they lived was annexed to the United States and they knew very well that if they were annexed to the United States their fate would be the same. They know that the British Crown has granted them the free use of their language, the free exercise of their religion and every liberty of self-government. Every time their rights have been brought into discussion those rights have been protected by the British Crown. And do you think for a moment the Frenchmen of Quebec would be stupid enough to cast away the power that has protected them for a century and a half?—to be flooded, if they were annexed, by the United States, or to be flooded by the majority of this country, when they have had such instances as those to which I am about to refer. In the province of Ontario, for fifteen years, the Tory party, trying to get power and fighting against the Liberal Government of the late lamented Oliver Mowat made an outrageous and criminal campaign. What was their war cry? Down with the inferior race! Down with the Romish French Canadian! Down with the pea-soup French Canadian! Down with the moccasin French Canadian!

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Rot.

Mr. GAUTHIER: It may be 'rot' for hon. gentlemen; but when we had to suffer it, we had the sentiment that we would never throw our lot in with the men who despised us when these men were enjoying self-government through the hardships, the toils and the sufferings of our fore-fathers, and who were paying us by despising us and heaping upon us all sorts of injuries and all sorts of ill-treatment. You may call it 'rot' if you like; but here, discharging my duty, I wish to place in 'Hansard' these remarks for which I take the responsibility. And in the same province of Ontario what do we see now? Out of a population of 2,800,000 one-tenth is French-Canadian; and the Government of the day is trying to cut out the rights that are recognized by the Treaty. And what do we see in the province of Manitoba, in the cities of Brandon and Winnipeg? The majority demand unjustly from the minority double taxation on the school question. And, after all these instances—and many others that I could state—after one hundred and sixty years of constant and perpetual loyalty on the part of French Canadians, because the Liberal party is under the guidance of a Frenchman from Quebec, he is accused by the papers favourable to the present Administration of promoting a policy as if he were a separatist. Because a Frenchman from the province of Quebec has the guidance of the Liberal party, he is accused, by papers favourable to the present Administration, of favouring a separatist policy, and, after one hundred and sixty years of perpetual loyalty, this is our reward. I say also that people are trying to minimize the value of our sentiments in this country in which we have, thank God, the right to live; in which we have proved our ability and willingness to recognize the importance of self-government; in this country for the guidance of which we have supplied our share of public men fully cognizant of their duty towards Canada and the Empire. We are not separatists; we are not advocates of independence. We want to remain under the British Crown, because we are sure that this is the only power which can protect us, and because the British Crown has given to us a measure of liberty and freedom and is powerful enough to secure the recognition of our rights.

The Government of the day comes to this Parliament and says: We want a contribution of $35,000,000 to send to Great Britain. Some say there is an emergency; others say there is an urgent need, and still others say there is a peril, and to prove an emergency, to prove urgent need, to prove that there exists a peril, we have the memorandum from the Admiralty. Let me discuss this for a moment. After having read, with the greatest care, the memorandum from the Admiralty, and after having followed with all possible diligence the different speeches delivered in this House, I have no hesitation whatever in offering the three following propositions: First, there is no emergency; second, the measure submitted is unfair and unsound; third, it has been engineered for political purposes. According to the document issued by the Admiralty, there is, I say, no proof of an emergency. I am not going to read this memorandum, but I submit that in perusing clauses one and nine of that memorandum, one must necessarily come to the four following conclusions: First, the document has been issued at the request of the Prime Minister of Canada; second, it contains the confidential conversations and informations exchanged between the ministers of the Imperial Government and the Canadian ministers; third, it is

in a form that can be made public if the Cabinet deem it necessary; fourth, Great Britain, alone and unaided, has in the past defended the Empire, and she has not lost her capacity of watching over and protecting the vital interests of the Empire.

Is that proof that there is an emergency? Does that prove there is any real or urgent need? I claim that if an emergency existed, the Government of Great Britain would not have deferred making the fact known until they were requested to do so by the Prime Minister of Canada; and to state that the memorandum issued at the request of the Prime Minister of Canada is proof of an emergency is to state that the Government of Great Britain refrained from making known the fact that there was an emergency until they were requested to do so by the Canadian Prime Minister. Is it possible, if there was an emergency or an urgent need, that the Imperial authorities would have chosen the Canadian Government as the channel for tne conveyance of this information to the British Empire and the world at large? That is an absurdity. Supposing there was an emergency, and, that the Imperial Government had chosen the Canadian Government as the channel for the carrying of this information; is it possible they would have granted the Canadian Parliament the necessary discretionary power to render this document public, and to make public, if they deemed it necessary, the remedy for existing conditions? That is another absurdity. I think the home Government, if there was an emergency or a peril, would not, in this manner, come to Canada or the Canadian Parliament—although this Parliament is under the guidance of a man who is greater than Caesar—that is, if we accept the acknowledgement of certain jingo papers in the Old Country. Is it possible that this document discloses an urgent need or an emergency? Is it possible that without these three ships we are going to supply, there would be an emergency, and, upon the supplying of the three ships, the peril ceases? That is the proposition as offered by hon. gentlemen. If that is true, the home Government, in not providing by their naval programme for the construction of these three ships, did not do their duty. Is it possible to believe that a government would supply the proof of their own inability to look after the vital interests of the Empire? No! This contention that these three ships to be supplied by Canada are urgently needed is refuted by clause number nine, in which the Lords of the Admiralty declare that, without these three ships, Great Britain has always been in a position, alone and unaided, to meet any emergency, and that she has not lost her capacity to watch over and protect the vital interests of the Empire.

without these three ships and yet the Government wants us to believe that these three ships are needed, that it is an absolute necessity for us to vote the contribution of $35,000,000. Hon. gentlemen who have spoken have seen the weaknesses of this document and the Postmaster General has tried to supplement the evidence which should be in the Government document and which is not there. To quote his own words: I know whereof I speak—intimating that he had had conversations, that he had seen documents to prove the emergency and that these conversations and these documents were not referred to by this document. If this is true I know at least one member in this House who would be ready to change his mind, but, if I am not mistaken, the Postmaster General at the time of the last Imperial Conference went to London, not to attend the naval conference, but to look after the cable rates. At that time there was no split among the ministerialists, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier had not resigned his seat, the Postmaster General and his late chief, Armand Lavergne, the Minister of Inland Revenue, and Le Devoir, of which he is a shareholder, were fighting together for the sake of the Government, and it was stated all around in the newspapers favourable to the present administration that the Postmaster General was going to England to attend to the question of cable rates, but not to the Imperial Conference. Is it possible that in discussing the cable rates the Postmaster General has had conversations tending to prove the emergency? With whom did he have these conversations? With the Sea Lords? No, Sir, because the document in clause one states that it contained all the confidential conversations between the ministers of the home Government and our own ministers. Has the Postmaster General had conversations with parties interested in ship-yards? It may be, but if he was not a member of the Imperial Conference discussing the navy question did he see some documents proving the emergency? Who showed him these documents? The Sea Lords? No Sir, because clause one says it contains the confidential communications and conversations. Who did show these documents to the Postmaster General? It may be these parties interested in the ship-yards, but Sir, I claim that the document which was to prove the emergency proves that there is no emergency, we are left for a proof to the word of the Postmaster General—that is the only proof we have. But if the word of the hon. gentleman is in direct contradiction with the document, I ask what kind of a proof we are content with? A minister of the Crown under his oath of office may be prevented from disclosing certain secrets, but I say also that when

the Sea Lords took the precaution of issuing a document as important as the one I am now discussing, in which document it is stated that it contains the substance of all conversations, confidential or otherwise, and that the only change is not in substance but in form, how are we to take the declaration of the Postmaster General when it is contradicted by the document itself? In Great Britain in 1908 the First Lord of the Admiralty made certain declarations in the House of Commons. He was partly responsible for the German scare of 1909. He relied on certain information which he thought correct; afterwards he was compelled to admit that his information was not correct. What did he do? He resigned his portfolio because in constitutional law a minister of the Crown cannot err even if he errs in good faith. I do not ask the Dominion cabinet to treat the Postmaster General in this country as the First Lord of the Admiralty was treated in 1908, but I leave it to this House to decide whether a minister of the Crown is entitled to use his position to make us accept, relying on a document, statements that are contradicted by the document itself, on which he bases his opinion.

I state that the measure is unfair, unfair for Canada, unfair for the Empire. We are asked to pay $35,000,000 and as a result of this gift or this tribute or contribution we are to have the privilege of having a representative on the Imperial Council of Defence. In other words the ministers of our own Government want us to believe that in paying this amount of money we will purchase the right of being represented in the Imperial Council of Defence. I wonder if the measure is fair when we are asked to give an amount of money which is not needed and to be entitled to have an adviser when the adviser is not requested any more than the money. The adviser will be useless. But there is another point: Is this representative to be permanent or only temporary? If it is going to be a temporary representative I claim we are paying rather dear for the privilege. But, if it is going to be a permanent representation, if it is to form part of the permament policy of the Government, it should be submitted to the people of the country. The Government of the day have told us that when they propounded a policy for the establishment of a permanent naval force in Canada, the measure would be submitted to the people. If the representation upon the Imperial Council of Defence is to be permanent, it ought to be submitted to the people because we have not been elected to this House with any mandate to send a representative to England. What for?—to look after the expenditure of our money? If I am not mistaken, the $35,000,000, if it were ever voted, would be spent under the guidance of the Governor General in Council. Is our representative to go there and give advice and, to use the words of my excellent friend the Postmaster General, is he to ascend the stair of the temple where the questions of war and peace are to be decided? If that is true my opinion is that before sending such a representative the question ought to be submitted in order to ascertain whether Canada wants to change her constitutional status. The measure is unsound.

May I be permitted to say, Mr. Speaker, that since this measure has been brought down and since the speeches with regard to it have been delivered in this House, there has been a lot of hard thinking going on in every hamlet in the land. We were told by the right hon. Prime Minister, when he introduced his resolution, that the protection of Canada from 1763 had cost an immense sum of money. We have been taught to believe that when Great Britain decided to extend her Empire all over the world she was seeking to prove to humanity what Britons could do. She wanted, to build up the greatest Empire that humanity had ever seen. She wanted, for the sake of civilization, to extend the protection of her flag all round the world. The ministers in Canada to-day want us to understand that when we were led to believe that she was actuated by such a high motive we were mistaken, that there was a book in which was kept a separate account of everything that England had been compelled to spend for our protection. According to the ministers of the Crown in this country Great Britain did not grant us freedom and liberty; she sold us protection and now is the hour to begin the partial repayment of our indebtedness. That is the contention as it has been presented by the ministers of the Crown. We have always claimed that we were free men in a free country, that we were living under the protection of the British flag and that the most complete protection had been given to us by Great Britain freely. If we are to begin payment for the protection that was given us, is it not possible that as business men most of our people will start figuring in order to find out what is the amount of our indebtedness? I claim that it is unsound to propound such a measure and to make such speeches as some of those which have been delivered in this House because you are trying to replace the love and sympathy that we have had for the British Crown for what Great Britain has done for our population by a question of account, by a question of dollars and cents. And you are doing that at a time when the Imperial authorities state emphatically that they do not need our assistance. They say that they are in r

position, alone and unaided, to preserve vital interests of the Empire the world over.

Then, why is this proposal made?—because the Government of the day are trying to concentrate patriotism within the boundaries of their own party, because the Government of the day, in order to remain in office, are trying to wave the flag once more to serve their own party interests. The measure has been engineered for political purposes. Not only does the memorandum not say that there is an emergency but, on the contrary, the memorandum says there is no emergency. The memorandum issued by the First Sea Lord could not prove that there was an emergency; otherwise the Imperial Government would have stated all through the whole Empire that they were unable to manage the Imperial affairs of Great Britain. This measure was propounded as the result of a combination of the Tory party in Canada with the Unionist party in Great Britain. We had the first idea of a contribution in this country three years ago, when there was a demand made for $20,000,000. The Government of the day in England has been going on with their naval programme and with the execution of that programme they say they are in a position alone and unaided to watch over the vital interests of the Empire. The emergency has ceased in England and the emergency has been aggravated in Canada. Those who are responsible for the management of Imperial affairs come out and state that there is no emergency, that there is no need, that there is no peril and here in Canada ministers, who are not charged with that duty, come out and increase the proposed contribution from $20,000,000 to $35,000,000. In Great Britain those who are responsible to the people claim that there is no need for the construction of these three ships. Here in Canada the ministers who have not been called upon to give their views are proposing to augment the amount by $15,000,000 as compared with the contribution it was proposed to give them three years ago. I am in this Dominion Parliament as the representative of a constituency in this Dominion; I have been elected to look after the affairs of Canada; I was not elected to look after the affairs of Great Britain. I think the people of Great Britain are capable of giving their confidence to and keeping in power the men who are entitled to hold office there. I claim that if by my vote in this Parliament I contribute money for ships, for which no provision was made by those who are principally interested in the maintenance of the naval supremacy of Great Britain, I would be casting a vote to say that the people of Great Britain have not elected the proper men to manage their affairs. I say that I have not been elected for this purpose. Britons in Great Britain are capable of knowing what is good for the British Empire and which of the political parties should be kept in power, and no doubt the people of Great Britain have confidence in their own Government, which in the past has shown itself capable of looking after the development of Great Britain and of the Empire at large. When these men, under their oath of office send to this Parliament a document such as the memorandum from the Sea Lord, in which there is not the shadow of proof that the ships are needed, or that the money is needed, I feel it is my duty to vote against the resolution now before us and to try by all means to not let this Bill pass, because Sir, in my heart and soul I believe that if this contribution were approved by this Parliament, it would be a proof to the Empire and to the world at large that Great Britain in the year of Our Lord 1913 was unable to maintain her supremacy among the nations of the world. When the ministers responsible to the people of Great Britain state plainly that they are in a position to face any emergency whatever, I do not feel that it would be in the interests of the Empire, or in the interest of Canada, that we should grant this contribution. On the other hand Sir, the Liberal party in this House submits a proposition along the lines of the programme initiated by the highest naval authorities of Great Britain. Great Britain, if I have read well, is centering her fleet in home waters and asking the colonies to look after the protection of their own shores, and to come to the rescue of Great Britain if ever the Empire were in danger. We, on this side of the House are offering a measure, which, if enacted, would be in consonance with the present management of naval affairs, in Great Britain, and I say that I am going to try by all means to stop the passage of the measure proposed by the Government, and I am going to vote against the resolution and in favour of the amendment.

Mr. S. SHARPE (Ontario North): The hon. gentleman from St. Hyacinthe has laboured long and hard to disprove what to this House must be by this time a self-evident fact. I think the documentary evidence produced in this House by the various members supporting the naval proposal now before the country, has proven to the satisfaction of any reasonable man that there is real emergency in the naval affairs of Great Britain. To prove this I have many quotations that I could belabour the House with, had I a desire to do so, but I will dismiss that phase of the hon. gentleman's argument by reading from

the Yorkshire Herald, of date August 17, 1912:

The German naval menace has now become a reality to all except political and religious cranks.

I would not like to place the hon. gentleman in either of these categories, but that is where the Yorkshire Herald places persons who attempt to mislead themselves into the belief that there is no menace threatening the British Empire to-day. We also hear the argument adduced by hon. gentlemen opposite, that this gratuitous gift of thirty-five million dollars interferes with our autonomy. I will not belabour that question further than to read from the Manitoba Free Press one of the ablest and most influential papers published in the Liberal interest in Canada, the following from its leading article on the 5th of December last:

To say that the Dominion of Canada cannot make a direct gift to the Imperial Government either of cash or dreadnoughts, without outraging the principles of self-government, is just so much nonsense. The Dominion Parliament is master of the Dominion's wealth and can do what it pleases with it. It can make a gift to the Motherland without affecting in the slightest its powers to exercise all its constitutional functions.

I listened this afternoon with a great deal of interest to the hon. gentleman from St. John. He always speaks with suavity and dignity and force, and he always proves interesting and entertaining to the House. He repeated the desire expressed by so many Liberals for another election. I want to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal party had a fair trial on the 21st September, 1911. They were found guilty and were sentenced to the Opposition benches for four years, and let me add that I have never yet seen a criminal who was sentenced to the gallows who did not plead for a second trial. They also say they are anxious for another election, but they only want half the issue placed before the jury. They have presented their whole case to this Parliament, which, as I understand, consists of two fleet units, but the policy of the Government has two parts, one only of which has been placed before the country, calling for an emergency contribution of thirty-five million dollars. The permanent naval policy of the Government has not yet been presented to the country, and when it is formulated and presented these hon. gentlemen opposite who now desire so much to go the country, will most of them stay in the country. I say that the whole issue is like the position of the counsel who presents his case to the jury, and before the other party presents their full case, wants the jury to retire and render a verdict. I say we are quite satisfied to allow this whole question to be submitted to the jury of the people of this country, when not only the emergency contribution part of our policy is before the people, but our whole policy is before the people in the way of a permanent policy. Now it is not my intention and it was not my intention to occupy very much of the time of this House in the discussion of this question. In fact, I would not have intervened in this debate at all, had not the hon. member for South Renfrew and other hon. members accused me and other members on this side of the House, who voted for the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier as being inconsistent. We all remember that the amendment the hon. member for Jacques Cartier moved provided that the naval proposals of the Laurier Government should be submitted to the Canadian people by means of a plebiscite, before being put into effect. The hon. member for South Renfrew also stated that members of this House who voted for that amendment would be guilty of inconsistency, if they supported the present Bill, unless it first be submitted to the people for approval. I desire on this occasion, it being the first opportunity that has been afforded to me, to deny the charge of inconsistency, and to express the utmost satisfaction in the course I followed on that occasion. I desire to reiterate the sentiments I expressed on that occasion with all the emphasis of which I am capable. My position and my vote upon that occasion in 1910 were made very clear. It will be remembered that the British Admiralty in 1909 had made certain propositions to the overseas dominions, suggestive of the best means of assistance. The Liberal Government repudiated those suggestions, and on February 3, 1910, they brought in certain propositions which were calculated to involve Canada in a great deal of expenditure without any corresponding advantage either to this country or to the Empire. The subject of a Canadian navy had never been discussed in any general election prior thereto; and there was a general demand arising throughout the country that no such radical measures as proposed should be put into operation until the people had an opportunity to pronounce upon them. Influential papers like the Grain Growers' Guide in the West and the Weekly Sun here in the East, and influential bodies like the Grain Growers' Association in the West and the Grangers in the East, demanded that the people should have a voice in the ultimate solution of that question. Speaking in my constituency prior to that election, I told my electors that I was in favour, before a measure was put into effect involving a great deal of expense, of submitting that question to the

people; and I voted for the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, and I say that I am perfectly satisfied with that vote. The amendment was couched in the following language:

This House, while declaring its unalterable devotion to the British Crown, is of opinion that the Bill now submitted for its consideration changes the relations of Canada with the Empire and ought in consequence to be submitted to the Canadian people in order to obtain at once the nation's opinion by means of a plebiscite.

Nine Quebec Conservative members voted for that measure, seven Conservative members from the province of Ontario: Broder, Chisholm, Currie, Lewis, Sharpe, White and Wilcox; and the other provinces were represented by two members. During the course of that debate, I also spoke and I outlined what in my humble opinion I deemed to be the duty of the members of this House. It was with peculiar satisfaction that I listened to the right hon. the leader of the Conservative party making his proposal, whereby it was suggested and proposed to present three dreadnoughts immediately to Great Britain, and to delay the permanent policy until it was fully matured and then submit the same to the people. During the course of the debate in 1910, I made a reasonably accurate guess or prophecy of the policy, so far as it is at present outlined by the present Government. With your permission I will read one or two short sentences from the remarks I made during the course of that debate. At page 4487 of 'Hansard' I made these remarks:

Now, we come to the question of what Canda's duty is at the present time. If the supremacy of the British navy is being challenged, and I believe it is, if the emergency be pressing, urgent and compelling, and I believe it is, then this House should act and act promptly, definitely and decisively. It is Canada's duty to order, not one, two or three dreadnoughts, but a sufficient number of dreadnoughts to meet the emergency. We should order dreadnoughts according to the extent of the peril, according to the magnitude of the danger to be apprehended, according to the exigencies of the case. These dreadnoughts should be manned with British men and officers until Canadians can be trained for the service—all at the expense of Canada. Then the question of Canada's permanent policy should be left to the people. Having thus, in part, atoned for our past neglect, and having, in part, liquidated our obligation of long standing, we could then consider with due deliberation and with due regard our constitutional obligations to the electors who have sent us here, the permanent policy which this country should adopt in regard to the construction, organization and maintenance of the Canadian navy service. Then we would have time to consider and adjust all Imperial questions relating to the navy and its relationship to the Empire—the question of the control and final command of the navy in time of war and what voice Canada is to have in deciding Imperial questions. The people of Canada have a right to be heard before this permanent policy is decided upon. We have no mandate from the electors.

Then my concluding remarks. I want to remind the House of course that I am merely voicing my own opinions. I am a humble member of this House, and I do not pretend to speak for any person except myself; I am speaking on this occasion on my own authority and giving in my humble opinion the correct view of the situation, and I used this language at page 4490:

I think, that it is the duty of Canada to place an immediate order for dreadnoughts to form part of the Canadian navy and act in co-operation with and as a part of the Imperial navy and under the control, in times of danger and emergency, of the British Admiralty. We should then postpone the inauguration of any permanent policy until the Canadian people have been heard, either by means of a referendum or in a general election. In the meantime, speaking for myself, I desire to go on record, as I have done on previous occasions in my own constituency, and in the corridors of the House, where I have expressed myself in favour of the principle of a Canadian navy. I desire to go on record as in favour of the principle of a Canadian navy as the means best calculated to serve the interests of the Empire of the future, and best calculated to work out the great destiny of this country.

Thus the House will see that I was in favour of submitting any proposed permanent policy at the time to the people; yet I was in favour of an immediate contribution of any number of dreadnoughts according to the exigencies of the case. This was the policy of the Conservative party before the last general election and it was endorsed at that election. Since the votes were taken and since the views which I have read to the House were expressed, there has been a general election, and I was opposed at that election by Mr. H. M. Mowat, K.C., a very estimable gentleman and president of the Liberal Association in the province of Ontario. Occupying as he did so influential a position in the councils of the Liberal party, Mr. Mowat was able to summon to his aid the greater and lesser lights of the Liberal party. He summoned Hon. A. G. McKay, who opened the campaign in my constituency; he summoned the Rev. J. A. Macdonald, editor of the Globe, and the author, if we are to believe the reverend gentleman, of reciprocity and the finisher of the Liberal party. He also secured another greater light, the hon. member who sits in this House representing the constituency of South Renfrew (Mr. Graham). Speaking

at the town of Beaverton in my constituency, my opponent attempted to criticise my action in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). He accused me of being in sympathy with the Nationalist movement, because I voted for an amendment to submit the question to the people. He pictured me in a way that I would not care to describe to the House, as belonging to the Nationalist wing of the Conservative party; but during the course of his remarks, a good Liberal in the audience, a gentleman by the name of Wyndatt, who by the way voted at the election in favour of my friend Mr. Mowat, but having a great sense of fairness, said to Mr. Mowat that their representative, the gentleman who has the honour of addressing the House at the present time, voted in accordance with the wishes of his constituents, voted in accordance with the declaration he made at a meeting prior to the vote being taken, and that he voted in accordance with the wishes of hundreds of people who had written to him telling him they wanted a voice in the solution of this question. Consequently the hon. gentleman who was criticising my action in voting for the amendment of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier dropped the subject immediately, and the electors showed their approval of my course in voting for that amendment by increasing my majority from 200 to nearly 600. Thus my vote on the Navy Bill was made an issue in the last campaign notwithstanding the language of the hon. member for South Wellington who said that outside the province of Quebec the navy issue was never discussed in any constituency.

But, I was in favour, three years ago, of an immediate contribution of three dreadnoughts and the submission of the permanent policy to the people, and that is where I stand to-day. And, when any hon. member in this House accuses me of inconsistency in my attitude, I can only say he is not speaking acording to the record and must admit that according to the actual facts of the case he is not correct. But it is a most interesting thing to trace the policies of hon. gentlemen opposite—to contrast their policy in 1910 when they were in power with their policy in 1912 when they were in opposition. These hon. gentlemen when in opposition are big in promise, but when they are in power they are mighty small in action. At a time when Australia, New Zealand and the other overseas dominions were carrying out the recommendations of the Admiralty and contributing dreadnoughts, Canada, under the leadership of a Prime Minister who has shown no enthusiasm for Imperial interests, lagged lamentably behind. When the Liberal leader brought down the meagre proposals which he placed before the people of Canada, he stood before the people of the Empire devoid of all enthusiasm for Imperial unity. The Liberal party had repudiated the suggestion of the British Admiralty to construct one fleet unit at a cost of approximately $25,000,000; and had gone back and asked the British Admiralty what Canada could purchase for a paltry $4,000,000 or $6,000,000, Canada was humiliated before the Empire; and the Canadian electors resented the badge of inferiority put upon them by the Liberal party. In their desire to maintain their hold upon office, the Liberal party proposed in this House a colourless policy. They fell between two stools—they offended their Quebec following by going as far as they did and they offended the other provinces by not going far enough. I say that with all respect for the right hon. gentleman who led that Government, for I have every respect for him—respect for his ability and also for the high position he occupies. But I do say that, with his 'seventy odd years of service to the Empire' of which he so proudly boasted the other day, it would have been more to his credit and to that of his party if they had, when in power, attempted to put in force the two-fleet-unit policy which they now enunciate with so much gusto. When they were in power the naval policy of the Liberal Government made Canada a subject of ridicule and contempt all over the Empire; and now when they are in Opposition and helpless to do anything. they dramatically attempt to outbid the only party that has ever offered to do real and effective service to the Empire. The Liberal party will be judged in the country—and I say this advisedly—by its actions when in power and not by its loud mouthed protestations when in Opposition. The Rainbow and the Niobe represent their policy when in power—two fleet units represent their policy when in Opposition. The Rainbow and Niobe is the measure of their desire to help the Empire; two fleet units is the measure of their desire to get back into office. That party when in health and strength and pride of power, came to grief giving birth to the miserable runts the Rainbow and the Niobe; what hope is there for those husky, robust twins, the Atlantic and the Pacific fleet units, with the Liberal party in Opposition, disheartened, depressed in spirit, divided in counsel, and in no condition to endure the pangs of further child birth?

If the policy of the present Government has done nothing else, it has compelled the Liberal party to come out and take a definite stand upon this question. The favourite attitude of the right hon. leader of the Opposition and his party is to remain within the lines of Torres Vedras.

But now they have to come out and disclose their position. The patriotic policy of the Conservative party and the earnest sentiment of the country compel them to come out and announce their policy vociferously, and to claim credit for their desire, if they have it, to help the Empire. The policy of the Conservative party, if it has done nothing else, has compelled the Liberal party to take a definite stand, to take advanced ground, and to embrace a forward policy of substantial aid to the Empire. At the same time, the people of Canada can not but deprecate the partisan spirit of the Liberal party in propounding their present policy. It would have redounded to their everlasting credit, had they, for the time being, buried their party feelings and supported this magnificent gift of thirty-five millions of dollars to the Empire.

I know something of the public sentiment in the province of Ontario, and I know that there is a feeling of scepticism with respect to the sincerity of the Liberal party on this question. Everybody is of the opinion that this question would still be in the Rainbow and Niobe stage were it not for this magnificent policy so ably outlined by the right hon. leader of the Conservative party. Seeking to retrieve their lost reputation and some of their old prestige, the Liberal party have made themselves grotesque, in the light of their past performances, by now coming out and, with dramatic effect, trying to outbid their opponents by offering two fleet units for the Empire. Theirs is a political navy, not a real navy. A fleet of airships, surely would be more in the line of some of these hon. gentlemen; as if they could not man them, at least they could supply the means of propelling them. The advantages of the present policy are obvious to any student of this question. It means immediate and effective aid to the Empire. It allows time to mature a permanent policy to be submitted to the people for adoption. It completes the circle of overseas dominions contributing to the common navy. It demonstrates Imperial solidarity. And it proves to Germany the utter futility of her mad ambition to outdistance the British Empire in naval construction. And that is what the newspapers mean by the 'moral effect' of this policy—it will prove to Germany that she cannot, by any amount of expense, outdistance the British Empire in naval construction. And this means we hope, that peace will be established and that ultimately a universal treaty of disarmament will be arranged among the nations of the world. The policy so ably outlined by the right hon. the leader of the Government enlists the national pride of the Canadian people by giving them the inestimable privilege of having dreadnoughts in the firing line and thus of participating in Imperial enterprises. It provides a practical solution for the present of a very difficult question. Some hon. members opposite may smile. We acknowledge, free from partisan spirit, that it is a difficult question and deserving the careful deliberation of our best minds. Owing to the extent of our territory, owing to the diverse nature of the people whom we have attracted to occupy these lands, this is a difficult question. Time is required for the development of a permanent policy, which, before it is adopted will be submitted to the people for consideration and ratification. The Liberal party's policy for two fleet units to be owned and manned by Canada would afford relief only in the distant future. In view of the condition of the labour market at the present time it would be absolutely incapable of being brought into effect immediately. Let me read a few words from a statement by Mr. Frederick William Wallace, of Montreal, recognized the world over as an authority in marine affairs:

> For Canada to maintain a navy capable of defending our long coast lines, east and west, from even a sixth-rate power, would demand a navy larger than the Dominion could support at the present time. We will have to depend upon Great Britain for many years to come, though eventually we will be powerful enough, perhaps, to maintain our own navy. 'Perhaps' is accentuated, for though we may be rich enough to support a navy, yet, if Canada's present prosperity continues, she will never be able to man it with Canadians.

Then he goes on to describe the difficulty experienced by the United States authorities in obtaining recruits for the navy, and points out the attractive and alluring placards posted all over the United States to induce men to enter the naval service. And what is his conclusion? This is the way he puts it:

> Few native Americans sign for the navy, and those who do are desperate—men who are no good, socially, morally, and otherwise. A hard winter, hard times, and strikes make the best recruiting seasons for the United States navy. Thus it becomes a sort of home for destitutes and moral degenerates. Deserters from foreign ships, Scandinavians, Russians, Finns, Austrians, and Latins take kindly to the Yankee navy, for in it they learn the language and a trade, and the life to them is easy compared with their previous existence.

He goes on to show how we might utilize men who lead a seafaring life during the season of navigation, but have leisure time during the other months of the year; and how we might thus have a naval reserve force of some 50,000 men. Canada, he believes, could form a naval reserve of 50,000, composed of seafarers on our coasts and

sailors on our great lakes. He holds that while we are giving Britain ships, a course which meets with his approval, we might as well be licking this good raw material into shape for emergency uses. He shows the feasibility of his plan by pointing out that these men could be trained as a reserve during the off season, when there is little doing in their particular vocations.

In conclusion, I desire to again state, on my own authority as an individual member of this House, and without attempting to commit my party in any way, that I reaffirm the position I took in 1910. I believe it would be proper to have a combination of both the propositions which have been submitted; I think we should have an immediate contribution, as outlined in the proposal of the right hon. leader of the Government, to meet the present emergency, and that when the Government forms its permanent policy they should adopt a plan which will involve the principle of a Canadian navy. The two policies now before the House are not contradictory, but are complementary, one of the other. The adoption of such a plan as I suggest would remove the naval question from the arena of politics—a consummation so greatly desired by leading members of both parties—and place it upon a plane of enlightened citizenship and patriotism. The fact that the Liberal party has suggested two fleet units as their policy does not necessarily mean that the policy is wrong; it may possibly mean that they have at last stumbled upon the right policy. Sir Oliver Mowat, in his palmy days, frequently stole the clothes off his political opponents and appropriated whatever was good in them. Whether the Government, in formulating its permanent policy, should adopt, with certain modifications, the proposition of our Liberal friends, is a matter worthy of consideration. If this were done, it would remove this national and Imperial question from the cockpit of contentious politics, would satisfy the demand for immediate assistance, and carry out what I consider to be the aspirations of the Canadian people for the establishing of a great shipbuilding industry within the borders of our own country.

However, I desire to say in conclusion, that I have absolute faith in the ability and judgment of the right hon. leader of the Conservative party, and those associated with him in the government of this country. I say I have confidence in the Prime Minister, whose visit to the old country has marked a forward step in Imperial history; whose public utterances while in England marked him out as an outstanding Imperial character, a leader whose pleasing personality, whose sturdy and lofty patriotism, whose strength of purpose and consummate ability, mark him out as the most conspicuous figure in recent Imperial history, and on whom the eyes of the whole Empire have been focussed during the past few months. Such a leader, I am sure, is capable of evolving a plan satisfactory not only to the people of Canada, but to the people of the whole Empire.

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

On motion of Mr. Rogers, House adjourned at 10.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, January 20, 1913.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 77, to incorporate the Calgary, Edmonton and Fort McMurray Railway Company.—Mr. Armstrong (Lambton).

Bill No. 78, to incorporate the Canada Hail Insurance Company.—Mr. Aikins.

Bill No. 79, respecting the Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 80, to incorporate the Huron Lake Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Baker.

Bill No. 81, to incorporate the Quebec, Portland and International Short Line Railway Company.—Mr. Cromwell.

Bill No. 82, respecting the Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 83, respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar).

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 58, to incorporate the Intercolonial Trust and Investment Company.—Mr. Barnard.

Bill No. 66, respecting the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation.—Sir Edmund Osler.

Bill No. 70, respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company, and to change its name to the Toronto and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Lewis.

Bill No. 71, respecting a Patent of the Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PORT HOOD DREDGING.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness):

1. Did the Minister of Public Works, or any other minister of the Government, receive a

request from any one last summer or fall for the dredging of Port Hood harbour? If so, who sent the request?

2. Did the Government make arrangements to have this dredging done last fall? If so, why was the dredging not done, and at whose request was it abandoned?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

QUEBEC RAILWAY, LIGHT, HEAT AND POWER COMPANY.

* Mr. LEMIEUX:

Has the Government or any of its members received the Analytical report rendered by the general assembly of the French bondholders of the Quebec Railway, Light, Heat and Power Company, held at Paris, on the 17th December, 1912?

Mr. CODERRE: No information.

QUEBEC FLOATING DOCK.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any offer been made to the Government for the construction of a floating dock at Quebec?
2. If so, by whom and on what date?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No information.
2. Answered by No. 1.

QUEBEC DRY-DOCK.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Has any offer been made to the Government for the construction of a dry-dock at Quebec?
2. If so, by whom and on what date?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No offer has been received from the Department of Public Works to construct a dry-dock at Quebec under the Dry-Dock Subsidies Act, but when proposals were invited under the Act, Sir John Jackson (Canada) Limited, made an offer under date of 2nd July, 1912, to construct, as contractors a dry-dock direct for the Government.
2. Answered by No. 1.

LIFEBOAT STATIONS, MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

1. What are the names of the coxswain, assistant coxswain, and each member of the crew connected with the lifeboat service at Canso, N.S., prior to October 11, 1911?
2. What are the names of the coxswain, assistant coxswain, and each member of the crew connected with the lifeboat service at said Canso at this date?
3. What are the names of the coxswain, assistant coxswain, and each member of the crew connected with the lifeboat service at White Head, N.S., prior to October 11, 1911.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness).

4. What are the names of the coxswain, assistant coxswain, and each member of the crew connected with the lifeboat service at said White Head at this date?

5 What are the names of all localities on the coasts of the Maritime provinces where lifeboat stations have been established, and the dates when such stations were so established; also the name and the post office address of the coxswain or officer in charge at each of said stations?

6. What is the name and the Post Office address of each coxswain or officer in charge of any of said lifeboat stations who has been dismissed from the service since October 11, 1911?

7. What is the name, post office address of each coxswain or officer in charge of any of said lifeboat stations who was dismissed since October 11, 1911, without an investigation being held, if any?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. W G. Matthews, Ed. Burns, John Pembroke, Robt. Eustus, Pat. Ryan, John Sullivan, George Matthews.

2. John J. Berrigan, Wm. H. Manuel, Thos. McNeary, Jas. Keating, Wm. Hanlon, Ed. Flaherty, Jacob Manuel.

3. Hugh P. Munro, Jos. Uloth, Arthur Munro, Jas. Duncan, Abram Munro, Samuel Duncan, Chas. Duncan.

4. John Phalen, Thos. Feltmate, John J. Grover, Canon H. Feltmate, Geo. A. Grover, Adam Fitzgerald, Albert Uloth.

5. Little Wood Island, Grand Manan, N.B.; 1910; Harry Harvey, Little Wood Island, Grand Manan, N B.

Richibucto, N.B.; 1907; A. Long, Richibucto, N.B.

Point Escuminac, N.B.; 1908; E. F. Flieger, Pt. Escuminac, N.B.

Baker's Cove, N.B.; 1886; R. L. Baker, Baker's Cove, N.S.

Blanche, N.S.; 1889; W. A. B. Smith, Blanche, N.S.

Bay View, N.S.; 1911; J. W. Hayden, Bay View, Digby, N.S.

Cheticamp, N.S.; 1911; M. Maillet, Eastern Harbour, N.S.

Clarke's Harbour, N.S.; 1900; W. D. Attwood, Clarke's Harbour, N S.

Canso, N.S.; J. J. Berrigan, Canso, N.S.

Devil's Island, N.S.; 1885; B. H. Henneberry, Devil's Island, N.S.

Duncan's Cove, N.S.; 1886; J. W. Holland, Duncan's Cove, N.S.

Herring Cove, N.S.; 1885; J. Gorman, Herring Cove, N.S.

Pictou Island, N.S.; 1889; D. McCallum, Pictou Island, N.S.

Port Mouton, N.S.; 1889; Walter Cook; Port Mouton, N.S.

Scattarie, N.S.; 1885; T. Nearing, Scattarie, N.S.

Seal Island, N.S.; 1880; Thos. Symonds, Seal Island, N.S.

St Paul's Island, N.S.; 1885; John Campbell, St. Paul's Island, N.S.

Whitehead, N.S.; 1890; John Phalen, Whitehead N.S.

Sable Island, N.S.; 1885; G. Soderberg, C. Ritcey, Sable Island, N.S.

6. Captain John Champion, Alberton, P.E.I. ; Albert Cain, Baker's Cove, Yarmouth, N.S.; W. G. Matthews, Canso, N.S.; Wm. Leavitt, Cascumpeque, P.E.I.; John Moore, Charlottetown, P.E.I.; Everett P. Cox, Weller's Bay, Consecon, Ont.; Edward V. Dempsey, Herring Cove, N.S.; Geo. Wisner, Long Point, Port Rowan, Ont.; Alex. Currie, Pictou Island, N.S.; W. F. Clarke, Port Hope, Ont.; Edward Long, Southampton, Ont.; Hugh P. Munro, Whitehead, N.S.

7. Captain John Champion, Alberton, P.E.I.; Albert Cain, Baker's Cove, Yarmouth, N.S.; Wm. Leavitt, Cascumpeque, P.E.I.; Everett P. Cox, Weller's Bay, Consecon, Ont.; Alex. Currie, Pictou Island, N.S.; Edward Long, Southampton, Ont.; Hugh P. Munro, Whitehead, N.S.

BERESFORD DISTRICT—PROPOSED BREAKWATER

Mr. TURGEON:

1. Did the Government receive a petition from the residents of Beresford district, Gloucester County, requesting the construction of a breakwater at their shore?

2. Did the Government order a survey and estimate made of the cost of such construction?

3. If not, will the Government issue instructions to that effect without further delay?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes.

2. Yes. Estimated cost of proposed work, $17,500.

3. Answered by No. 2.

STEEL RAILS—REMISSION OF DUTY.

*Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Has a remission of customs duties been given to the Algoma Steel Company on steel rails imported by the said company at Fort William.

2. If so, at what date and for what amount, under what statute and what section of the same?

Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Yes.

2. This remission was made at various dates after June 1, 1912, under Section 92 of the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act. The whole of the remission was $294,000, being one-half the duty on 75,000 gross tons imported steel rails. 50,000 tons of these rails were for the use of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway and 25,000 tons for branch lines of the Canadian Pacific railway in the Northwest. The said steel rails were urgently required by the said railway companies for the completion of lines in the northwest provinces in time to be available for the movement of the crop, and evidence was submitted showing that the rail producing companies of Canada would not be able to supply the rails required, or any part thereof, by reason of being under contract for their full output for the season.

CONDITION OF LABOURING CLASSES.

Mr. DEVLIN:

1. What steps, if any, have been taken by the Government, since the 21st September, 1911, to inquire into the condition of the labouring classes in Canada?

2. Have any practical steps been taken to materially improve same?

3. What changes, if any, have been effected in the publication of the Labour Gazette?

4. What is the proportion of the average wages paid to Canadian labourers as compared to that of the labourer of the United States of America?

Mr. CROTHERS:

1. Every board established under the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, 1907, makes inquiry into the conditions of the labouring classes concerned in the particular disputes for the adjustment of which the Board is established. There have been twenty-one such boards established since September 21, 1911. At the present time investigations are being conducted in this way as follows: (a) into conditions affecting metalliferous miners in the Kootenay district; (b) into conditions affecting machinists and blacksmiths in Ottawa.

In addition, various special inquiries have been undertaken and are proceeding in the Department of Labour, as follows: (a) into wholesale and retail prices of leading commodities of life, at all points in Canada, bearing on the cost of living; (b) into wages paid in all lines of industry at all important centres in Canada; (c) into causes of all strikes and lockouts in Canada, and showing numbers of workmen concerned, amount of time lost, and results generally achieved; (d) into labour organization in Canada. Officers of the Department of Labour have on various occasions conducted special inquiries into railway construction in Western Canada; also, as a result of information reaching the department, numerous investigations have been made by departmental officials into specific grievances alleged to exist in different parts of Canada.

2. As a result of the investigations indicated in reply to No. 1, disputes have been adjusted without strikes, strikes have been adjusted, and improved conditions have been brought about in numerous instances.

3. The Labour Gazette has been published on the same general lines followed in the past, with modifications and developments

consistent with the expansion of industrial interests.

4. Owing to the great variety of industries and the variations of wages at different points, it is not possible to convey this information in a reply to a question. A report as to wages paid in the different industries and at various points in Canada is now in course of preparation. A similar report as to conditions in the United States is understood to be now in preparation in that country. When the two reports are complete it may be practicable to compare the respective conditions. At the present time the information is not available.

QUEBEC CENTRAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is it within the knowledge of the Government or the Minister of Railways that the Quebec Central railway has been acquired or leased by the Canadian Pacific?

2. If so, does the Government or the Minister of railways know whether the Timiscouata railway is included or not in the said arrangement?

3. If the Temiscouata railway has not been acquired or leased by the Canadian Pacific railway, is it the intention of the Government or the Railway Department to acquire or lease it as part of the Intercolonial railway as this road is said to be one of those which could bring the greatest amount of traffic to the Intercolonial railway and from the day on which it is acquired or leased by the Canadian Pacific railway, it would be a detriment to the Intercolonial railway?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes.

2. Temiscouata Railway is not included.

3. The whole question of branch lines is receiving the attention of the Government.

L'ISLET WHARF.

Mr. GAUVREAU :

1. Has the Government received tenders for the reconstruction of the wharf at L'Islet?

2. If so, what is the name of each tenderer and the amount of each tender?

Mr. ROGERS :

1. Yes.

2. La Cie de Laiterie de St. Pierre, $1.38 per cubic yard, $17,940; J. B. Gallibois, $1.85 per cubic yard, $24,050; Misael Bernatchez, $2.07 per cubic yard, $26,910; Théophile Beaumont, $2.09¾ per cubic yard, $27,267.50; Elzéar Caron, $2.18 per cubic yard, $28,340; Cloutier & Gaudreau, $2.20 per cubic yard, $22,600; Joseph Normand-Onésime Poliquin, $2.25 per cubic yard, $29,250; Alexandre Duchesneau-Louis Roy, $2.45 per cubic yard, $31,850; Paul T. C. Dumais, $2.96 per cubic yard, $38,480; Thetford Contracting Company, $3.74 per cubic yard, $48,620; Massicotte & Fréres, $5.00 per cubic yard, $65,000.

Mr. CROTHERS.

EMPLOYMENT OF HONORE FOURNIER.

Mr. GAUVREAU :

1. Is Honoré Fournier, St. Jean Port Joli, in the employment of the Government.

2. If so, what is the date of his appointment?

3. What is his salary and what are his duties?

Mr. CODERRE :

1. Yes.

2. September 3, 1912.

3. Inspector at Grosse Ile at $3.50 per day. During the time those works are closed down (January to March) Mr. Fournier is employed in the Montmagny office.

EMPLOYMENT OF DAVID MORIN.

Mr. GAUVREAU :

1. Is David Morin, formerly a tailor at St. Roch des Aulnaies, in the employment of the Post Office Department?

2. If so, on what date was he appointed?

3. What are his duties?

4. What is his salary?

5. Does the Government know that the said David Morin, as alleged, was one of the most active canvassers of Doctor Paquet, member for L'Islet at the last election?

6. Does the Government know that Captain David Bourgeault, keeper of the lightship at La Traverse, St. Roch, has declared to have paid to the said David Morin five hundred dollars to be appointed to the said position?

7. Does the Government intend to inquire into these facts?

Mr. CODERRE :

1. Not in the employ of the Post Office Department.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. Answered by No. 1.

L'ISLET POST OFFICES.

Mr. GAUVREAU :

1. How many new post offices were established in the county of L'Islet since September, 1910?

2. What is the annual revenue of each of these offices?

3. What are the total expenses for the organization and annual maintenance of each of these offices?

4. At what distance is each of these offices situated from the nearest post office.

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Nine.

2, 3 and 4.

Office.	Revenue.	Cost of Maintenance.	Distance from nearest Post Office. Miles.
Tourville.. ..	$190 35	$ 50 00	4
Chapais	35 00	35 00	4½
Berryer	60 00	155 00	4½
Artois	30 00	35 00	5
Bégin	45 00	135 00	3
Lafrance	50 00	110 00	3½
Frenette	60 00	135 00	2
Frepell..	25 00	135 00	4½
Ozanan..	60 00	165 00	2

It is expected that the opening of these offices will be one of the means which will help to promote expansion and prosperity in these different places and that the postal revenue will thereby increase materially.

THE BOAT GUNHILD.

Mr. SINCLAIR :

1. Has the Government bought the boat Gunhild, of Victoria, B.C., from Mr. Harry Price, or any other person? If so, how much was paid for said boat?
2. Where was the Gunhild built and when?
3. What is her tonnage and speed?

Mr. CODERRE :

1. There is no information on the subject in any department of the Government.
2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

H. M. C. S. NIOBE.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. What is the total amount paid or payable for repairs to H.M.C.S. Niobe?
2. What were the amounts respectively chargeable to dock charges and ship repairs?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Total amount paid to date $202,715.04. Amount payable not yet established.
2. Total amount chargeable to ship repairs.

GOVERNMENT SAVINGS BANKS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

Would the Government favour a proposal to increase the rate of interest to depositors in the Post Office Savings Banks from three to say three and a half or four per cent?

Mr. PELLETIER: The question is receiving the attention of the Government.

FENIAN RAID VETERANS.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has Mr. Anthime Boulé, of St. Eugene de Lamartine, county of L'Islet, P.Q., made application to obtain the grant of $100, as a volunteer in 1866 and 70?
2. If so, was his claim accompanied with the affidavits of Messrs. Philippe Gagné and Joseph Caron, declaring that the said A. Boulé had been a volunteer with them on the date mentioned by them?
3. How did it happen that the two companions have received their grants and that the one of Mr. A. Boulé has been refused?
4. Were the affidavits of the two volunteer companions put aside in the case where the name of the volunteer applicant was not found on the pay list, or was badly written or printed?

Mr. HUGHES:

1. For 1870 only.
2. Yes, but affidavits not sufficiently definite.
3. Because their names are on the active service pay lists of No. 5 Company, 61st Battalion, and that of Mr. A. Boulé is not.
4. The affidavit of Messrs. Gagné and Caron are not satisfactory, as, in the former, no dates or circumstantial evidence is given, and, in the latter, no specific dates or circumstantial evidence.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ICE CONTRACT.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1 Have tenders been asked for to furnish ice for the Intercolonial railway from Lévis to Campbellton? If so, how many tenderers were there?
2. What are their names and the amount of their tenders respectively?
3. Who obtained the contract at the different places and what are the prices granted?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes, there were twelve tenderers.
2. 950 tons for Chaudiere Junction: La Société de Quincaillerie, per H. P. Beaulieu, Lévis, 80 cents per ton; Xavier Romain, Pont Etchemin, 90 cents; Jos. Bolduc & Edouard Bolduc, Lévis, 72 cents; P. T. Cauchon, Pont Etchemin, $1.95; Ph. Paquet Fils, St. Romuald, 65 cents; Chas. Coulombe, St. Fabien, 65 cents; P. Robitaille, Lévis, 95 cents.

420 tons for Lévis: La Société de Quincaillerie, per H. P. Beaulieu, Lévis, 85 cents per ton; Xavier Romain, Pont Etchemin, 90 cents; Jos. Bolduc & Edouard Bolduc, Lévis, 72 cents; P. T. Cauchon, Pont Etchemin, $1.95; Ph. Paquet Fils, St. Romuald, 70 cents; Chas. Coulombe, St. Fabien, 65 cents; P. Robitaille, Lévis, 95 cents.

1,170 tons for Riv. du Loup: La Société de Quincaillerie, per H. P. Beaulieu, Lévis, 90 cents per ton; Xavier Romain, Pont Etchemin, 90 cents; J. A. Pelletier, Riv. du Loup, 57½ cents; Chas. Coulombe, St. Fabien, 65 cents; Frank Magnier, Riv. du Loup, 70 cents; Thos. Ouellette, Blaisville, P.Q., 98 cents.

1,000 tons for Ste. Flavie: La Société de Quincaillerie, per H. P. Beaulieu, Lévis, 90 cents per ton; J. A. Pelletier, Riv. du Loup, 65 cents per ton; Chas. Coulombe, St. Fabien, 59 cents; Frank Magnier, Riv. du Loup, 90 cents; Adjutor Picard, St. Patrick, County of Temiscouata, P.Q., 65 cents; J. H. Rioux, St. Fabien, 64 cents.

110 tons for Rimouski: La Société de Quincaillerie, per H. P. Beaulieu, Lévis, 90 cents per ton; Chas. Coulombe, St. Fabien, 59 cents; Frank Magnier, Riv. du Loup, 90 cents; Adjutor Picard, St. Patrick, County of Temiscouata, P.Q., 65 cents; J. H. Rioux, St. Fabien, 74 cents.

80 tons for Riv. Ouelle wharf: La Société de Quincaillerie, per H. P. Beaulieu, Lévis, 90 cents per ton; J. A. Pelletier, Riv. du

Loup, 80 cents; Chas. Coulombe, St. Fabien, 65 cents; Frank Magnier, Riv. du Loup, 90 cents.

3. Ph. Paaquet Fils, St. Romauld: for Chaudière Jct., at 65 cents per ton; for Levis, at 70 cents per ton.

J. A. Pelletier, Rivière du Loup, for Rivière du Loup, at 57½ cents per ton.

Chas. Coulombe, St. Fabien: for Ste. Flavie, at 59 cents per ton; for Rimouski, at 59 cents per ton; for Rivière Ouelle wharf at 65 cents per ton.

The ton above mentioned is the net ton of 2,000 pounds. In the case of the ice for Levis the offer of Ph. Paquet Fils, of St. Romuald, at 70 cents per ton was accepted, as the ice is to be supplied from St. Romuald, four miles from Levis. The ice offered by Chas. Coulombe for Levis at 65 cents per ton was to be supplied from St. Fabien, 160 miles from Levis, in which case the cost to the railway of hauling the ice would be 40 cents per ton.

ISLE VERTE WHARF.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the Department of Public Works purchased from Dame A. Dionne, widow of Charles F. Bertrand, a certain piece of ground along the river Verte, county of Témiscouata, for the purpose of a passage in connection with the wharf built on the south-west side of the said river in the parish of Isle Verte?

2. If so, what amount has been paid, who was the advocate charged to examine the titles of the property, and what amount has been paid to him?

3. Has the Department of Justice examined the titles to the property?

4. Has it been ascertained that Madame Bertrand had any right to sell the said piece of ground acquired by the Government?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. Yes, for road and site of wharf.

2. The price paid was $482. Mr. Leo Bérubé, advocate, Fraserville, was employed to examine the title and report. $17.35 was paid to him for his services.

3. Yes, through its agent Mr. Bérubé.

4. Yes, by the report of its agent.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION.

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Has the evidence taken by the Morine Public Service Commission on its reports, or any portion of either, been printed outside of the Government Printing Bureau?

2. If so, where, by whom, and at whose request?

3. Were tenders invited for the work? If not, what rate was fixed for such outside printing, and by whom?

4. Was the said rate higher than the rate charged for similar work in the Printing Bureau? If so, how much?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. No.

2, 3 and 4 answered by No. 1.

Mr. COCHRANE.

CAP DE LA MADELEINE WHARF.

*Mr. BUREAU:

1. Who recommended the appointment of Mr. L. H. Loranger as overseer of the repair works done to the wharf at Cap de la Madeleine during the year 1912?

2. Who recommended or suggested to the district engineer the names of carpenters, teamsters and labourers employed for this work?

Mr. ROGERS:

1. Mr. L. H. Loranger was recommended by Mr. P. E. Blondin, M.P.

2. Mr. Loranger.

THREE RIVERS PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

*Mr. BUREAU:

1. Is it the intention of the Minister of Public Works to award the contract for the public building at Three Rivers on the tenders received in 1912 for that purpose?

2. How soon will the contract be awarded?

3. How many tenders were received?

4. Was there a deposit accompanying each tender, as called for in the advertisement?

5. How many of these deposits have been returned to the tenderers?

Mr. ROGERS:

1 and 2. No.

3. Three.

4. Yes.

5. All.

DISMISSALS.

*Mr. CASH:

1. Was Dr. J. D. R. Williams dismissed from the position of collector of canal tolls at Cardinal, Ontario?

2. If so, for what reason and on whose recommendation?

3. What is the name of Dr. Williams' successor?

4. Is such successor a brother of the present Minister of Customs?

5. Are there any canal tolls collected at Cardinal?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Yes.

2. Neglect of duty and lack of necessary qualifications because of age. Honourable Dr. Reid.

3. On the vacancy arising Mr. George Reid, who was appointed collector of canal tolls at Cardinal, by Order in Council of October 18, 1889 and filled the position with perfect satisfaction until dismissed on April 29, 1897, without just reason or cause, applied for the vacant position and was appointed.

4. Yes.

5. No. On none of the canals in Canada are tolls collected, but collectors are kept on each canal for the purpose of securing statistics and collecting canal revenues and Cardinal is on the same basis as the others.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. At whose request was Lt.-Colonel Bourk, of Nicolet, Quebec, dismissed as mail clerk?
2. For what cause was he dismissed?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. P. E. Lamarche, Esq., M.P.
2. Political partisanship.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. For what reasons was J. G. Leclerc, of St. Jean, Port Joli dismissed from his post as keeper of the lighthouse Les Piliers at Trois Saumons?
2. Who was his successor?
3. Was the latter at the time of his appointment qualified to fill that position?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Political partisanship.
2. Mr. Eugène Francoeur.
3. Yes.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. What are the names of the postmasters dismissed in the county of L'Islet since September 1910?
2. At whose requests were these dimissals made?
3. What are the names in each case?
4. Have inquiries been held?

Mr. PELLETIER: :

1. and 2. Irénée Lord, St. Cyrille de L'Islet; Joseph Pelletier, St. Jean Port Joli; Magloire Francoeur, St. Roch des Aulnaies; Germaine St. Pierre, Tourville; Philippe Hamel, Village des Aulnaies.
2. By the instructions of the Postmaster General.
4. The facts were so well known as to render it unnecessary to incur the expense of investigation in these cases.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has Madame Paul Farley, receiver of the mails of St. Gabriel de Brandon, county of Berthier, been removed?
3. If so, for what reason and at whose request?
3. Has an inquiry been held in this case?
4. Who is her successor and by whom was he recommended?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. and 2. During the last federal election Mr. Paul Farley sent in what he called his resignation in order to have his wife made the apparent postmaster, so that he, with his sons, might have more liberty to take a very active part in politics. Having done so, he had to stand the consequences.
3. The facts were so well known as to render it unnecessary to incur the expense of an inquiry.
4. Mr. Telesphore Michaud has been appointed by direction of the Postmaster General.

* Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has Mr. Philippe Hamel, postmaster of the Village des Aulnaies, county of L'Islet P.Q., been dismissed?
2. If so, for what reasons, and was there an inquiry? If not, why not?

Mr. PELLETIER:

1. Yes.
2. For political partisanship. The facts were so well known that it was not necessary to incur the expense of an investigation.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has Mr. Edouard Beaulieu, of Cacouna, been dismissed as Indian agent in the county of Témiscouata? If so, for what reason?
2. Is an inquiry to be granted? If not, why not?
3. Does the department know that his succesor, Mr. Narcisse LeBel, of Cacouna, as alleged had to leave this position in order not to face an inquiry on the subject of grave accusations brought against him?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Yes, for political partisanship.
2. No. Not considered necessary.
3. No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BRANCH LINES.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON moved the following resolution:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable in furtherance of the transportation interests of this Dominion, that the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial railway as a Government operated railway shall be widened and extended by securing by lease or otherwise such of the branch lines of railways now connected with the Intercolonial, as will serve as direct and profitable feeders to the traffic of said railway and further by securing as aforesaid such of said branch lines as may be considered to be in the general interest of the Dominion of Canada and of its people, with relation to its transportation problems and interests, without especial consideration to the immediate direct financial results.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the question of the absorption by the Intercolonial railway of the branch lines connecting with that railway has been so frequently brought to the notice of this House, not only during this Parliament, but in preceding Parliaments, that to me at least, and I am sure to many hon. members, the subject has become somewhat threadbare. It will be observed that this motion goes somewhat further than any other resolution which has been brought to the notice of the House heretofore. I think in 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910, and 1911, if not in 1912, the scope of the proposed resolution was to acquire such lines as would be directly proved to be of financial advantage to the Intercolonial railway. The qualifica-

tions with respect to the character of the road were always in the line of having it demonstrated that all railways to be thus absorbed should be proved to be financially beneficial to the Intercolonial. In attempting to discuss the question I am somewhat hampered by the fact that the Department of Railways and Canals have not answered the following question which stands on the Order Paper:

1. Has the Government reached any decision as to the action they propose taking, if any, with a view to the acquisition of the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial railway, and the operating of the same as a part of the Government system of railways? If so, what is the nature of the decision reached and when will their intentions relating thereto be given effect?

2. What is the estimated maximum amount involved in the purchase of all the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial railway, as feeders operated at present by isolated private railway companies?

Mr. COCHRANE: I could give the hon. gentleman the answer.

Mr. EMMERSON: I should be very glad to have it.

Mr. COCHRANE: The answer to the first part is that it is still under consideration. The answer to the second is that it is not in the public interest that we should give any estimate of what they are worth.

Mr. EMMERSON: I thank my hon. friend for the information. Apparently the Government have not reached a conclusion with respect to the matter and, as to the second part of the question, my hon. friend thinks it is not in the public interest that it should be answered. I do not know what reasons influence him or the Government.

Mr. COCHRANE: We do not want to give our opinion of the value, that is all.

Mr. EMMERSON: My hon. friend might err on the safe side, and make the estimate low enough to remove any possible difficulties that might arise. My reason for wishing that information was to have placed before the House and the country approximately a statement of the amount of money involved in connection with the branch line railways, in connection with all the railways that might possibly be acquired or absorbed by the Government system of railways. It seems to me that it would not involve very great injury to any individual railway or to the Government railway, or to the interests of the people as a whole, to have that information. To-day we have propositions before this Parliament, and we have had them before preceding Parliaments, with respect to the enlargement, indeed, to the building of a new Welland canal, and the amounts have been given with respect to that, that is, the amount of money approximately involved in the proposition. We have also had propositions with respect to the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. Whether you consider it from the point of view of the capital expenditure required, or the annual charge for maintenance and operation of these several branch lines, the sum of money involved is insignificant in comparison with the large expenditures on other public undertakings. We are dealing with figures in this Parliament to-day which would make the members of former Parliaments shudder; thirty-five million dollars is apparently nothing for us to send across the water in connection with a naval proposition; one hundred and fifty million dollars is said not to be much to spend on the Georgian Bay canal, and the construction of a new Welland canal in place of the old, which is serving the purposes of the Dominion at the present time, will of course, involve the expenditure of millions. But, when it comes to a matter of a small expenditure for furnishing transportation facilities, which are absolutely needed in the Maritime provinces and in parts of Quebec, we find the Government hesitating. I do not make any particular charge against this Government in that respect, because I know that for years past in this House, whenever any expenditure was mentioned in connection with the Intercolonial, the first question put is what will it cost, and the Government is inclined to hesitate. Look at the history of the branch line movement. When I was Minister of Railways, when making my annual statement to this House I referred, not officially but as an individual member of the House, to the day which was fast coming when in the interests of the Intercolonial railway and of the Dominion at large it would be necessary for the Government to acquire these branch lines. When I resigned from the portfolio of railways, I brought the matter before the House on several occasions, and I felt there was not that interest taken in the project, not alone by members representing western constituencies but by many members representing constituencies in the Maritime provinces, which the importance of the question deserved. At last, in November, 1909, the matter was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, and a Bill was introduced which, though in my opinion as absolutely inadequate, adopted the principle and would eventually result in the acquisition of these branch lines. I took exception to the Government Bill when introduced, on the ground that it was not sufficiently comprehensive and that it would fail to be workable, and the result demonstrated the correctness of my prophecy. In 1911, it was proposed to amend the Bill of 1910, and

resolutions were introduced for that purpose by Mr. Graham, then Minister of Railways. These resolutions reached the point of final concurrence when Parliament was dissolved. Since then the matter has remained, well not quiescent, but no progress has been made. During the elections of 1911, the Prime Minister promised throughout the Maritime provinces, that he would, if returned to power, have these branch lines acquired by the Government, so as to form a part of the Government railway system. These were not merely verbal promises but they were also announced in telegrams which the present Prime Minister sent to the different constituencies. One particular telegram which was sent by the Hon. Mr. Borden from Charlottetown, was read in Westmoreland, in Albert, and in the different constituencies of the province of New Brunswick and it announced the assurance that if Mr. Borden were returned to office he would carry out this scheme in which the people in that part of the country were so deeply interested. I have always held that the people of other sections of Canada were as much interested directly in the expansion of the Intercolonial railway as were the Maritime provinces. I have always held, and have so stated throughout the length and breadth of this country, that the people of Ontario particularly were quite as much interested in the expansion and improvement of the Intercolonial as were the provinces by the sea. I had realized that the construction of the Intercolonial had furnished to the manufacturing and mercantile interests of Ontario and Quebec markets that are incomparable with any other markets in Canada. Even if the Intercolonial railway had not always had a balance on the right side in connection with its operation, yet I felt that from the very inception of its operation there had been a surplus created by that railway, but that the surplus by reason of the low rates that were established was in the pockets of the people of Canada, and that without that railway Ontario would have been minus the splendid markets which were afforded her along the coast of Nova Scotia and in the lumbering sections of New Brunswick. I realized from those facts that by the acquisition of these branch lines better and more extended markets would be available and accessible to the manufacturing interests of Western Canada. I felt that it was in the interests of all classes regardless of geography, to have that road branch out in the many directions in which it could branch out, in order that these markets would be available, not merely to those who sought for purchasers for their wares and merchandise, but also for the people who live along the line of these respective railways and were served with the inadequate facilities which are now afforded by these branch lines. That there will be any who will deny this proposition, I question; that there will be any who can successfully refute the proposition I question strongly. The situation is simply this: the Intercolonial railway is owned by the Government of Canada; the people of Canada have somewhere in the neighbourhood of ninety millions of dollars invested in it; it is now under operation by the Government, and doubts are being created day by day as to the continuance of its operation, as doubts have been created year by year in the past. I believe that some decisive action should be taken by this Government, as it should have been taken earlier by a former Government, to set at rest forever the question as to whether the Intercolonial is to pass into the hands of a private corporation or whether it is to be maintained and continued as a Government operated railway. This is a matter that should be decided and decided now. The Minister of Railways has told us, not today but on a former occasion during this session, that negotiations are being had with his department, as they were had with his predecessors in office by the Canadian Pacific railway, looking for the acquirement by that railway of certain running rights over the Intercolonial railway between St. John and Halifax, and between Truro and the Sydneys. Admittedly the Canadian Pacific railway have sought for many years to secure these running rights; they have made application to one after the other of those who have held the position of Minister of Railways; and they have submitted to the department year after year certain propositions with a view of securing running rights over that road, not merely ordinary rights for through traffic, in order that they might reach the port of Halifax or the port of Sydney, but running rights as respects local traffic, their contention being that in order that they might successfully operate their through traffic, they should be given the privilege of running their trains over the rails of the Intercolonial railway between the points I have named to do the intermediate passenger traffic and the intermediate freight traffic. They were not content to get, as they might have obtained long ere this, the privilege of securing the right to run over the rails of the Intercolonial railway with their through cars in connection with their through traffic, both passenger and freight, they were not content to have the ordinary rule that applies between private corporations executed and exercised as between the Canadian Pacific railway and the Intercolonial railway. Such a proposition has never been made in the history of railways between private corporations, whereby one railway has asked another for the right to run over their rails to compete with the railway

granting that right in the matter of intermediate or local traffic. A proposition so astounding as that has never been made even by any railway on this continent or in Europe. Yet the Canadian Pacific railway has been and is persistent with respect to this matter. I am not complaining as to their course, it is a business one, if they can secure those rights, they are justified in making the effort. The Intercolonial railway is a splendid asset; the people of Canada for the past forty-five years have been expending and investing their money in it; by reason of these years of expenditure and the building up of the business of the country and its development, the Intercolonial railway has become an asset that I think is without equal with respect to any of the assets of the Government of Canada. I would even go farther and say that there is no more valuable portion of railway in Canada than the Intercolonial railway between Montreal and Moncton and through the eastern provinces as well.

It would be natural for the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to desire to secure this splendid railway without the expenditure of a dollar on capital account, without outlays ordinarily required by a railway corporation in the construction of roads, the establishment of terminals, and the acquiring of the many facilities which are necessary to the operation of a great system of railway. If the Canadian Pacific railway or any other private corporation could secure the right to use the rails of the Intercolonial railway for all the purposes which I have enumerated, it would mean that they would be enabled to absorb the Intercolonial railway without, as I say, the expenditure of a dollar on capital account. How so, you ask. Why, Mr. Speaker, the Intercolonial railway in the past has not had, and even to-day, has not, the traffic it is capable of handling. It has not had sufficient traffic, particularly over some sections of it, to make it a paying concern at the rates which were established at the time of Confederation and which have been continued with more or less modification down to the present time. If the Intercolonial railway could have secured that traffic, even at the old rates it has charged, it would have been enabled to make good book-keeping showing at the end of each fiscal year. But, at last, and after long years it has built up a good traffic, though no more than it could handle. If now the Government should allow another railway to run trains over the rails of the Intercolonial railway, in competition with the Intercolonial railway trains, I venture the assertion that within five years the Government of Canada would not be operating one single train on the Intercolonial railway. You may think, Sir, and others may think that that is an astounding statement. Let me give my reason for making it. If any private corporation secured these running rights, then, in a night, in the twinkling of an eye, that corporation would secure the branch lines which we have been considering all these years, the coal roads of Nova Scotia, the lumber roads of New Brunswick, the roads connecting with the fishing ports in Quebec and the Maritime provinces. All these would be secured instanter by the railway corporations which would secure running rights, the privilege which the Canadian Pacific railway is seeking at the hands of the Minister of Railways, negotiations for which are pending at this very moment between the Department of Railways or the Government of Canada, and the Canadian Pacific railway. Now, I would ask the Minister of Railways, I would urge him to take no step in connection with the granting of running rights over the Intercolonial railway to the Canadian Pacific railway, the Canadian Northern railway or the Grand Trunk railway, before he has determined and acted upon a branch line policy —which, my hon. friend admits, they have not done. Although his leader, the right hon. the leader of this Government, promised the electors, that this policy should be entered upon; although it has been mentioned time and again in this House, although there has elapsed nearly two years since they came into power, no action has been taken; there has not even been a decision reached as to the course that should be taken. I was not surprised, that the Speech from the Throne last session did not contain a paragraph relating to the acquisition of the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway. The present Government had only been in office a few months, and naturally it was impossible for them to elaborate a measure to meet the situation. But, I did expect, Sir, that when the time came to open this session the people of the country would hear from the Governor General, that which they were entitled to hear, a declaration that a policy with regard to the branch lines had been reached and that action would be taken in that direction. No such reference was made; there was no such paragraph in the Speech from the Throne. And I have been led to draw a comparison between the treatment of some sections of Canada in connection with railways and treatment accorded to the Maritime provinces. We have heard of the Hudson Bay railway. Now, I do not want to say a word in condemnation of that railway. I would not wish any words of mine to be considered as in any way throwing a wet blanket on that proposition. But here is

a line of railway, that, at the best, can only be operated in connection with the export trade of Canada for three or four months of the year. I put aside all questions, existing in the minds of many who claim to know, as to the feasibility of the Hudson Bay railway. I take it for granted that it is possible to have connection between Europe and the West of Canada through the Hudson bay for three months of the year, and that during that period the grain trade of Canada can be served. It is true that that period is at a time of the year when there is not much shipment of grain from the West—the months of July, August, and perhaps September. That railway serves the western farmer, and he is worthy of recognition; but it serves him only for three months of the year, and that at a time when there is little shipment of his grain. That railway proposition, placed as it is, surrounded as it is, was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne in 1909; it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne in 1910. Action was also taken in 1911 with respect to the matter, and in 1912 this Government came into power, and they, too, emulating their predecessors in office, brought down to Parliament a hopeful statement with respect to the Hudson Bay railway. Even in the Speech from the Throne during the present session, further reference was made to that railway. This is a proposition affecting, it is true, the great and important interests of the West; it has been mentioned in every Speech from the Throne from 1909 to 1912, both inclusive. But here is the question of the branch line railways, affecting the interests of eastern Canada, and, being an advantage to Quebec and Ontario as well as the maritime provinces. This matter, during that period, has never been mentioned in a Speech from the Throne except in the session of 1909-1910. I arraign the present Administration, and I arraign the right hon. leader of the Government, in that they have entirely ignored the interests of the Intercolonial railway in that regard; I go further, and say that the people of eastern Canada have been betrayed and misled with respect to this branch line question. Throughout all the years during which I have striven to promote the carrying out of this idea, I have endeavoured on all occasions to present the matter to this House not as a political measure or a party question. I have said, as against my friends on many occasions, that which I now say as against my political opponents, who are now struggling with the responsibilities of office. In view of the importance of this matter; in view of all the conditions that it involves; in view of the pledges made by the Government, and the consequent expectations of the people of this country, and particularly of eastern Canada; in view of the promises made by hon. members who to-day sit in this House as supporters of the Government; in view of all these facts, I say we have a right to expect decisive and early action in connection with this matter. Yet, after nearly two years, we have the humilitiating admission of the Minister of Railways that he is not in a position to take the House and the country into his confidence in regard to whether the Government has any intentions in regard to the carrying out of this policy.

Mr. RHODES : The hon. gentleman refers to broken pledges on the part of the Government with respect to branch line railways; will he be good enough to detail what these pledges are ?

Mr. EMMERSON: The merest tyro in politics would readily understand that. My hon. friend knows full well that during the election of 1911 the present leader of the Government, then leader of the Opposition, went into the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Prince Edward Island, and there, particularly in constituencies traversed by the Intercolonial railway, he gave assurances to the electorate at large, that if returned to power, he would at once without the delays charged against the Laurier administration, make these branch lines part and parcel of the Government system of railways by constituting them a portion of the Intercolonial railway. I do not know whether the right hon. leader of the Government paid a visit to the county of my hon. friend during that contest, but I know he was in many constituencies, and I know further that his telegram regarding the branch lines was published in the Conservative press with large headlines, causing the electors to come to the natural conclusion that it made no difference which party was sustained, as they were both pledged to the carrying out of that policy. The electors in the county of Cumberland expected, and to-day expect, that that promise will be carried out by the present administration. As a faithful—I will not say servile—but as a very faithful and powerful supporter of the Government, I would ask the hon. member for Cumberland to exercise the great influence he commands in the councils of the Government towards bringing this administration down to the hitching post, and making them carry out what they have led the country to expect they will perform.

Any argument tending to make evident the advantage of this branch line policy would be wasting the time of the House. It has been admitted, at your right, as well as at your left, that the idea of the present leader of the Opposition in respect to this matter is a correct one. His Government

was proceeding to carry out the idea—indeed, contracts had been entered into or negotiations had before they resigned from office, with a view to acquiring some of these lines. They were then committed to the principle, and the present administration is committed to the same principle through the mouth of the Prime Minister. There is not a member from the Maritime Provinces, whether he sits at your right or your left, Mr. Speaker, but realizes that the whole force of public opinion in that section of Canada is in favour of the carrying out of that proposition, and they are looking to the Government of the day for the redeeming of their promise to make the Intercolonial what it should be, and what it is destined to be. All that I am saying is premised upon the idea that the Intercolonial railway is to be continued under the control of the Government of Canada and operated as a state-owned railway. If, as has been stated quite recently in the public press and on the platforms throughout the provinces, there are any other ideas to the effect that the Intercolonial railway is to be passed over to some railway corporation, then my words are, of course, entirely useless; my effort is being entirely wasted and the motion is even not relevant at this moment. The president of the Maritime Board of Trade, Mr. Matthew Lodge, was in Ottawa quite recently; he went from here to the West and has now returned to Moncton. At a meeting of the board of trade of that city, of which he is also president, he announced that negotiations were now being had between the Department of Railways or the Government of Canada and a private railway corporation which he did not specify looking towards the passing over of the Intercolonial railway to it. He made that statement publicly at a meeting from information which he said was secured very recently in the city of Ottawa. His statement was to the effect that the Intercolonial railway was to be transferred to a private corporation and to be managed and operated by it in the very near future. If that is the case I can quite understand the inactivity of the Government with respect to the acquisition of these branch lines. If they are going to adopt such a policy then I say: Do not acquire any branch lines, it would be a waste of the people's money to take even one forward step towards securing any of these branch lines that connect with that railway. Any great private corporation securing the Intercolonial railway would, as a business proposition, immediately secure these branch lines. That has been the history of great railway corporations in Canada, in the United States, in Great Britain, wherever railways have been successfully operated; it has even been the policy of the Canadian Pacific railway in New Brunswick in the operation of its lines there. If the Canadian Pacific railway or the Grand Trunk Pacific railway or the Canadian Northern railway were to secure a lease or even running rights over the Intercolonial railway they would at once as a business proposition acquire these branch lines. Why? Because they would marshal all the traffic originating along the several branch lines, assemble it at their points of connection with their trains on the Intercolonial railway, pass it along over the rails say of the Canadian Pacific railway to Montreal or to western points, leaving the Intercolonial railway minus any of that traffic, impotent to gather up any of the traffic that is in any way remote and for every train placed on the Intercolonial railway by a company after such running rights had been granted the Government of Canada would have to withdraw one of their trains, and in a very short period the only trains running over the Intercolonial railway would be company-owned and operated trains, the shops along the Intercolonial railway now occupied by the Government would become as silent as the tomb and the railway corporations would in their stead furnish their own at points to suit their convenience. The Canadian Pacific railway already have very large terminals at McAdam in the county of York, New Brunswick.

The Minister of Railways has not studied this question as I have—and in saying that I have no idea of being egotistical. He has not had it driven into him by a knowledge of the facts and conditions. I know that the service which these branch lines afford to those living along them is entirely inadequate. I have correspondence from every province relating to the manner in which these railways are operated to the disadvantage of the people and to the very great disadvantage of the Intercolonial railway itself. There is no unanimity of action with respect to trains, no consideration is given by one to the other with respect to traffic or train connections or the apportionment of rates. In every way possible they seem to work against the interests of the people. Because of discrimination in freight rates there can be no industry established along any branch railway in the eastern provinces. The fishing interests have to be served in a measure by these branch lines because the ports at which the fish are brought in from the sea are remote from the Intercolonial railway itself and the discrimination with regard to freight as against fishermen who operate outside of the zone of the Intercolonial railway is so serious that it favours many fish operators who are placed directly along the line of the Intercolonial railway against the interests

of the others whom I have named and who are thereby handicapped in the carrying on of their business. I have received numerous communications from the province of Quebec upon this subejct. The Quebec and Oriental railway runs down through the county of Bonaventure to Gaspé and through a portion of the county of Gaspé.

There is another line of railway known generally as the Matane railway, or the Gulf Terminal railway. It connects with the Intercolonial railway at Ste. Flavie and, as far as present constructed, runs to Matane en route to Gaspé. It is proposed to extend that railway to Gaspé, and perhaps there will be an application asking aid for that purpose. But to-day the facilities afforded by that railway are such that complaints are coming from the mayors of the towns, from the municipalities, and from the people along its route to the Dominion Railway Commission Board which disclaims any jurisdiction in the matter, and to the Quebec Utilities Commission, who claim that they are unable to force the railway to give the necessary facilities. I have been given to understand, from information sent to me by some of the officials of those municipalities in Quebec, that the way that railway is being operated, so far as the interests of the people are concerned, is a shame and a disgrace. I would suggest that if any further application is made for subsidies, the hon. minister himself should insist upon an inquiry as to whether, in view of the money already expended in the way of subsidies to that railway, it is giving adequate accommodation to the people living in the counties which it traverses. I shall not go into details as to those complaints, but I know that similar complaints are being made with respect to railways in other sections of the country. I would call my hon. friend's attention especially to two railways in the county of Cumberland, in Nova Scotia, which is represented by my hon. friend who interrupted me a few moments ago. I refer, first, to the railway known as Joggins railway, and secondly to the one known as the Springhill road. Their corporate names are different from these, but my hon. friend must be familiar with them. The operation of the Joggins railway is not in the interests of the people, but in the interests of the coal mining company who own it.

An hon. MEMBER : That is right.

Mr. EMMERSON : I want to say more than that. I know, as a matter of fact, from my experience as a former Minister of Railways, that in the matter of Intercolonial cars for the transportation of coal, the company, having the coal mines run in its own interest, and in connection with the operation of its own railway, seizes those cars to the disadvantage of competing coal companies using that line, and is in a position to gather information as to consignees to whom competing coal companies are shipping coal. There are times when business can only be secured and maintained by the prompt shipment of coal, which those other mining companies operating on this railway are not able to furnish, because they are unable to secure cars which have been sent to them, but which have been seized by the railway coal company to accommodate the patrons of its own mines. That is a railway which should have been secured at the very earliest opportunity, not merely in the interests of the people, or in the interests of trade, not merely in the interests of the coal industry, but in the interests of the Intercolonial railway itself, so that it could advantageously secure the traffic which comes over that railway and in order that the people in that section of the country might enjoy the facilities they anticipated when the subsidy was originally granted by this Parliament. They are not having the facilities which they expected, and the money expended has been practically thrown away, so far as the interests of that section of the county of Cumberland are concerned.

The same is true with respect to the railway which operates between Springhill junction on the Intercolonial railway and the seaport of Parrsboro on the basin of Minas. I am told there are coal areas along the line of this railway which are not being operated because capital will not be invested in them, that they will not be opened up because in the trans-shipment of coal they would be at a very great disadvantage, that the marginal profit on such operations is so small that a company could not compete, on the one hand, with the railway coal company, and on the other hand with the Springhill Coal Company, which owns the line from Springhill junction to the Springhill mines, and thence to Parrsboro. Trade is being restrained and injury done to business interests which are already established, and there is no hope for any further development. There is no inducement for any continued investment of capital, and what is true of one railway is true of the other.

Take the railway which operates in the county of Westmorland, which I have the honour to represent. That railway runs between Sackville and Cape Tormentine on the Straits of Northumberland, at which point there is the shortest distance between Prince Edward Island and the mainland that is to be found anywhere along the coast. That railway known as the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island rail-

way should be acquired by the Government and operated in connection with its Prince Edward Island traffic, and also in connection with the traffic that naturally comes from the Government road in Prince Edward Island known as the Prince Edward Island railway. We had much ado about the ferry service between those points or between other points on the Straits of Northumberland. I had supposed from the telegrams which had been sent by the right hon. the leader of the Government to the leader of the Conservative party in the province of Prince Edward Island that the matter had been determined, and that action would be taken. I concluded, from the letter addressed by the Minister of Railways to the people of Charlottetown just one year ago that action would be probably taken then. It was announced that plans had been prepared, that tenders had been called for, and that there would be connection between the mainland and Prince Edward Island by November, 1912. The matter seems to have been forgotten, and Parliament has not been furnished with information as to the steps, if any, which the Government have taken. That question is allied with the branch line policy; it connects the Intercolonial with the traffic of a whole province, and it makes one the two separated parts of the Government railway system. That car ferry should be established and established now. Probably the Government have been so occupied with decapitations of officials and with finding positions for their needy friends, that they have been unable to take into consideration these important matters; it has been a Government looking after individuals and not looking after the collective interests of the community. The inactivity of the Government in regard to these two particular measures justifies the strongest condemnation.

I trust the Government will bear in mind the last paragraph of this resolution. It may be that a branch line would not at present be in a position to make a financial showing that would justify the Government in taking it over, but the main question that should be considered by the Government in such a matter is, whether the taking over of that branch line would be of advantage to the trade and commerce of Canada generally, or to the Intercolonial itself, by reason of enabling the Intercolonial to enter a larger zone of usefulness. The financial aspect of the matter, of course, should not be overlooked, but if the acquisition of a railway would mean advantage to the Dominion of Canada generally with relation to the transportation problem, then the Government should determine to take over that road. There have been railways which when operated as local concerns did not pay, but which when taken over by trunk line companies were found to be a valuable asset. The Tobique Valley railway is a case in point. The Minister of Marine knows that the Tobique Valley railway was constructed with the aid of Provincial and Dominion subsidies. It connects with the Canadian Pacific railway at Perth in Victoria county, and it was for some time operated by a private company. I am informed that for a number of years the company had difficulty in meeting its bond interest, that no interest was paid on the stock and that it was practically worthless. The Canadian Pacific railway secured that railway and have been operating it on the basis of a percentage of gross earnings, payable annually to the Tobique railway company, with the result that the interest on the bonds is now being met and that a dividend is being paid to the stockholders.

Mr. HAZEN: I think my hon. friend is not correct in that. I know something about the facts as I was a trustee for the bondholders. The road was never operated except by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Before it was finished an agreement was entered into with the Canadian Pacific railway to operate the road, on a payment of forty per cent of the gross earnings which was security for the payment of the interest on the bonds. There were two issues of bonds, one for $5,000 a mile and a second issue also for $5,000 per mile. For a time the forty per cent of the gross earnings was not sufficient to pay the interest on the first issue, but subsequently it became sufficient, and after a good many years of operation, the forty per cent is now I think very nearly paying the interest on the second bond issue of $5,000 a mile.

Mr. EMMERSON: I thank my hon. friend for the information which no doubt is correct as the hon. gentleman is in a position to know. I was informed that a dividend was being paid on the stock now.

Mr. CARVELL: So there is.

Mr. EMMERSON: I was so informed.

Mr. CARVELL: I have a client who is a stockholder and he informed me during the last month that he was receiving dividends on his stock now.

Mr. HAZEN: If so it must have been very recently.

Mr. EMMERSON: My information did not come from my hon. friend; it came entirely apart; it was given to me a year ago or more.

Mr. HAZEN: There was a large sum of money to overtake because of the non-payment of interest on bonds for so many years. Maybe that has been paid now and also interest on the stock. I was not aware of it.

Mr. EMMERSON: That does not affect the principle. Take the Canada Eastern

railway, as it was formerly known; it was not a success financially; it was absorbed by the Intercolonial; and I venture to make this assertion, not fearing successful contradiction, that there has been no better paying section of the Intercolonial than that portion of it between Loggieville and Fredericton; and even if it had not been, it has been of advantage in other directions, of great advantage to the Intercolonial itself in conserving to that railway the zone of influence which it should control as a government railway along the North shore. More than that, there have been afforded facilities under government operation, which could not possibly have been secured if the company operation had been continued. There should be no question as to the amount of money that is involved in the taking over of these railways. As a matter of economy in the interests of the Intercolonial itself, those branch lines of railway should be acquired, in order that they may be enabled to utilize the stock when it becomes obsolete for use on a trunk line and when it can only be available for use on a branch line or a small line of railway; take in the matter of engines, cars, both passenger and freight, rails which are being taken up year by year by the Intercolonial, because they have become too light along the Intercolonial by reason of decay—rust is the word that should be used instead of rot; take in the matter of bridges that are lying along the line of the Intercolonial railway, in the province of New Brunswick alone to-day, there are many thousands and thousands and tens of thousands of dollars' worth of steel rails, of bridges, of obsolete cars, of obsolete engines which could be made available, without any very great expenditure on the part of the Government, for these branch lines of railway. Yet the people living along these lines are denied the privilege of proper facilities, because the Government has delayed and too long delayed and because—if it is any asset to my hon. friend—his predecessors too long delayed in moving in this matter.

Mr. COCHRANE: And yourself?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend says myself. As an individual I was not in a position to advocate it; but during the time I was Minister of Railways, while I was in a position to advocate it as a member of the Government, I found that these things came about by evolution. If it had depended upon myself between the year 1903 and April 1907, as a business proposition, these railways would have been acquired by the Intercolonial railway. I am not dealing with this matter as a political question or from a partisan standpoint; I have repeatedly on the floor of this House refuted any such idea. To-day I am charging the Government with negligence in connection with the matter, as I charged their predecessors. To-day I am charging them with broken promises, because there are broken pledges with respect to the matter. I feel that it is my duty, the country know about it; the people in the East know this to be true; and I am directing the attention of this House and the direction of the people of Canada to the facts as they exist, without regard to any political bias and without any hope of making any party, political point in connection with the whole subject. The point is that the people of the Maritime provinces want these lines to be operated as a part of the Intercolonial railway, and they have had the promise of this Government that they would be so operated. I am asking at the hands of this Parliament a declaration on their part that this policy shall be declared to be acceptable to this House, to be acted upon by the Government of the day. The trouble with us in the East has been too long that our members and representatives are too intent upon making some little, puny, party, political point in connection with the great activities of eastern Canada; too long have they not been willing to stand shoulder to shoulder to see that their interests are conserved. It may be small politics; it may content many hon. members to indulge in that sort of thing; but it is not in the interests of the people whom they represent. Some little political party advantage may be secured, either in this constituency or in connection with that constituency, by reason of the adoption of such a picayune policy of thinking first of party interest and afterwards of the interests of the constituency which you serve. I think the time has come, if it is not already here, when the men of eastern Canada should stand in the interests of eastern Canada. The number of their representatives is lessening year by year, Parliament by Parliament, or at least every ten years. How long will it be before they come to the almost vanishing point I know not; but I say that the influence of the East is lessening; and where it is divided, where hon. members are content to think only of small, petty, party advantages, rather than the interests of the East; so long as that continues, the interests of the East will be neglected. I have moved this resolution in this House on many occasions, and with but one or two exceptions I have not had the assistance of those who do not see eye to eye with me politically. This resolution has been moved year after year, and I have never found, with the one or two exceptions to which I have referred, a Maritime province man standing in his place and asserting the interests of the Intercolonial railway, the interests of the

people living along these branch lines and the promotion of trade in connection with the communities that are thus served. We are all very enthusiastic about building up a trade with the West Indies or with this or that country, or voting subsidies for a steamship line to promote trade with this or that country; but in the matter of taking over by the Intercolonial railway of the branch lines which would develop and promote traffic in the district served by these branch lines, no voice is raised, everything is hushed and still, and there is silence whenever this proposition is made, for fear perhaps that some little party interest will be injured, or that there will be some stepping upon the toes of this or that leader in the Government. I ask that this should cease, and that the men of eastern Canada should one and all unite, stand together with respect to this matter. How did the Hudson Bay railway ever find lodgment in the minds of the members of this Parliament? Simply because the men of western Canada, the men of the prairie provinces, stood together and said: You must give us the Hudson Bay railway, opposition being broken down ever since they sent their delegates, and ever since they asserted their demands for the construction of the Hudson Bay railway. We have immense delegations to the Minister in connection with the Trent Valley waterway. We have equally large delegations asking for the construction of a new Welland canal. Not satisfied that we have one, which has been rebuilt once and which affords excellent facilities for the transportation from one lake to another, they want millions upon millions, and scores of millions, invested in the building of another Welland canal, putting out of business entirely the present one. How comes it that these things are even considered now, or even tolerated, by a Parliament of Canada? Simply because influences are exercised, and directed; influences concentrated, in the hands of the party in the province of Ontario supporting the Government has moved this thing forward with such momentum that it is now irresistible, and before long we shall have a new Welland canal. And yet the Maritime provinces are left to chew over the promises that were made with respect to the acquisition of the branch lines and the construction of the car ferry. And so will it be so long as the members supinely sit and take such treatment at the hands of those who are interested, perhaps, in doing that which they are compelled to do because of political exigencies. The time has come when there should be a right about face in this matter. I ask the Minister of Railways, I ask the members of the Government, I ask the Conservative members from the Maritime provinces, to stand up here and say: We will carry out the pledges made by our right hon. leader; we will have fulfilled the representations that were made to the people of Eastern Canada during the last general election, and we will have them fulfilled now. Now is the time when it is desirable that this should be done.

There is one thing which the former Government did which might well be accepted as a precedent by the present Administration, and that is the laying down of the policy with respect to the operation of what is known as the River Valley railway, to be controlled and operated by the Intercolonial railway. There is a contract in the Department of Railways and Canals whereby the Government of Canada is bound, when that railway is completed, according to certain terms and provisos, to take hold of it and operate it in connection with the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. CROCKET: That is one of the things which this Government has done along the line of the hon. gentleman's proposal.

Mr. EMMERSON: I am thankful for small mercies; and if the Government of Canada has done anything in that direction, I am willing to admit it. It is the principle I have sought to have adopted, and it was adopted by the previous Government.

Mr. CROCKET: Does the hon. gentleman call this a small mercy?

Mr. EMMERSON: It is small in comparison to other mercies that have been promised. It is simply a question of comparison. Many other great things have been promised. But I was going on to say that it was the previous Government that adopted that principle, that entered into that contract which this Government is obliged to carry out.

Mr. COCHRANE: The previous Government did not enter into that contract.

Mr. EMMERSON. I stand corrected with regard to that.

Mr. COCHRANE: Another thing you have to be thankful for.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am afraid I shall have very little occasion to be thankful for things accomplished by my hon. friend in that direction.

Mr. COCHRANE: I accomplished that; I entered into that contract.

Mr. EMMERSON: My hon. friend knows, and the people of New Brunswick know, that the contract was drawn up and the arrangements made between the former Government and the company,

and the pledge given whereby the Government was to take that road and operate it upon certain conditions. The mere execution of the contract, the signing of the document, is one thing, but the arrangements entered into is another thing. I am stating the fact——

Mr. CARVELL: The contract was signed by the former Minister of Railways.

Mr. COCHRANE: No.

Mr. CARVELL: It was. I have a copy of it. I can tell the hon. gentleman where the original was signed by the former Minister of Railways.

Mr. COCHRANE: It was not in the department.

Mr. EMMERSON: Mr. Speaker, I think I have the floor. The point that is raised is quite immaterial to the question which I was discussing. The point I make is that the former Government had admitted the principle of taking over this road. It was in consequence of the agitation of the branch line question in this Parliament during a period of years, and it resulted in such a policy being accepted by the former Government. I am glad that this Government is carrying it out also. I shall be very grateful if, at the end of the period, they are in a position to honestly fulfil the expectations of the people with regard to the operation of that railway.

Mr. RHODES: Will you support them if they do?

Mr. EMMERSON: In this, I certainly will support them.

Mr. PELLETIER: That is not an answer.

Mr. EMMERSON: I cannot go over holus bolus like my hon. friend. If they go on doing right, I might go over by degrees; I will support them in anything good that they do; and, so far as they are doing anything in the acquiring of branch lines, I am willing to support them and give them credit for what they are doing. I am not small enough to refuse credit to opponents who bring forward a proposition in which I believe. I announced in this House last session, that, in the matter of the car ferry service, I would applaud and support the Government in any movement they might make in that direction. I will stand by my colours on that, and will give the Government credit, not merely in this House, but in the country, if they carry out their pledges in regard to it and meet the expectations of the people. And so with the principle of the branch lines adopted by the preceding Government in the matter of the River Valley railway. That has been adopted by this Government, and under the agreement this Government is pledged when the River Valley road is completed, to take it over and operate it as part of the Intercoloial railway. Why, then, should there be any hesitation about their agreeing to the policy outlined in this resolution? They are doing it in the matter of that particular railway, although that railway will not be considered a direct feeder of the Intercolonial; although that railway is isolated, in a way, from the Intercolonial, and outside its original sphere of influence. They are committed to the principle in the execution of the contract they have at this moment admitted their having entered into. I ask, then, why should there be any hesitancy in answering the question respecting branch lines, which has stood on the Order Paper almost since the beginning of this session? Why cannot my hon. friend, speaking on behalf of the Government, say to the House and the country: we have admitted the principle with respect to the River Valley railway and other lines; we are going to acquire the branch lines and thus at once carry out the policy of the acquisition of branch line railways in connection with the Intercolonial, and money will be provided in the Estimates for the purpose of executing our decision in this regard. But no! My hon. friend is constrained to say he has not reached a conclusion—the Government is still considering the matter. How long did it take them to consider their action with respect to the River Valley road? And, having made their decision in this regard, why should it not stand good with respect to any or all of the roads, and particularly with respect to the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway; with respect to the lines that run from Salisbury to Albert Corners, and from Moncton to Buctouche; with respect to the Kent Northern and Caraquet roads, which traverse a very prosperous and flourishing section of the province of New Brunswick, and the Matapedia road, running from Matapedia to Gaspé. There are many of these roads, including the Nova Scotia coal roads, in the constituency of the hon. member for Cumberland. Why should it not stand good with respect to those branch lines in Kings county, and running through into the county of St. John, and to St. Martins from Hampton in the county of Kings.

There is one road which this Government has allowed to pass into the hands of the Canadian Pacific railway, and that was known as the Central railway. This line was owned by the province of New Brunswick, in the operation of which that province has invested a million and a quarter of money. That road has been handed over to the Canadian Pacific railway to be operated by them not on a basis

of a division of the gross earnings, but on the basis of a participation in the proportion of the net earnings. Did anyone ever hear of a proposition of that kind in any country with respect to the leasing of a railway? It is one entirely new, and unique in the history of railway corporations. They handed that railway, serving a rich country, furnishing a splendid traffic, to the Canadian Pacific railway—for nothing. Without even an encumberance upon it they have passed it over to the Canadian Pacific railway for nine hundred and ninety-nine years, although it makes no difference whether it was ninety-nine or nine hundred and ninety-nine—it is the property of the Canadian Pacific railway, and its possession by that company places it in a position to insist upon running rights and privileges over the Intercolonial in order to connect their system in the centre of New Brunswick with their branch line terminating at Truro in Nova Scotia. It placed the Canadian Pacific railway in possession of a vantage point which they will not be slow to seize upon, and it has given them the control and monopoly of the railway system in the western portion of New Brunswick. They entirely control the county of Charlotte in the matter of railway facilities; they have control of all that district adjacent to the river St. John; they are acquiring now the Temiscouata—a road which the Government of Canada should long ago have acquired. By the acquisition of the Temiscouata road the Canadian Pacific railway will simply scoop in the whole of the center of New Brunswick, and, without any competition, monopolize all the traffic, charging what they please. The fact that the Temiscouata road was owned by a separate corporation made it possible for a shipper at St. John to send his merchandise over the Intercolonial to Riviere du Loup and over the Temiscouata line from Riviere du Loup to Edmunston at a lower rate than the same shipper could ship direct to Grand Falls on the Canadian Pacific railway, which is nearer St. John than is Edmunston—the latter place being on the direct line from St. John via the Canadian Pacific railway. But no! They will give you rates over their line to Edmunston cheaper than they will give it to Grand Falls, because the Intercolonial and the Temiscouata submit competitive rates, this having the effect of lowering the rate over the Canadian Pacific railway from St. John to Edmunston. And so shall it be with respect to the centre of the province, and in the county of Kings, in connection with the coal areas there. They will control the Minto line and it is claimed by many they will eventually control the River Valley, the contract to that which we have referred, to the contrary notwithstanding. They now control the Central railway, formerly owned by the province of New Brunswick, operating from Norton to Chipman and on to Minto. They will soon acquire, as we are led to understand from the Minister of Railways, running rights over the Intercolonial from St. John eastward. Having acquired these advantages, securing the Central railway for absolutely nothing, they will be in a position to have at their mercy the people of the central and western portions of New Brunswick, and if the time ever comes that this Government should hand the Intercolonial over to the Canadian Pacific railway, or to any other railway corporation, the people of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia will be in the grip of a huge railway monopoly. My remarks are based upon the movements transpiring all around us in connection with railway matters in eastern Canada. There is a profound sentiment among the people that the necessity that the Government should continue to operate the Intercolonial is one that should be recognized by the present Administration, and that it should also acquire the branch lines and operate them in conjunction with the Government railway system. The Canadian Pacific railway have recently taken over the Dominion Atlantic railway, a railway that should have been acquired by a former Government. The Dominion Atlantic railway runs from Windsor to Yarmouth in Nova Scotia and has running rights over the Intercolonial railway between Windsor and Halifax. The Canadian Pacific railway having acquired that road and, having acquired the road from Truro to Windsor, are in a position to control the whole traffic of western Nova Scotia, they have the people at their mercy. It is all very well to say there can be no evasions but there are evasions, notwithstanding the efforts of Government to regulate the traffic.

Mr. HAZEN: Why did not the Government supported buy the Dominion Atlantic?

Mr. EMMERSON: I say that the Government which I supported did not buy it and I condemned them for it and I unhesitatingly say they ought to be condemned for it. I am not indulging in any little local politics as my hon. friend did the other night when speaking on a great national question. I am speaking of a principal involved in this resolution, a principle not in the interest of governments or of corporations but in the interest of the people and I think my hon. friend in asking me a question of that kind is not paying the respect which is my due when I am presenting before this Parliament arguments in favour of this proposition. Have I not admitted already that the former Government should have gone on? The question is not as to which Government does these things, the wrong is that it is not done and the wrong

is on the part of the Governments of Canada in permitting this thing to go on, in permitting the aspirations of the people to be stifled, their interest crushed and in giving a monopoly the control of the whole western section of a great, rich and flourishing province like Nova Scotia. I have illustrated New Brunswick. This is an illustration of the condition of things as they exist to-day in Nova Scotia. How much wider this thing is going to go and how much more is there to be overflowing of the banks which should protect the people from inundation I know not but I am asking the consideration of this Parliament in behalf of a resolution which will, I believe, in some measure be a resistance against the incoming tide of great corporation control in the matter of railways at least.

I feel that I should make an apology to the House for taking up so much time in view of the fact that I have so frequently on former occasions addressed myself to this subject; but my excuse is that I believe it to be in the interests of the people, in the interest of the Intercolonial railway, in the interest of the solution of at least one feature of the great transportation problem of Canada.

Mr. CLARENCE JAMESON (Digby): Mr. Speaker, for one who stated during the course of his remarks that he did not propose to discuss this question from a political or partisan standpoint, the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has delivered a most extraordinary argument. He began in a mild and reasonable manner but he had not proceeded very far in his address before he arraigned the Prime Minister of this country for as he said misleading the people of the Maritime provinces. He was forced however before he concluded his remarks, by some question asked him by some hon. member on this side of the House, to arraign the administration of which for fifteen years he had been a supporter. He arraigned them because, as he said, they had not done the proper thing in connection with the acquisition of branch lines as feeders of the Intercolonial railway.

The hon. gentleman was himself in this House a supporter of that administration for a number of years, and for several years, at least, he had the honour of holding the portfolio of railways as a member of that Government. During that time I am free to admit that the hon. gentleman frequently raised his voice in this House, as he has done since, in favour of the acquisition of branch lines by the Intercolonial railway, but he must be compelled by the record to admit that he did not accomplish very much in that particular regard.

Now after the lapse of but fifteen or sixteen months since this Administration came into office, he rises in his place and because they have not done in fifteen or sixteen months what the preceding Government did not do in fifteen years forsooth he arraigns the Prime Minister of Canada for misleading and deceiving the people of the Maritime provinces in connection with the acquisition of branch lines.

There is this distinction between the hon. gentleman, who was formerly Minister of Railways and the present minister of that department, that whereas the hon. gentleman frequently released his energy in speech, the present minister acts. He is not a man who takes up much time in this House in speaking, but in the administration of his department there has in my opinion never been his equal.

My hon. friend said that legislation should have been foreshadowed in the Speech from the Throne in connection with this branch lines question. Why was it necessary that such legislation should be foreshadowed? I do not suppose my hon. friend inquired of himself as to why in his judgment this was the case, or he would scarcely have adventured so unfortunate a statement. If legislation be required this is the reason simply because the legislation which was placed upon the Statute Book in 1910 by the previous administration in connection with the acquisition of branch line railways was, I think I may say advisedly, prepared to make it impossible to acquire them, and it was done very skilfully I am compelled to admit. The method which was taken to prevent the acquisition of branch lines by the previous Administration was that by that legislation the Government of the day demanded so high a physical standard of the railway to be acquired that none of the branch line railway companies could raise the money necessary to put their systems into a condition which would bring them up to that standard. That was the condition of affairs under the preceding Administration.

My hon. friend said, in connection with the St. John Valley railway, I think that this Government has created a precedent by agreeing to take it over. And he says, because we have done that, we should immediately bring down a policy to take over other roads. But there is this distinction between the case of the St. John Valley railway and that of other branch line railways: that railway is at present under construction and of course will be up to a certain physical standard when completed; while the other railways have been constructed and operated for years, and are run down. Consequently there is

no similarity whatever between the two cases.

Now, Sir, I have every sympathy with the resolution which is before the House. I think it is a question which deserves the most serious consideration, and that, I am sure, it will receive from the Government. But I do not think it is fair for my hon. friend to wax so indignant or so eloquent over the remissness, as he chooses to style it, of this Administration, because they have not done in fifteen months what the Government of which he is a supporter, failed to do during fifteen years.

My hon. friend says that the Maritime provinces have been unfairly treated by this Government—I think these are the exact words he used. In my judgment, the Maritime provinces have been very fairly dealt with by this Government. I believe that my hon. friend himself will be forced to admit that when I draw his attention to the work that is going on at Courtenay bay in the province of New Brunswick, to the St. John River Valley railway, to which he himself alluded, also in the province of New Brunswick; and to the projected car ferry between the mainland and Prince Edward Island.

Mr. HAZEN: Which is under contract.

Mr. JAMESON: The contract for the construction of that car ferry is now, I understand, signed.

Mr. EMMERSON: Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the car ferry is now under contract? If that is so I might congratulate the Government.

Mr. HAZEN: It is so.

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend seems to be very much surprised.

Mr. EMMERSON: I think the Minister of Railways might have told us so.

Mr. JAMESON: In the province of Nova Scotia we have a very different condition of affairs from that which hitherto prevailed. I remember a former president of the Halifax Board of Trade, a very ardent Liberal, saying once that the province of Nova Scotia was 'connected with the rest of the Dominion by two streaks of rust,' referring to the single line of the Intercolonial. He also spoke very strongly as to the necessity for improved terminals and dock facilities at Halifax. Now, as this House is aware, the present Government have taken measures to give the port of Halifax facilities by which it will become one of the great Atlantic ports of this Dominion, and all that to which I have alluded, pressed forward within the fifteen months that the Government have been in office. Therefore, I do not think my hon. friend can say that this Government has treated the Maritime provinces unfairly.

But might I ask my hon. friend to look back to the time of the construction of the Transcontinental railway? The Transcontinental railway, as you remember, Mr. Speaker, was an issue in the federal election of 1904. After that election we found that from the province of Nova Scotia there had been returned to this House a solid delegation of eighteen Liberals, and yet the only province of the dominion which will not be served by that railway, in which not one mile of rails has been laid, is the province of Nova Scotia, barring, of course, the province of Prince Edward Island which, owing to physical conditions, could not possibly be traversed by that road.

My hon. friend laments a rumour that the Intercolonial is to become a company road, and he predicts dire misfortunes if such should be the case. Well, I saw some reference to that in the St. John Telegraph of December 22, last, but from whom did it come?

Mr. HAZEN: The St. John Telegraph advocated it a few years ago.

Mr. JAMESON: This is the reference in the St. John Telegraph, in a despatch from Montreal dated December 21:

> Five lower province men in Montreal to-day declared themselves in favour of company ownership of the Intercolonial railway. They are W. A. Black and Lt.-Col. Whitman, of Halifax; Mathew Lodge, of Moncton; E. McDonald, M.P., for Pictou, and H. J. Logan, ex-M.P., for Cumberland.

I do not say that my hon. friend the member for Pictou who is not in his seat at the present time, is in favour of the acquisition of the Intercolonial by any of the transcontinental railways in this country; I merely state that it was so reported in that despatch. The Telegraph, which, a few years ago, was in favour of the Intercolonial railway being handed over to one of the great railways of Canada in an editorial of December 24, said—

Mr. EMMERSON: That was when it was controlled by Conservatives.

Mr. HAZEN: Not at all. The hon. gentleman is wrong there, it was when it was under Liberal control.

Mr. JAMESON: The Telegraph in its issue of December 24, made this reference at the conclusion of its editorial:

> The Intercolonial is a tremendously important public asset. A policy of 'hands off and a business-like management free from politics' will suit the people. The party that tries to alienate the road will be likely to encounter the public in a head-on collision.

I do not know whether the hon. member for Pictou expressed himself in favour of the sale of that road, or of its acquisition by a company, but if so, that is an awful prediction which the Telegraph makes.

My hon. friend referred to the fact that the Maritime provinces were losing representation in this House and unfortunately this is a fact. In 1891 Nova Scotia sent to this House twenty members, and after the census of 1901, when our Liberal friends opposite had been in office for six years, the redistribution left us with but eighteen members. After ten years further tenure of office by hon. gentlemen opposite, the population of that province was such at the last census, in comparison with the rest of the Dominion, that we will lose two more representatives, and Nova Scotia in this House will for a time in future only be represented by sixteen members.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JAMESON: Mr. Speaker, when you left the chair at six o'clock, I was about to conclude my remarks by saying that I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) in his statement that the Maritime provinces have been unfairly treated by this Government, in the face of the facts. The Maritime provinces, however, were unfairly treated by the previous Administration, and more especially the province of Nova Scotia by the failure of that Government to bring the Transcontinental railway down to the port of Halifax.

In the province of Nova Scotia to-day, yes, I think I may say in the three Maritime provinces, there is a feeling of optimism and hope in the future, which has not been known there for years. Although in the past these provinces have lost from their representation in this House, that representation will, I believe, be restored in the not far distant future, and that by means of their development, by the increased population as the result of the active interest which this Administration is taking in agriculture, in fisheries, in immigration, and in transportation. I believe that under the Borden Administration the development, and the increased population of the Maritime provinces will be such, that the representation which those provinces formerly had in this House, will be restored to them, as a result of the good honest and progressive Administration to which I have already alluded.

Mr. TURGEON (Gloucester): It is not my intention to occupy the time of the House very long on this question. My sentiments have been expressed on many occasions in previous parliaments on this question of the extension of the Intercolonial railway and the acquisition of these branch lines. I wish to accentuate every word that my hon. friend the member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has said on behalf of his motion before the Government to-day. It has been stated that the previous Administration had not completed its work in that matter before the last dissolution in 1911. May I be permitted again to repeat that for many years when such a proposition was attempted on the part of some of the members from the Maritime provinces, or upon the part of some of the newspapers of the Maritime provinces, it was found every time that public opinion in the western provinces had not been sufficiently cultivated to warrant the Government undertaking such a project without responsive echoes from the West as well as from the East. It was the intention of the previous Administration not to have the people of Canada consider the Intercolonial as merely the property of the Eastern or Maritime provinces, but to create and confirm the opinion in the mind of every Canadian citizen that the Intercolonial railway is a national asset, and that the country at large should take the same interest in it, whether they come from the extreme east or the extreme west. To the credit of my hon. friend the member for Westmorland, I may say that he has no doubt been the one, foremost of all in the Maritime provinces, to exert his activities in that direction in order to create a more favourable opinion on behalf of the Intercolonial railway in the Maritime provinces. To him perhaps is due more credit than to anybody else irrespective of party politics, and I for one wish to say that I take a legitimate pride in considering that for the last fifteen years I have given him all assistance in my power, whether in this House, by public utterances in the small region or scope of my influence, or through the public press, when until very recent years I had under my direction a French newspaper in New Brunswick. It is nothing new, but I must say it is to the credit of my hon. friend the member for Westmorland, who has been told by the hon. member, who just taken his seat, that nothing has been done in that direction. I might recall to the mind of my hon. friend the member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) that one of the first acts of my hon. friend the member for Westmorland, when he assumed the office of Minister of Railways in 1903-4, was to take over the main branch line at the time from Loggieville to Fredericton, a line which up to that time had not proved to be of commercial or financial benefit; but which has ever since proved to be not only a benefit to the Intercolonial, but also of

extreme benefit to the whole population along that line. Now, with all that work and the work of the hon. member for Westmorland, a stronger and better opinion prevails in the west. For the last two or three years previous to the last election the former Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) and the then Administration took every possible step in order to secure an understanding with the different companies owning the different branches, especially in Nova Scotia. As the hon. member for Digby has charged the ex-Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) with having imposed upon the owners of the branch lines conditions and standards which in his opinion made it impracticable for them to accept the standards required, I might say that this showed no favouritism on the part of the Government to the owners of those lines. If the conditions were made too hard for them, it was better than to have made them too easy.

If that was all the trouble, I believe it would have been very easy for my friends who came into power after the 21st of September, 1911, to at once come to terms with the owners of those branches. It has been my fate in the exercise of my duty to again, since the last election, call the attention of this House and of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Cochrane) last year to this matter, and he gave me his reply that he had not had sufficient time yet to consider the question; but if I understand the meaning of his words, that he would do so after the session, during the vacation. In the first days of the opening of this session I again called the attention of the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals; and in the course of my remarks mentioned the disquietude which prevailed in the minds of many of our people along the Intercolonial, more particularly in the Maritime Provinces, as to the possible agreement existing between the Government and the owners of other corporations wishing to acquire the railroad, or rights perhaps more extensive than should be granted to them. I do not say that those rumours were well founded or well grounded. It has, however, been proved to-day by my hon. friend the member for Westmorland as well as by my hon. friend the member for Digby that such a feeling exists at the present time, not only among the people of the Maritime Provinces, but in Montreal and the western provinces as well; and without making any charge whatever against the Minister of Railways and Canals, or any member of the Government, I take the liberty to warn every member of the Government and every member on both sides of the House that public opinion in the Maritime Provinces, and to-day I may say public opinion in the country at large, will never tolerate that this great asset of the Canadian people should pass from the hands of the people into the hands of any corporation, whatever it may be. I will only say that I am personally interested in the acquisition of some of those branches on behalf of the people whom I represent, and the part of the country from which I come. Since the acquisition of the Canadian Eastern railway by the previous Administration, we have in the county of Gloucester to-day perhaps one of the most important of those branches, possessing over eighty-four miles of railway, traversing I may say the whole county of Gloucester from Bathurst to Caraquet, and from Caraquet to Tracadie and Shippigan, called the Caraquet and Gulf Shore railway. On this railroad, the same arrangements have been made and the people have been anxiously awaiting the result of the conferences. I might repeat also that in my county as well as in other counties in New Brunswick during the election of 1911, the Conservative candidate declared that whichever party came into power, that part of the railroad would be acquired by the Government, because the leading member of the Conservative party had so promised. I have upheld this policy for the last fifteen years, and have pressed it just as earnestly upon my hon. friend the present Minister of Railways as I pressed it upon his predecessor in office in the late Administration. I hope we shall soon receive from the Government some satisfactory assurance that that measure will be undertaken. The railway in the counties of Gloucester, as my hon. friend must have observed, is one of the most populous and wealthy portions of New Brunswick. It has a population of from 21,000 to 22,000, from Bathurst to Tracadie. Great development has gone on there especially within the last two years. This district possesses the greatest fishing interests known in the province of New Brunswick. It has also great lumber interests which require constantly more and more transportation facilities, for every market of the world has to be competed for. It possesses free stone quarries at Clifton and Stonehaven, which have reached great development, the products of which have been forwarded chiefly to the United States so far, because the freight rates, especially on the branch lines, are so high that competition in the western provinces market is prevented. It has been fully demonstrated by the hon. member for Westmorland that the Government can operate these branch lines with what may be practically considered old stock, not adapted to the trade of the day on the main line, and can operate them without great extra cost; and carrying more than merely local traffic, the Government

can operate them at lower rates than the present operators are compelled to charge. I believe the hon. member for Westmorland has made it clear that he wishes all these branches to be taken over. For we all know very well that the commercial conditions of the day in a given district may not be what they are pretty sure to be a few years hence. Many of these branches which now yield no dividend to their owners will yield such dividends within a short time, owing to the great changes which are taking place in all departments of trade. I hope the Government will at once dispel the fear that prevails in certain quarters of the possibility of the transfer of this great asset of the Dominion of Canada, the Intercolonial railway, to the hands of a private corporation. And I would urge the Minister of Railways also to give this question of the branch lines his immediate consideration. The sooner he can inform the public at large, and especially the people of the Maritime provinces, of his intention to continue the policy of the last three years, the more popular will his action be.

Hon. C. MARCIL (Bonaventure): It affords me very much pleasure to congratulate the hon. member for Westmorland, the former Minister of Railways and Canals, upon having once more brought this question to the attention of the House. If my memory serves me well, I have heard this question fully debated in this House on three different occasions. I am glad to know from the Minister of Railways and Canals that the question is still engaging the earnest attention of the Government of the day. This Government is the representative of one of the great political parties of this country, and that party has, in the past few years, expressed the intention of making the Intercolonial railway system what the fathers of Confederation intended that it should be, one of the permanent bonds of Confederation.

Though I do not wish to enter upon a discussion of the different phases of this question so ably treated by my hon. friend from Westmorland, I think I should be recreant to my duty did I allow this opportunity to pass without calling your attention and that of the Government to the condition in which, at the present time, the constituency I have the honour to represent in this House for the past twelve years finds itself with regard to the railway in question. In explaining that situation, I trust you will allow me to quote, very briefly, from Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Hector Langevin the reasons which brought about the construction of what was then known as the Baie des Chaleurs railway, now known as the Quebec Oriental railway, and which has been extended from Paspebiac, or rather from New Carlisle to Gaspé, under the name of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway. These reasons were set forth in 1883 by Sir Charles Tupper, and they are just as strong, even stronger, today. My constituency forms part of the peninsula of Gaspesia, one of the most interesting portions of the Dominion. It has a marine coast on the Baie des Chaleurs of about two hundred miles and a marine coast of about two hundred and fifty miles on the St. Lawrence. It is the end, so to speak, of the mainland of Quebec, and is half way between the St. Lawrence and the Maritime provinces. But for the interests conflicting with it in the Maritime provinces and the other older provinces of Canada, it would have been, long since, the stopping off place for the traffic from Europe and the place of embarkation for those going to Europe. Political reasons, at the time of Confederation, made it imperative that, while the traffic of the upper provinces went on through the St. Lawrence in the summer time, the winter traffic was diverted to St. John and Halifax. That, I am sorry for the peninsula of Gaspé to say, is still the state of affairs. The House will realize the very strong reasons given by Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Hector Langevin for the construction of this road. This is what Sir Charles Tupper, then Minister of Railways, said:

> The district that is proposed to be opened up by this Baie des Chaleurs railway is one that is well known to those who have paid any attention to the subject, to be very remote from the Intercolonial railway, and the communication with it to be exceedingly difficult; and we believe the opening up of that section of country will not only facilitate the business of a very large area, but by giving facilities of communication with the Intercolonial railway will also bring a large volume of traffic to that road, which otherwise would not reach it. The line is supposed to start from a point on the Intercolonial railway, at or near Matapedia station, and run thence in an easterly direction along the north shore of the Restigouche river, and Baie des Chaleurs to Paspebiac, a distance of 100 miles. It is contemplated to extend the line, not only to Paspebiac, but a distance of some eighty miles further on, to Gaspé basin. The resources of that district are very considerable. It is a very finely timbered country, and the product of the fisheries is very large. The hon. member for Gaspé (Dr. Fortin), who has given much attention to the resources of that section of the country, has prepared from trade returns of the province of Quebec, for 1881, a series of tables which show a very large product from the fisheries in that district.

Those resources have increased twenty-fold since that time. Speaking of the fisheries more particularly, Sir Charles Tupper says:

A large portion of the catch is despatched by sailing craft to the United States and foreign ports, whereas when the railway is constructed it is believed that the major part of the catch wil find its way to Quebec, Montreal and the western parts of Canada and the Northwest by rail, and not only so, but supplies from the western portions of the country will come down as return freight. The section of country of which I am speaking has not only valuable forrests but an agricultural district, which is very inviting to settlers, and it is believed that the construction of this railway will greatly conduce to the development of its resources.

The construction of the road is estimated to cost $2,590,000, and with an equipment of $100,000. The province of Quebec has, I believe, given a subsidy to this line of railway of 10,000 acres of land per mile along the route so far as available in that part of the country.

Then, after the subsidy had been voted, the company which undertook the construction of the road, realizing the following year that the undertaking was beyond its financial resources, applied for further assistance, and the Government set down the precedent that I am now speaking of. I am trying to keep my remarks as far as possible from the political arena and free from controversy, and dealing merely with the interests of the district concerned. In 1884, Sir Charles Tupper and Sir Hector Langevin laid before the House a proposition to build a branch of the Intercolonial railway from Matapedia eastwards. The intention at that time was to commence building the Baie des Chaleurs railway as a branch line feeder of the Intercolonial, and this is what we find in 'Hansard' of April 10, 1884, page 1510:

RAILWAY RESOLUTION.

For a branch of the Intercolonial railway from Matapedia eastward towards Paspebiac, in the province of Quebec, a sum not exceeding in the whole, $300,000.

Sir CHARLES TUPPER: We came to the conclusion that a feeder of the Intercolonial should be there, and we were prepared to ask the House for an amount for its construction. We have, therefore, decided to build a branch of twenty miles rather than ask for a larger sum.

Sir HECTOR LANGEVIN: The first twenty miles is the heaviest portion of the road line, and by building it as a branch of the Intercolonial, a fair chance will be given to the company to construct the balance of the line afterwards. The company have a subsidy of $3,200 per mile from this Government and 10,000 acres of land from the local government, and the right-of-way, which has not been bought, but has been given by the municipalities; and as the Dominion Government would build the heaviest portion of the line, the company would afterwards be able to get along.

I am sorry to say that unfortunately these hopes were not realized. The following year the company came again before Parliament and secured a subsidy, together with their usual grant. The construction of the line was undertaken, and in 1900, when I had the honour of being elected as representative of the constituency, the road had reached New Carlisle. The financial enterprise was too heavy for the company; its resources were not sufficient, and the road was turned over to trustees of the bondholders, who have since been continuing it, under the direction of Mr. Galindez a business man of some importance in the city of London, represented at New Carlisle by Mr. C. R. Scholes, a railway man of importance in the Maritime provinces, who has been operating this road for the last eleven years. I must give Mr. Scholes credit for the fact that under very great difficulties he has managed to keep the road running, and has succeeded in having a train running almost daily to New Carlisle—every ton of freight of course going to or over the Intercolonial railway. It has, therefore, become, in a sense if not in fact, a feeder of the Intercolonial railway, but has been carried on under very adverse circumstances. In 1903 or 1904 the hon. ex-Postmaster General, who then represented the constituency of Gaspé, was very anxious to give the constituency of Gaspé the railway communication to which it was entitled. After many efforts on his part he induced an English syndicate to undertake the construction of a railway from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin, a distance of 102 miles. This road has now been completed, and trains run regularly from Matapedia to Gaspé Basin, a distance of 202 miles. I would like to mention the fact that the Government inspector of railways has declared that the road which has been built from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin is of standard quality, and to his mind, is a specimen for railroad building in Canada. It was built by English engineers, and it was an exceedingly difficult road to build. From Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin no less than twenty-six iron bridges had to be constructed, the conformation of the country being such that this road ran along the shore of Chaleur bay and across the mouths of rivers at every point. A special subsidy of $250,000 was given to assist in the building of these iron bridges and, apart from that, the regular subsidy amounting to about $709,000. At the present time, therefore, we have a magnificent road, constructed with British capital and Government subsidies from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin. The promoter of the road was an Englishman named Carpenter, who was familiar with the conditions in Gaspé Basin, and who had been promoter of the oil wells there. He had managed to induce a banking institution that he had started

himself in London, called the Charing Cross Bank, to invest very heavily in this undertaking, and I understand that with the subsidy, and the money so obtained, the road was built to the satisfaction of the Government and of the people, who have been paid to the last dollar all that was coming to them. But the difficulty in which those interested in the Charing Cross Bank—who unfortunately are poor people who invested their money with promises of large returns of interest which were never forthcoming—the difficulty in which they found themselves was that this road found itself handicapped from connection with the Intercolonial railway except through the old Baie des Chaleurs railway. It would be impossible to run a modern train from Matapedia to Paspebiac; the engines now running on the line are those of the old Grand Trunk style of twenty-five years ago. With the exception of three or four old locomotives, and a few passenger cars, the rolling stock is almost entirely owned by other roads. In the summer months these roads have to compete with the boat running from Campbellton in the province of New Brunswick to Gaspé Basin. An appeal has lately been made to the Government to discontinue the payment of subsidies to this boat. I have the return brought before the House on this matter, and there is an interesting letter from Mr. Read, London, England, who is at present representative of the people who have put their money—over two millions and a half—into the construction of this road from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin. He advocates doing away with the subsidy to the steamer that is now running in operation to these railways. Mr. Read, who is managing director of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company, writes to the Minister of Railways and Canals as follows:

Sir,—I have the honour to draw your attention to the following circumstances in connection with this company's railway, and to submit for your consideration whether you cannot assist in developing the Baie des Chaleurs coast and the harbour of Gaspé.

There is a steamer subsidized by the Dominion Government running between Campbellton and Gaspé. I understand that the Intercolonial railway gives all through traffic intended for the coast to this steamer at Campbellton. It is submitted that the steamer subsidy should be withdrawn and all through traffic for places along the Baie des Chaleurs and Gaspé be handed over by the Intercolonial railway to the railways at Matapedia. This steamer does not, of course, run in the winter, but the railways have to, and it seems hardly fair that the Government railway should hand over the cream of the traffic to the steamer in the summer, when the railways have to bear the cost of serving the public in the winter.

Without the railways the important territories they serve cannot be developed, and unless the traffic is encouraged with a subsequent improvement in earnings, the railways cannot give such travelling facilities to the public as are necessary for the rapid development of the district served; a district where industries such as timber, fishing, agricultural and mining only wait encouragement to become of great importance. Further, the Baie des Chaleurs coast should, before long, become one of the most popular play-grounds of Canada and America.

The importance of Gaspé harbour alone should, it is submitted, justify the Government in helping to develop the railway.

This harbour is the best on the eastern Canadian sea-board. Situated within seven miles of the track followed by all the shipping up the St. Lawrence river, it is an ideal place for a dry-dock and wrecking plant. The harbour could be developed at a minimum of cost, no dredging being required. It is open for at least ten weeks longer than the St. Lawrence river and could at little cost be kept open all winter.

The route via Gaspé is the best for the interchange of traffic between the Dominion and Newfoundland, being nearly 400 miles nearer by rail to Montreal than Sydney, Cape Breton, and it is suggested that a subsidized line of steamers should be started between Gaspé and Newfoundland. The opening up of this route will also be an important factor in the development of Anticosti, the north shore of the gulf and Labrador.

As compared with Halifax the ocean route for Liverpool is rather shorter, and the rail haul to Montreal 180 miles shorter.

Mails could be landed at Gaspé effecting considerable saving in time, more especially for deliveries in New Brunswick and the south.

The strategic importance of this harbour in time of war as a harbour of refuge would be incalculable, protected as it would be by the straits of Belle Isle and the Cabot strait; and it is quite conceivable it might be the only Canadian harbour which could be used with safety by merchant vessels in war time.

In the interests, therefore, of the Dominion and of the considerable population in the districts served, it is submitted that the traffic on this important and costly railway undertaking should be encouraged and developed as rapidly as possible.

An acknowledgment was sent saying that the matter would be considered.

I have no intention of dealing with the steamer aspect of the question. That would come up more properly on the subsidies to steamers but I have brought up this phase of the question to show to the House the importance of Gaspe Basin which has been already signalized on several occasions by the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux). It is a splendid harbour where the Dominion Government is at present engaged in constructing a $300,000 wharf. As far back as 1535 it was visited by Jacques Cartier before he ascended the St. Lawrence, and the Prince of Wales, afterwards King Edward VII of revered memory, sought shelter with the British fleet before ascending the St. Lawrence on his way to

Canada. Yet this splendid harbour remains to-day dormant. The time has come when the Dominion Government should take up this matter and bring this magnificant part of the province of Quebec, rich in resources of all kinds, into direct and speedy communication with the rest of the Dominion. This cannot be done until the railway between Matapedia and Paspebiac is put into a more modern condition. It was built in 1885, it has been kept running and operated regularly but no substantial improvements have been made and the time has surely come when the Dominion Government should take up this matter and deal with it thoroughly. Canada has already expended enormous sums to give this particular connection to this peninsula. The subsidy paid to the Baie des Chaleurs railway exceeded $828,435 and the subsidy paid to the Atlantic, Quebec and Western amounted to $709,000. With the subsidies paid by the province of Quebec we have over $2,500,000 in round figures which have been paid for these roads and still the people have not the connections they should have. Their whole business is done with the province of New Brunswick on the other side of the bay during the navigation season and with St. John in the winter. Their winter communications with Quebec and Montreal are very difficult. When several snow-storms come in February or March, communications are exceedingly difficult—the rates on all freight traffic are very high. Local rates apply from Matapedia to Paspebiac and another local rate from Paspebiac to Gaspé Basin, so that a man ordering from Quebec has to deal with three railroads, the Intercolonial, the Quebec & Oriental, and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway. If a plebiscite were taken in the Gaspé peninsula to-day I am sure there would not be a dissenting voice raised against the proposal that the Government should take over this road and make it a feeder to the Intercolonial railway. The importance of the Intercolonial railway would be increased immensely in consequence, it would have a new sea-port in Gaspé Basin, a magnificent coast line opened up on the Baie des Chaleurs and sea communication on the St. Lawrence side of the Gaspé peninsula. It would bring within a few hours Anticosti and Newfoundland, in fact it would open up the whole of eastern Canada.

During the last 12 years I have voted for millions and millions of dollars of subsidies to build railways in all parts of Canada, especially in the West. I realize that in opening up western Canada we were favouring Canada as a whole. I do not begrudge anything that has been given to western Canada, but as has been truly said by the late Minister of Railways the interests of the older portions of this country should not be overlooked. I had occasion a few days ago to visit a portion of the Northwest for the first time in 15 years, and I came in contact with people in agricultural pursuits in that country who complain strongly if railway communication is not given them the second or third year after their arrival. Until a few years ago we had old men in Gaspé who had never seen a railway train, never seen a locomotive, and whose fathers and forefathers before them worked to build up this country. Men in western Canada ask for railway connections the day after their arrival, but in the old days of the eastern portion of Quebec and New Brunswick men gave up a lifetime to hew down one farm that they could hand down to their children. The claims of these men should not be overlooked, the claims of their descendants should not be overlooked. We have made the experiment of encouraging railways on the Gaspé peninsula, and of building railways by subsidies. Under both of these headings we have met with dismal failure. The railway statistics show that the surplus from the operation of the first hundred miles of the Baie des Chaleurs last year amounted to about $5,000 and that there was a net loss of $19,000 and that on the operation of the other 100 miles from Paspebiac to Gaspé. The reason of that is that these companies are operated by the trustees of bond-holders who are merely keeping the road running to save their charter, who are not investing a dollar more than is necessary, just keeping the thing going but not developing the country; but still we have in that Gaspé peninsula 10,000 square miles, the size of an ordinary kingdom in Europe, with a population of upwards of 60,000, and we could easily accommodate three or four times that number of people. We have enough pulp to keep the pulp mills of Canada running for many years to come. We have on the Baie des Chaleurs the most magnificent fisheries it is possible to conceive. But is it credible that on that whole line of railway, 200 miles, along one of the richest fishing coasts of the world, there is not a railway car in which you can send a pound of fish? No fish can be sent unless it is sent by boat to Campbellton, at great risk and expense. Apart from the fisheries, and from the lumber, which is being developed more than it has been in the past, we have untold minerals. The interior of Gaspé is really terra incognita, where those who have been through it say there are magnificent valleys rich in fertile soil, and minerals and coal oil deposits awaiting development. We have a magnificent harbour at Gaspé and others at Port Daniel and Paspebiac, which is one of the most magnificent natural harbours to be found in any country in the world. These har-

bours are deserted to-day, and the resources of the country are lying dormant in the soil. We, the representatives of the eastern part of Quebec, vote cheerfully millions of money to bring new settlers into this country. We realize that every settler that comes into Canada is an asset of the Dominion. We realize that once he has entered this country and experienced the benefits of living under British rule and under the British flag, that man becomes a good citizen of Canada. We vote that money cheerfully, but we ask the men who have been entrusted with power to-day, who have been chosen by the majority of the Canadian people to administer public affairs, to take up this question seriously and to see if we have not in that part of the country a magnificent asset which should be worked and developed. And the only way in which it can be worked and developed is to introduce the modern instrument of progress, the locomotive. If the Gaspé peninsula were connected with the Intercolonial railway, the change in that peninsula in 10 years would be inconceivable. Those hon. members of the House who have visited it, and I am sorry that a greater number have not done so, must have realized the magnificent opportunities we have there for settlement and for all kinds and branches of trade and industry. But, the people have no communication. What is the use of raising farm produce if you cannot reach the market? What is the use of fishing if you cannot send your fish to market? I have seen those splendid fish taken out of the water and literally soaked in salt. The value of those fish in the Montreal market would be 20 cents per pound, but it is transformed into dry codfish and the value is reduced to four or five cents per pound for lack of communication. Timber is there and some of the large timber limits are being developed. Some Americans have come in there. Mr. Cutler from Boston has made important investments on some rivers, and important concerns in Montreal have opened mills in Gaspé. Some members of this House have mills at Barachois, and Senator Edwards is operating limits. But they have only touched the fringe of that constituency, and realized only the possibilities of that whole region.

The time has surely come when the Minister of Railways should take this matter up not in a political spirit, but in a truly patriotic sense, and my appeal is addressed to both political parties. I say to him that if he could now, once and for all, solve the railway difficulty in that part of the country, he would be entitled to, and would receive, the everlasting gratitude of the people of the Gaspé peninsula.

Mr. PELLETIER: My hon. friend has referred to Mr. Read and to the steamship subsidy. The hon. member takes a deep interest in that part of the country which he represents. Would he kindly favour the House with his own views as to the feasibility of continuing that subsidy?

Mr. MARCIL: My intention was to deal with that more especially when the question of steamship subsidies came up. I am revealing no secret to my hon. friend in saying that it was promised at the time this railway was built that the subsidy to the steamer would be discontinued. It was one of the arguments for giving a subsidy when the railway was built, that it would be discontinued. These were the words used by Sir Charles Tupper in that connection:

> This district is very imperfectly served at present by steam communication, which is provided, of course, only during the season when navigation is open, and when navigation is not open the district is not served at all. When navigation is open communication is maintained by a steamer, which we are obliged to subsidize to the extent of $12,500 a year. It will be at once seen therefore, that not only will the service be performed much better, and throughout the entire year provided the company are able to raise a large additional amount of capital required. But the subsidy of $320,000 will render unnecessary the old subsidy of $12,500 a year, which at 4 per cent represents a capital of over $300,000. It will not be necessary to grant the subsidy of $12,500 a year which we are now obliged to give when the road is extended to Gaspe; and so soon as the railway reaches Paspebiac, even supposing steam communication could be maintained between that port and Gaspe, it will be only for a distance of 80 miles and will be performed at a small cost.

My opinion of the matter as a business proposition is this: I do not see how the Government of Canada can afford to pay a subsidy to a steamer to run in opposition to those railways, provided they are put on a proper footing. If they become part of the Intercolonial, or feeders or branches of the Intercolonial system, as the Fathers of Confederation intended they should be, I would say at once that under such conditions the subsidy to that steamer should be discontinued. But the Postmaster General will admit, if he has visited the country lately, that at the present time the railways are not in a position to give the people of Bonaventure and Gaspe that service to which they are entitled. If the railway service was equivalent to that which the people on the south shore of Baie des Chaleurs receive from the Intercolonial Railway, I would say at once discontinue the subsidy. But that should be an inducement to the Minister of Railways to take over these roads and, thereafter, to discontinue the subsidy. When I go to spend my holidays during the summer I always look with envy upon our friends in Restigouche and Gloucester counties on the

other side of the bay, because they are served by such a splendid railway system, compared with what we have on the north shore of Baie des Chaleurs, which through a combination of unfortunate political circumstances, as those familiar with the Baie des Chaleurs are aware, was for 20 years practically the storm centre of Quebec politics. Many of those who took part on one side or the other have gone to the great beyond but the people are still there, and they are still entitled to obtain those railway facilities which they were promised. There are the descendants of poor settlers who saw Ontario grow from a howling wilderness into a great and prosperous province, who saw the West develop, who have given their sons and daughters to this Dominion. But the old land in that part of the country has practically remained dormant. Surely the time has come when this progressive country and this progressive Government—for I want to be fair and to state that I have reason to believe that the Government of Canada at the present time is a progressive government, as all governments should be—will take this matter up and consider the interests of the people. Surely the time has come to open up this country and to give the people proper railway communication. Proper railway communication for those people will increase the opportunities of the Intercolonial which will then become, what it was intended to be the main line of communication for eastern Canada.

I would not like to resume my seat without saying a few words as to the position taken by other railways in connection with the matter of branch lines. Today I was glancing over the very interesting railway statistics which have been laid on the table, and I find that the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway which has become now one of the greatest railways of the century, and the pride of Canada, is only 2,903 miles but that the whole Canadian Pacific railway system comprises 10,712 miles. It appears therefore, that 7,809 miles of the Canadian Pacific railway system is composed of branch or leased lines, and in this fact we have evidence of the value of branches to a trunk line. The Canadian Pacific railway has grown up within our lifetime; I remember, as a boy, reporting the speech of Sir Charles Tupper in the old Queen's Hall, St. Catharine street, Montreal, explaining the Canadian Pacific railway project, and with others connected with the press of those days, I remember witnessing the first Canadian Pacific train start from Montreal on its through journey to the Pacific coast. The Canadian Pacific railway never would have become the pride of Canada as it was to-day, if it had not been provided with these branch line feeders, bringing traffic to it from all parts of the country. I find that on the Atlantic division of the Canadian Pacific railway it has eight branches, on the eastern division, 21 branches on the Ontario division, 12 branches; on the Lake Superior division, 3 branches; on the Manitoba division, 15 branches; on the Sasckatchewan division, 10 branches; on the Alberta division, 12 branches, and on the British Columbia division, 10 branches. Then, we find that the other great Canadian railway, the Grand Trunk, has not less than 56 branch lines, and the Canadian Northern is reported to have 32 branch lines. These figures furnish an argument which should have weight with this House, as I know they have weight with the minister of Railways. We would like to see the Intercolonial railway extended; we would like to see it remain what the Fathers of Confederation intended it should be, a bond of union between the various provinces of Confederation; we would like it to remain the people's railway. In this connection I invite the minister to give full consideration to this particular branch line which I am speaking of, because, if it were attached to the Intercolonial railway it would fulfil a long expected promise made to the people of that district. I believe that line would bring in revenue which would fully repay the Dominion for any outlay that might be made in acquiring it.

Mr. PELLETIER: What objections are urged to the merging of these two small railways, one of 100 miles and the other of 102 miles?

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): The same people are not the owners.

Mr. PELLETIER: It is the same interest.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure): They are. The Quebec Oriental, the old Baie de Chaleurs road, and afterwards the Atlantic and Lake Superior railway (it has changed its name several times), is largely owned by a syndicate headed by Mr. Galindez, and the other road is owned by the creditors of the Charing Cross Bank, who have appointed trustees, one of whom is Mr. Reid, whose letter I have read. These people may come together, but they are not railway men in the proper sense of the term. Mr. Galindez is a broker in London, who became interested in this road when it was projected to extend as the Atlantic and Lake Superior, from Gaspé to Lake Superior. Certain debentures were then placed on the London market in the hands of Mr. Galindez, and since then, to protect these interests, he has acquired the majority of the stock, and is now merely keeping the road running, so as to prevent it going out of business altogether. I think reasonable terms could be made with him, and

if they are not reasonable public opinion would justify the expropriation of the road, and the Government could pay him its fair value. As to the other portion of the road, the Atlantic, Quebec and Western, the minister has the report of his own officers that the road is in perfect condition. I think the whole thing is a good proposition, and I can assure the Minister of Railways that if he, and the Postmaster General who represents that district, extend the Intercolonial railway to Gaspé Basin, they will never be forgotten by the people of that district. We have waited in vain for a good many years for this project, and I think the time has come now when it should be consummated. This branch line to which I refer has a peculiar claim, inasmuch as it is the sole line of communication with a very large territory, and if it is not attached to the Intercolonial railway nothing remains. I leave the matter to the earnest consideration of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As I had for fifteen years the honour of representing Gaspé, I feel it my duty to add a word or two to the very illuminative remarks made by my hon. friend who so worthily represents Bonaventure. I heartily concur in the resolution now before the House. My hon. friend has given all the facts and data concerning that section of the country from a railway point of view. I might perhaps take exception to his remark that that peninsula has been neglected by different governments for the past thirty or forty years on account of political reasons. I understand that when Sir Charles Tupper was Minister of Railways, a contract for several miles was let and the work actually started, but later on the Government surrendered it to a private company and abandoned the idea of building it as a branch line of the Intercolonial railway. I understand from the old people of Gaspé and Bonaventure counties that the Government at that time did not continue the construction of the railway as a branch of the Intercolonial railway because of the very strenuous opposition of the Jersey fishing firms who operate along that coast. The Postmaster General, who knows that section of the country very well, is aware that for nearly 200 years there have been on the peninsula of Gaspé great fishing establishments controlled chiefly by people coming from Jersey. They came here under the French regime and they remained until this day, being to eastern Canada what the Hudson Bay Company has been for centuries to the the Northwest. The opposition of the Jersey firms was because they were in need of cheap labour and were afraid that with the railway construction the people might perhaps engage in other industries than that of fishing, in which case they might possibly be the losers. I have always heard it stated that this was at the bottom of the whole difficulty; if the Jersey firms had not been in the way the Government would long ago have acquired the railway from Matapedia to Gaspé basin as it was at first projected. My hon. friend has stated the difficulty confronting the Gaspé people. There are three roads, the Intercolonial, the Old Armstrong railway, known formerly as the Baie des Chaleurs railway, and the Atlantic and Quebec Western railway. The Bonaventure section of the road was unfortunately so mismanaged that a few years ago the Government of the day declared their charter null and void as regards the last section of the road. The Atlantic and Lake Superior railway was allowed to build from Caplin up to Paspebiac but the company could go no further because the Dominion Government would not subsidize it. It was under those circumstances that I became the representative of Gaspé in the House of Commons, and from the beginning the great issue in that district was the construction of the remaining section of the railway. But, as the first section was under a practically bankrupt management, we had to look for fresh capital in order to complete the road. I then associated myself with a gentleman whose memory is highly respected in the county of Gaspé—his name is well known to my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) an old classmate of his—the late Mr. J. X. Lavoie who was prothonotary at Percé, indeed the factotum of the county of Gaspé. He, with his intelligence—he was a very bright man—and with his indomitable energy, applied his faculties to find the necessary capital in order to complete the Gaspé section of the line. There were 102 miles to build in order to span the gap between Gaspé Basin and Paspebiac. With this additional handicap, however, that, as my hon. friend stated a moment ago, the coast in the county of Gaspé was much more rugged than in the county of Bonaventure. The company, an English company, came before Parliament unsuccessfully on two or three occasions; it had intended at first to build through the interior of the peninsula, but so much objection was raised by the people and by my hon. friend the member for Bonaventure, ex-Speaker of the House, that the company altered its plans and decided to build along the shore line. It started to work; invested I don't know how many millions in the construction of that road; obtained its money in England. It was subsidized by the Government, and got a special subsidy for the construction of the twenty-five or twenty-six bridges it had to build. As my hon. friend stated, it has

built a standard road, under the direction of English engineers and we know what that means; it is a first-class railway which can compare favourably with the Intercolonial railway. But here is the trouble: it is only a section of the line. There should be only one line from Gaspé Basin to Matapedia. The public who travel, the people who send or receive freight over the lines, are obliged to pay three rates, one on the Intercolonial, one on the Matapedia section, and the other on the Gaspé section. Whilst I am stating this, I might perhaps give a personal explanation, as some papers have two years ago criticised me very undeservedly, I may say. The railway company itself was financed by Mr. A. W. Carpenter, of the Charing Cross Bank. The Charing Cross Bank failed two years ago, and amongst the liabilities figured the name of the Atlantic, Quebec and Western railway. But Mr. Carpenter had large investments not only in Canada, but in South Africa, in mines, and even in Asia. He was unfortunate in many of his undertakings, and the Gaspé railway was only one of the many undertakings which brought about the failure. Let me say also that the creditors of the bank have appointed two trustees, Sir William Plender and Sir William B. Peat, two household names in the British commercial world, because their firm has branches in New York, Cape Town, in fact it is a world wide firm of accountants. They were selected as the trustees of the creditors and the road today is under their joint management. As I stated a moment ago, in order to answer some very unjust criticisms that have been made, I may say that I myself represent as solicitor the trustees regarding the railway business in Canada. The road is actually under their control. As my hon. friend said, the road is a standard road, but it is working under very serious disadvantages. It cannot for a long while be administered by trustees in this way. They are spending money and reaping nothing but deficits, on account of the gap from Matapedia to Paspebiac. If the road were under one management, or under the Government as part of the Intercolonial railway, I dare say there would be no difficulty in securing full success.

Mr. HAZEN: Have they tried to acquire the other?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, they have, but the failure of the bank came at that time. And the trouble is this—that the price which is asked by Mr. Galindez, who is practically the owner of the Baie des Chaleurs railway, i.e., the Matapedia section, is exorbitant, and the road would have to be practically revolutionized; it is a dangerous road to travel on.

Mr. PELLETIER: Would not the location of the road have to be changed?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Absolutely. In some cases it hugs the sea,—

Mr. HAZEN: I have been over it.

Mr. LEMIEUX: And the trestle works are in a most dangerous condition.

Mr. HAZEN: I did not intend to interrupt, but I would like to ask the hon. gentleman a question. From time to time I hear a statement to the effect that if a bridge were built across the river from Cross Point, I think, to the town of Campbellton, and the road abandoned from that to Matapedia, the result would be an advantage to the road. What does the hon. gentleman think of that?

Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend from Bonaventure and myself urged strongly the carrying out of that project upon my colleague the Minister of Railways and Canals in the former Government, and so did the hon. member from St. John. And I dare say it is an open secret that had we been returned, this would have been done, and also the branch lines would have been purchased for the Intercolonial railway. Coming back to our muttons, the Gaspé and Baie des Chaleurs railway, two years ago, before the last election, and during the session which immediately preceded that election, we had a Bill framed and accepted by the Minister of Railways and Canals of that time, the effect of which was practically a notification to Mr. Galindez that if, after a certain delay, the necessary repairs were not made to the road, the Minister of Railways and Canals could, after the ordinary process of law, sell the road, the proceeds of the sale to be applied to the repayment of the subsidies paid to the railway; and then the Government would be in a position to sell or lease that road to another company.

Mr. HAZEN: What were you going to do with the bondholders?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Remember that this is a very peculiar case. The amount represented to have been paid for the bonds is a debatable question. I would not say that this drastic remedy should apply to every railway, but this is a most extraordinary case. The present Government is too fresh in office to have been duped by this company, but everybody knows that previous governments, both the late Government and its predecessors, were duped and made the laughing stock by that company. Energetic action is needed, and it would be much in the interest of the Dominion to pass legislation which will result in giving that magnificent country the rail-

way facilities that it requires for its development. As it is, that country has one splendid railway, running from Gaspé to Paspebiac. A great harbour at Gaspé basin, a good track, fine bridges of the latest model, and a conservative management. But the moment you reach my hon. friend's (Mr. Marcil's) county at Paspebiac, the people do not care to travel——

Mr. PELLETIER: They travel at the peril of their lives.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, at the peril of their lives. And, until that section of the road is rehauled and reconstructed, certainly the steamship's service should remain. I heartily support this resolution, and I hope that the Government will acquire those branch lines as part of the Intercolonial railway. They would certainly have the gratitude of the people of Eastern Canada if they did so. The people of eastern Canada deserve it; they have paid taxes for years, and so have paid their share for the construction of railways in other sections of Canada; and surely they are now entitled to receive in return some consideration from the Government.

Mr. L. P. GAUTHIER (Gaspé): (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, as the representative of a portion of the Gaspe peninsula, I wish to add a few words to what has just been said by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and the hon. member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) in reference to the resolution which the House has just been considering. I listened with pleasure to the speeches of my hon. friends, and I am entirely in sympathy with all they have suggested.

The interest I take in that part of the Dominion is made keener by the fact that I was born there, that I have my home there, and that, as a result, I am acquainted with its requirements as well as with its resources.

The possibilities of the Gaspé peninsula are unexceptional. Of course, there as elsewhere, in order to develop those resources, transportation facilities are required, and such transportation facilities to be of use should be of a nature to foster trade. Now the line from Matapedia to Gaspé is not over its whole length in a state that will admit of its operation under paying conditions. The section from Matapedia to New Carlisle is in very poor condition indeed, almost useless for the transportation of freight, and even of passengers, who, as the hon. member for Rouville stated a moment ago, travel over it at the risk of their lives.

As things are at present, I do not think that the company of itself would succeed in putting the line in proper condition and making a paying venture of its operation. On the other hand, the Government not being expected to get returns from its investments as promptly as a private company, might take charge of such an undertaking in the public interest and with a view to developing that part of the country; and, to my mind, any outlay necessary towards acquiring and maintaining this line of railway would be justifiable.

I may say further that this line comprises two different sections since it has been connected with the Intercolonial, and as a result people are made to pay three different bills of freight on the same goods, as far as Gaspé is concerned. The same applies to passenger traffic. Such a condition of affairs practically shuts out trade.

While I am on my feet I may be allowed to refer briefly to the grant voted for the steamship service connecting Campbellton and Gasp.. So long as the railway line connecting Matapedia and Gaspé is not linked with the Intercolonial under conditions permitting the issuance of a single freight bill, I believe it will be in the interest of the public that this grant to the navigation company be kept up and even increased, if necessary. I wholly agree with my hon. friend from Bonaventure in his statement that as soon as the Matapedia and Gaspé line provides for that section a service as satisfactory as elsewhere and is linked to the I.C.R., there will no longer be any use for that grant to the navigation company, but until such a service has been provided for the benefit of the public, I think the grant should be maintained.

We people of Gaspé are pleased to see this Government ask a grant for a railway line which is to run from Matane to Gaspé through the interior. And let me say right here that we trust the Government will bring pressure to bear so as to ensure the locating of this line north of the Shickshock mountains, thus ensuring the development of that part of the country and accommodating residents on the north shore of the Gaspé peninsula. At any rate, the building of this railway line will give a great impetus to the development of the resources of the peninsula, particularly as regards farming and the lumber industry.

Mr. LEMIEUX: (Translation.) Will the hon. member allow me to ask him a question? Is there just now a party of engineers engaged in locating this line along the north shore, as far as practicable I am aware that my hon. friend has interested himself towards having a party of engineers sent to locate that railway on the northern slope of the mountain range. Are those engineers in Gaspé at this moment?

Mr. GAUTHIER: (Translation.) Just so, we have taken on ourselves to organize a party of engineers to explore the country from Matane to a point in the vicinity of

St. Anne des Monts, along the northern slope of the Shickshock range, so as to accommodate the northern portion of the peninsula from Matane to St. Anne des Mnots. The intention is not to have that line follow closely the coast, a location which would not be very desirable for construction purposes or the profitable operation of the road. It is proposed to locate the line at some distance from the coast, between the foothills and the sea coast, so as to open up the country for settlement.

Mr. LEMIEUX: (Translation.) Up to what point, as far as practicable, will that line follow the coast?

Mr. GAUTHIER: (Translation.) Up to a point in the vicinity of St. Anne des Monts, which is considered the only point where it is practicable to penetrate the mountain country, along the valley of the St. Ann river, and thence to Gaspé.

I trust the Government will grant us some effective assistance towards carrying out this exploration work, as it is in the public interest that this railway line, if it is built —and it will have to be built some day— should be so located as to develop that part of the peninsula, while at the same time accommodating the older settlements. Besides, a line so located would be much shorter than if it were to follow the southern slope of the mountain range, a circumstance to be taken into account, since less money would thus be required to carry out the undertaking. The Government would thereby save money.

I shall not, Mr. Speaker, go beyond those few remarks. I approve of the resolution, as being entirely in the interest of the country at large, and more particularly in the interest of the district I have the honour to represent.

Mr. KYTE: Mr. Speaker, I desire to make a few remarks upon the subject of the resolution proposed by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson). On two or three occasions when the matter was before the House I took the opportunity of supporting the proposition, inasmuch as it affected a matter in which the constituents whom I represent in this House are deeply interested. I represent one of the constituencies served by a branch line railway, so called. It is a road that extends from Point Tupper, one of the termini of the Intercolonial railway on the strait of Canso, to the town of St. Peters. It was originally constructed for the purpose of serving the large district comprising the growing communities which surround the city of Sydney, and the town of Louisburg. For some reason or other financial difficulties overtook the promoters of that railway, and they were unable to construct the road except for a distance of 30 miles. For many years the people of my constituency were disappointed owing to the choice the late Government made with respect to the location of the Intercolonial railway in the Island of Cape Breton. I am not now speaking for the purpose of criticising the judgment of the Government of the day, or the influences which brought about the choice of that location. The Island of Cape Breton, as is known, is peculiarly situated. No one line of railway can possibly accommodate the people of that territory. The Bras d'Or lake occupies the central portion of the Island of Cape Breton, and when the Intercolonial railway was built through Cape Breton and around the north shore of the Bras d'Or lake, it left that large section of the county of Richmond and the southern portion of the county of Cape Breton without railway accommodation. For many years disappointment was the lot of the people of the southern part of the Island of Cape Breton. In the year 1899 an American company came prepared to invest its capital in the construction of a railway through that territory. As I said a moment ago, their plans miscarried, and they did not build that railway into the city of Sydney, or to the town of Louisburg For ten years we have enjoyed very excellent railway service in the county of Richmond between Point Tupper and St. Peters, but I am free to say the railway has not been a paying proposition, because the section of the county in which it is built is also very well accommodated by water carriage. There is very considerable competition between water carriage and the transportation of the Cape Breton railway. As a consequence the earnings of that road have not been sufficient to pay its annual expenses. I wish to submit, however, that I think this is no reason why the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals should refuse to consider a proposition to take over that railway, and further extend the railway from the town of St. Peters into the city of Sydney and town of Louisburg, and to the large and populous centres surrounding the town of Glace Bay.

Mr. COCHRANE: The hon. gentleman made the statement that I had refused to take over this line—we have not refused anything.

Mr. KYTE: The hon. Minister has entirely misunderstood me. I said that is no reason why he should refuse, and I think he should give this matter his early consideration. Our proposition is that the Government should take over the Cape Breton railway from Point Tupper to St. Peters, and that it should extend the road from St. Peters into the city of Sydney, and into the large and populous centres surrounding the town of Glace Bay, and the town of Louisburg.

An enormous traffic has developed in Cape Breton on the Intercolonial. While I am not able to give the figures, I think that the records will show that more freight originates in the city of Sydney, the town of North Sydney and the collieries surrounding these places than on any other portion of the Intercolonial railway. Away back in 1887, when the extension of the Intercolonial railway in the Island of Cape Breton was contemplated, it was stated by those criticising the expenditure that there was not sufficient traffic to warrant such an outlay of money. I am bound to say there is more justification to-day for having two lines of the Intercolonial railway through the island of Cape Breton at the present time than there was for one line over twenty years ago. Since then much traffic has developed between Newfoundland and Cape Breton, all of which is carried over the Intercolonial. The establishment of steel works in the town of Sydney Mines has given a great impetus to the development of that district, and that very important industry has contributed very largely to the increase in freight traffic. The city of Sydney alone originates sufficient freight and passenger traffic to justify the Government in extending the railway from the town of St. Peters into Sydney. The Intercolonial railway has in the last few years been in a more fortunate position than in the earlier period of its history, and during the last few years we have assurance that the railway is not only paying its operating expenses, but a very handsome surplus has been realized. I think, however, in speaking of the increased earnings which have developed along the Intercolonial railway, something is due to the fact that the rates have been somewhat increased. I cannot speak exactly in regard to the freight rates, but I think in regard to the passenger traffic and other sources of earnings, the charges have been somewhat advanced, all of which comes out of the pockets of the people of the Maritime Provinces who have been obliged to patronize that railway. Private capital has constructed the railway from Point Tupper to St. Peters, and I think it would be unfortunate that the persons who invested their money in that undertaking should lose the capital which they have put into it.

I listened with some interest to the observations made by the hon. member for Digby, with respect to the inactivity of the late Government in respect to branch line railways. It is only within the last few years that this question has been mooted, and it was only comparatively recently that it has been dealt with in this House. If the hon. member for Westmorland had not moved this resolution a few years ago in the House of Commons I do not suppose the matter would have engaged the attention of any member of the Government. It was necessary to cultivate the soil, and to develop public opinion as well as to educate members of the late Government before taking the question up with a view to carrying it out. The present Government, however, is in a happier position. It is not necessary to allow them a period of probation, in which they might develop their minds up to the necessity of taking over the branch lines of railways. I have before me a telegram sent by the right hon. the Prime Minister from Summerside, Prince Edward Island, on September 8th, 1911. The telegram is addressed to Mr. George Fowler, the present member for Kings and Albert, New Brunswick. It reads:

> Am convinced that interests of Intercolonial railway demand acquisition of branch line railways as feeders and we propose to acquire them on reasonable terms if returned to power.

Therefore, before the right hon. Prime Minister was called upon to form a ministry, he was convinced of the desirability of taking over these branch line railways. I cannot think that the hon. member for Digby can successfully make the plea on behalf of the present Government for their delay in the acquisition of the branch lines, because as I stated a moment ago, they were convinced of the necessity of this before coming into power.

The character of the Cape Breton railway which exists in my county at the present time is of the very highest. A few years ago experts in the Department of Railways and Canals made a report as to the physical character of the road, and I understand that they reported it was in the very best possible condition. There is no necessity for any large expenditure of money for the purpose of bringing up that railway to the standard of the Intercolonial. The company that built the road maintained it in the very best condition, and have given us the very best service. Considerable traffic has developed on that railway, but a very much greater traffic would develop if the scheme originally intended—that of building the road from St. Peters into Cape Breton county—were carried out. I am not going to assume the present Minister of Railways and Canals is unfavourable to this proposal, but I rather assume he is favourable to it and has been gathering information with a view to enabling him to make a statement to Parliament at the present session. I am aware that during the last summer an expert was sent by him to the island of Cape Breton for the purpose of making a report upon this railway and I presume that report will be submitted to Parliament at an early date, and that as a consequence

the Minister will accept the principle embodied in the resolution of the hon. member for Westmorland and take over the branch lines of railway in the Maritime provinces, as well as the railway in the constituency whose interests I advocate at the present moment.

Mr. McKENZIE : The question engaging the attention of this House this evening is not by any means a new one, but the hon. member for Westmorland in the moving of his resolution has thrown fresh light and interest upon this subject. He has put the question before the House and the Government in such an able and lucid manner that were it not for the fact that the rest of us should back him up in the opinions that he expressed there would be no real reason for any more discussion. Other gentlemen have given further and very conclusive reasons why the policy which has been adopted and agreed to by the former Government should be carried forward by the present Administration. I am sure that besides the telegram which has been read by the hon. member for Richmond there are just as good reasons and evidence upon the records of this House and on 'Hansard' as to the position of the Prime Minister before he came into power. It is not good reasoning for the hon. member for Digby to say that the present Government must go back to the early stages in connection with the investigation of this question and must not take into consideration the progress made by the old Government, that they must start over again and take years of deliberation and research before they can reach any operative conclusion in respect to this matter. That cannot be held true in any line of life, progress would not be made in any subject, whether in the practical working of railways, scientific research or in any other line if we were obliged to abandon the progress made by our friends and predecessors and rely only on our own researches. The two sides of the House entered into the discussion and I think agreed upon the policy that the branch lines should be taken over. I remember well in 1910 a resolution was moved in this House by myself, representing the county I now represent, saying that in the opinion of this House the sphere of usefulness of the Intercolonial railway should be extended into the counties of the province of Nova Scotia which then had no railways. There is no difference, as I understand, between the resolution which I moved then and the resolution now before the House. There is a distinction in language but not in purpose and effect, it is practically and altogether the same and so any expression of opinion that was then given by the present Premier is a good and sufficient argument in support of the position that he is obliged to take upon the resolution now before the House. He was then speaking as leader of the Opposition, he was speaking as the head of the representation of the province of Nova Scotia at the time, and the resolution pertained particularly to the affairs of the province of Nova Scotia. Now that he occupies the high and honoured position of Prime Minister of Canada and the only representative of the province of Nova Scotia in the Cabinet it is of interest to us that the people of the province and himself should be reminded of the position which he took on that occasion. The great plea and complaint that he was making against the then Government was that they should not make up their minds in connection with this great question, that they were vacillating, that they were uncertain in their movements and that it was highly necessary that something should be done to force them to a decision. I am sorry to say that if that was true of the then Administration, the answer which the Minister of Railways gave to the mover of the resolution this afternoon, is somewhat akin to that position of vacillation and uncertainty as to the course which the present Government propose to take. In order not to do any injustice to the right hon. the Prime Minister, I shall quote exactly what he said. I quote from page 1179 of 'Hansard' for the 12th of December, 1910:

> As I understand, the Minister of Railways and Canals gives us his assurance that this motion will be taken up and disposed of during the present session. I would like to understand that definitely and positively, because the length of my remarks this evening will depend a little upon that.

Now, one of the great difficulties with respect to the Intercolonial railway which have existed since this Government took office is this, that the Government has been in a state of uncertainty and vacillation as to whether or not it would give the Intercolonial railway its proper development. That has been its great difficulty. If there is anything to be understood from that language it is that the then leader of the Opposition, the present Premier, was dissatisfied with the position of the Government of that day, that they were not speedily and at once deciding to extend the sphere of usefulness of the Intercolonial railway throughout its whole length. The sphere of usefulness of the Intercolonial railway was to be exercised and extended in two ways particularly, may be in many ways, but two ways particularly; one was in extending it into counties where we had no railways at all, the other and additional was taking over the branch lines that are not to-day rendering to the people the services they are entitled to, the services necessary for the proper transportation and

traffic of this country, and taking both into the system of the Intercolonial railway; then build lines where it is necessary to build them and take over lines that are already built, on reasonable terms, and put them in proper position to meet the requirements of the country.

Those were the two things which I think the Prime Minister had in view when he complained that the Government of that day were vacillating and uncertain in their policy and were not proceeding as rapidly as they should. He pointed out that Government-owned railways were paying well in Australia and other places, and he said it was not necessary to go as far as Australia to show illustrations and conclusive evidence of what Government ownership meant and that Government railways could be made a success. He said:

We can point to the operation of Government railways in the province of Ontario. It may be Government railways in Ontario have been operating during the past six or eight years under favourable conditions but we should also bear in mind that they have given exceedingly favourable results. Taking last year, I find that their total operating revenue was $1,361,224.80, that their operating expenses were $794,796.88, and that the net operating revenue was no less than $566,428. And that does not include the ore royalties and other items of that kind which ought not properly to be taken into consideration in comparing these railways with the Intercolonial railway. So that for the last year for which we have any return, the Ontario Government railways paid into the treasury of Ontario no less than a sum of $550,000 which was added to the consolidated revenue of that province. The Ontario Government railways were subject to all the disadvantages pointed out by the Minister of Railways. These disadvantages I do not wish to minimize, but I want to tell my hon. friend that the Intercolonial railway runs through a country in the Maritime provinces with equally great resources. I have declared often that the little province of Nova Scotia, in proportion to its size, has as splendid natural resources, a great many of which are still undeveloped, as any equal area in the Dominion. There can be no doubt about that. And those resources, as they continue to be developed, will give the Intercolonial railway the opportunity of adding to its revenue from that province, so that I agree entirely in what my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) said with regard to the operation of the Intercolonial railway in that province. I believe that were it not for the splendid revenue the Intercolonial railway does draw from Nova Scotia, its showing would be infinitely worse than it has been during the recent or any years. There are great natural resources in that province, some of them developed, and some undeveloped; and I understand the motion of my hon. friend from Cape Breton and North Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) was designed—if it had any object at all—to take the Intercolonial railway within the province of Nova Scotia into those parts of that province where natural resources are waiting to be developed; and the same principle should also apply elsewhere.

Then the right hon. the Prime Minister went on to point out the necessities of his own county of Halifax and of other parts of the province of Nova Scotia, where the sphere of influence of the Intercolonial railway should be extended. There is not in my mind the slightest doubt as to where the Prime Minister stood on the 12th of November, 1910. It is but a short time ago, and nothing has since happened in the province of Nova Scotia or in the Dominion of Canada which would justify the Prime Minister in changing his attitude as to the course which should be taken with respect to the Intercolonial railway. It is admitted therefore, I think, and cannot be controverted, that both parties are committed to the taking over of the branch lines and to the extension of the Intercolonial to such sections of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec as are to-day crying for railways, and those necessities cannot be met in any other way. I need not impress upon the practical mind of the hon. Minister of Railways the geographical conditions that he meets with particularly after he passes Moncton and until he reaches the extreme point of the town of old Louisburg. The peninsula is somewhat wide at Moncton, but as he goes eastward it narrows, and continues narrowing all the time, so that really there is room in the province of Nova Scotia and in the eastern part of New Brunswick for only one trunk line. The Intercolonial has taken those green spots, so to speak, it has taken hold of that traffic; and it has held all its resources in such a way that it is impracticable, and I think impossible to look for another trunk line alongside of it through the province of Nova Scotia. That being the case, and as a matter of national development, apart altogether from railway questions, it becomes necessary for the Intercolonial railway to supply the railway necessities in that part of Canada. I am not going to argue this point, and I am not arguing it now upon the ground alone that it is going to be a paying proposition. I have no doubt it would be a paying proposition, but even if it were not as a practical railway proposition, it certainly would be a good paying one in many other respects.

I say to the Minister of Railways and to the Government that there is no more difficult problem in this country to-day than the cost of living. The way in which the cost of living has advanced is to-day occupying the minds of the business men and the thinking men of Canada. Now, I submit that if there is any way by which we can get good wholesome food supplies in this country, and by doing so secure good wholesome food cheaper than it is at present, it is the duty of the Government to bring that condition about. I submit that

there is no cheaper, more wholesome, or more nutritious food in any part of Canada or in any part of the world than the magnificent fish that is to be found along the shores of New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and lower Quebec. It has been pointed out by the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) that they have abundance of that food in the province of Quebec, but that by a lack of commercial intercourse and of railway facilities that magnificent food which would supply thousands of people in this country is going to waste. The same thing is true all along the coast of Nova Scotia, and I fancy on parts of the coast of New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. They have not the facilities of transportation of their fish, and therefore there is no encouragement to catch them. It must be understood, though possibly it is not as well understood by the hon. Minister of Railways as it should be, that we have no less than 5,000 miles of fishing coast line in the Maritime provinces. Following the sinuosities of the shore, we have 5,000 miles of good fishing coast line from three to five or six miles wide, and inexhaustible. It is not like a coal mine or a gold mine or a forest; it is inexhaustible as a source of supply of excellent food, so that what we take out is hardly noticed at all. I submit therefore without any politics, without any narrow sectionalism, that the people along those coasts of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and lower Quebec are entitled to have this expenditure made, in order that they may have proper transportation facilities within their reach. As has been pointed out by the hon. member from Bonaventure, we are entitled to it. He has pointed out and I have said so before, that the people of the West press for railways the moment they go to that part of the country. In many instances they will not go at all unless railway facilities are forthcoming or are already there. The ancestors of the mover of the resolution and of his able supporter from Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) and my own ancestors landed upon the shores of this country when there was nothing but tall straight and strong trees growing down to the water's edge. They hewed out homes for themselves in the province of Nova Scotia, and I am sure that if there are any people in this country who deserve recognition at the hands of the Government of this prosperous country, to the making of which they have contributed a large share, the people of Nova Scotia and of the outskirts of that province are entitled to such recognition. No small policy and no fear of expending a few dollars or even of going into debt ought to deter the Minister of Railways from taking over the branch lines and extending the Intercolonial railway into those parts of Nova Scotia which are now absolutely neglected. I do not know what idea the Minister of Railways may have with respect to railway building in the Maritime provinces, but I hope he is doing a lot of wise thinking. For years and years we fought to have a railway in the county I represent, and at last we succeeded in convincing the Government of the day. Surveys were made, the contract was practically let, and that project for which the people of Cape Breton had pined for nearly a century was in a way to be achieved, but, unfortunately the change of Government brought about new conditions, and at present there is not much to indicate that that railroad will be built. The lands were expropriated for the right of way, and I am sorry to say the present Minister has notified the parties along the route that their lands will not now be required for that purpose. Of course it would not take him long to revest his department with these lands and put himself in a position to give to the people of Victoria and the rest of Cape Breton what they were so nearly getting under the late Government. I trust the Minister will soon reconsider, and, so far as this side of the House is concerned, and, indeed, I think the same might be said of his own side, he need not fear coming to Parliament for such sum of money as is necessary to give these parts of our Dominion much needed railway facilities. The resolution more particularly refers to branch lines, and my hon. friend from Richmond has dealt with the branch from St. Peter's to Point Tupper. Of course, it is quite impossible for the minister to know very much about the country through which it is intended to extend that road, but I may tell him that it was my duty at one time, as solicitor for the St. Peter's Company, to traverse the right of way from St. Peter's to Louisburg, and on behalf of the Company I purchased at a cost of $31,000 land for terminals in the town of Louisburg. The St. Peter's Company selected as their terminus the old French wharf, built 200 years ago by the French people when they settled in Louisburg, and to-day the original foundations of that wharf are, I may tell the minister, perfectly sound. I mention this to show the minister that this company meant business, and that they spent this large sum of money in purchasing the land, so as to have their terminal at what is one of the finest seaports in Canada. I trust the day is not far distant when this railway will be extended through that splendid territory along the shore where there is excellent fishing and lots of mineral land, and to the town of Louisburg, making connection with the Sydneys and Glace bay. The island of Cape Breton is divided into two parts, the north-

ern and the southern, and in some places one part is separated from the other by twenty-five miles of sea. The minister will at once see that it is impossible to serve these two separate and distinct islands with one railway. The railway was first built, along the fringe of the northern side of the southern island and possibly at the time that was the best thing that could be done. But we have a large thickly populated area on the south of the Bras d'Or lakes, and there is also a large population and extensive territory on the north side, so that it is impossible to serve all that country by the existing railway. The only way proper railway communication can be provided is by the continuation of the St. Peter's road through the southern island, and the continuation of the Mackenzie & Mann railroad from Hastings on the Strait of Canso; from the town of Inverness north along the shore of the northern island, including Inverness and Victoria Counties. A business man like the Minister of Railways will be very glad to hear of the great development which is going on in that part of the country. Ten years ago, there was no steel industry in Cape Breton, but to-day we have a plant representing eighty million dollars which annually gives $900,000 worth of traffic to the Intercolonial railway. It should be the ambition of the present Minister of Railways to be the pioneer in giving to that part of the country the railway facilities so much needed, and again I appeal to the Government, and to Parliament, to come to our relief. The Minister would save himself a lot of worry, and do a great deal of good to the country generally, by granting the request we now make. I endorse to the full what has been said so well and ably by the gentlemen who have supported the resolution, and I shall have great pleasure in voting for it. We who represent these constituencies, would not be doing our duty to ourselves, or to the people we represent, or to the Government, if we did not bring to the notice of Parliament what is required to enable us to take our place in the march of progress with the rest of the Dominion. If the people of the country knew the facts, they would, I am sure, be most glad to grant us what we ask.

Mr. McCURDY: I was rather struck with the statement made by the hon. member for Westmorland to the effect that the eastern provinces are now suffering from a feeling of neglect. I assume that the hon. member has not been East during the Christmas vacation, because I wish to state to you, Mr. Speaker, that so far as I can judge public opinion, there has not been a time in a great many years when the East has been suffering less from a feeling of neglect than it is at the present time. The contrast is rather marked between the attentions which they are receiving now and those which they have been receiving for some years; and I cannot really think that the hon. member for Westmorland was acquainted with the feeling of the East, as he expressed himself to-night.

Mr. EMMERSON: If my hon. friend will pardon me, I am not aware of having drawn any distinction between conditions in the Maritime provinces now and conditions as they were formerly. My hon. friend has certainly misunderstood me, as I made no such statement; at least I am not conscious of having made such a statement. What I did say was that the treatment accorded to the West in connection with the Hudson Bay railway in 1909 by the then Government and during the years that followed, and by the present Government during the past two years, I mentioned in my speech, and the treatment accorded to the East in connection with the branch railways was only once referred to in my speech. It was not a party reference, it was speaking in that way.

Mr. McCURDY: I understood the hon. member to call upon the East to resent the neglect under which they are, he claims, suffering.

The natural resources of the East, particularly in the district with which I am acquainted are very great.

I am sure that all hon. members who know that district will bear me out when I say that one of the greatest drawbacks and repressive influences of the past has been the pessimistic utterances of leading citizens; and, I fear one of the repressive influences at the present time is the pessimistic influence of members who, like my hon. friend, see in the almost immediate future the time when our representation in Parliament will reach the vanishing point. I wish to dissent from such a statement. I think that time is very far distant in the future, and not near as he apparently fears.

I was pleased with the opening statements of many of the hon. members opposite, when they said that they wished this matter discussed entirely apart from party bias, and as it should be discussed. Many of them carefully refrained from any reference to party politics; but in some cases the old Adam came to the surface; and to those and those alone, I would refer the record of railway construction in connection with the Intercolonial railway during the past twenty years. The last act of the old Conservative Government in June 1896, was the opening of some ten miles of railway as a branch of the Intercolonial—I refer to the Dartmouth branch. During the next fifteen years, or one hundred and eighty

months, less than three miles of railway were constructed as branches of the Intercolonial. Now in fifteen months time since September, 1911, there have been placed under construction in Nova Scotia 67 miles as a branch of the Intercolonial. This takes no account of the construction in New Brunswick, as I am only referring to what occurred in Nova Scotia. As the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) has pointed out, the Intercolonial railway has preempted the railway field in Nova Scotia; it is the only trunk line we have; it is necessarily the mother of the land transportation system in the province; and it is the duty of the Inercolonial, in my opinion, to extend its sphere of influence in Nova Scotia wherever possible and on a liberal basis. I do not know exactly how far the hon. Minister of Railways should be expected to assume the operation of such lines, which, to use a once favourite and popular expression, were called 'feeders.' But that name has dropped into disuse lately, and now we are referring again to what we call 'branch lines,' because I understand a large number, practically all of these lines, can hardly be called feeders in a financial sense. I should like to say that on general grounds I entirely agree with the proposition put forward by the hon. member for Westmorland. I am in favour and very strongly in favour not only of the acquisition of branch lines, which have any reason for their existence, but of the construction of new branch lines, wherever such, under a very liberal interpretation, can show a reason for their construction. I have never been, nor am I very much concerned, over the revenue producing operations of the Intercolonial. I do not think we should concern ourselves with any more than we are anxious to see the Welland or other canals revenue producing, or a handsome dividend accruing to the Government from the subsidies given to transcontinental railways. The Intercolonial was never undertaken as a business enterprise; it was a Government undertaking; no commercial company could be found to build it. It seems to me that the road is not performing its function unless it builds branch lines to serve all the country in which it lies, wherever there is a reasonable chance that it should make a fair show of earnings at all.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I desire to express my full sympathy with the resolution which is before the House; and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make a few remarks with regard to it. My hon. friend who has just taken his seat began his speech by criticising my hon. friend from Westmorland for making comparisons between the railway construction of the late Government and the present Government; but he did not go very far in his speech until he indulged in the same pastime. He has also made a comparison between the amount of railway construction by the late Government in the province of Nova Scotia and the number of miles constructed by the present Government; but he failed to tell the House that the railway that he refers to, which I presume is the Musquodoboit branch in the county of Halifax, was projected by the late Government; the survey was made by the late Government; the contract was entered into by the late Government; the money was voted by the late Government; and everything was done, except to allow the work to go on. The present Government claim credit for not having stopped the work on the Musquodobit Valley, as they did on the projected branch in the county of Guysborough. That is the only thing they can claim credit for, so far as that branch of the railway is concerned. I listened with interest to the compliments thrown across the floor by hon. gentlemen who said that this was a business Government. I should like to think that it is a business Government. But it should not be necessary to have a discussion lasting all afternoon and evening to convince any Government that it is a proper and businesslike thing to secure the branch lines to the Intercolonial railway. There is certainly no argument that can be advanced against the proposition. Every commercial road that is carrying on its business in a proper way secures branch lines as feeders to its main line. They even build branches into those districts where branches are justified. It is one of the hopeless things about the Intercolonial railway—that for the forty years and more since Confederation the representatives of the Maritime provinces have had to come here year after year and talk in favour of this idea and try to persuade the Government that it ought to be undertaken. The Intercolonial railway, to my mind, has stood in the way of the development of the Maritime provinces. Any of the great lines of railways would certainly have done much more in the direction of furthering these branch lines during the forty years than the Dominion of Canada has done. It is not creditable to either side of the House that more has not been done in this direction; and it is especially too bad, as I have said, that it should be necessary at this late hour to try to persuade the Government that something ought to be done. Many of these branches already constructed in the province of New Brunswick ought to have been built by the Federal Government. The local Government undertook to assist them; capital was in-

vested in them, and a great deal of that capital was wasted. Necessarily wasted, because the branches are too small and insignificant to maintain equipments of their own. A man does not need much railway knowledge to see that the Intercolonial railway, with its staff of engineers, with a large amount of rolling stock, with repair shops, with all the equipment of a great railway company could operate branch lines much more cheaply than an independent company could manage them. It is utterly impossible, in the case of small branch lines like those in Nova Scotia—for these branch lines usually run to harbours along the coast, and there is no part of our province that is much more than forty miles from the sea—to maintain a board of directors, a general manager, a chief engineer, workshops and all the equipment for a road, and make it pay, whereas such a road could be very well made to pay as a feeder of the Intercolonial railway. I do not wish to be too local or sectional in this discussion, because it is not a matter regarding my own constituency alone; it is a matter in which all four provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island are deeply interested. I feel that the matter ought to be dealt with by the minister in a broad and statesmanlike way. I feel, however, at the present moment that I should not be doing my duty as representative of the county of Guysborough unless I made some representation of the situation in my own county. I do now not want to criticise the minister too harshly or to treat this as a party question. But it requires a good deal of Christian forbearance on my part not to say severe things in view of the way my constituency has been treated in this matter. The House accepted the principle of the branch lines in 1910. On that occasion the present right hon. leader of the Government was seeking the suffrages of the people of Canada. He expected in a very short time to face the electors. And when this question came before the House —moved, I think by my hon. friend from North Cape Breton—the Prime Minister made a speech in favour of the movement and made special reference to the county I have the honour to represent an dto his own county. The motion was agreed to by both sides of the House, and the Minister of Railways of that time, the hon. member for South Renfrew, spoke in favour of it. A little later, my hon. friend the leader of the present Government visited my constituency and held three meetings there and spoke in favour of these branch lines. This was one of the principal canvasses in the election in my constituency. My opponent, on every platform, said that if Mr. Borden was elected Prime Minister he had no doubt whatever the branch lines would be built. The right hon. gentleman was returned to power, and you know what happened. My hon. friend from Digby complimented my hon. friend the Minister of Railways as being a man who did not say much but was a man of action—a man who did things. That is what I complain about in my own case, for, if he had kept his hands off, if he had done nothing at all, we should have had a branch line in that county; but he took steps to stop it.

Mr. CARVELL : He is a man of action.

Mr. SINCLAIR : He certainly is. But it is very disheartening to the people I have the honour to represent. Before the present Government came into office, provision had been made for the construction of this branch line. A survey had been made and $1,000,000 had been voted by the House. Something further had been done. A contract had been entered into with a construction company to build the road; $50,000 had been deposited by the construction company in good faith as a guarantee that they would carry out their contract; and the late Government purchased the branch line known as the Sunny Brae branch, running twelve miles from Ferrona junction in the county of Pictou to Sunny Brae, with the idea of projecting it into the county of Guysborough. They purchased that line, and paid $100,000 on the purchase. This was the state of matters when the hon. gentlemen opposite took office. It was not long before we found the course they would take. The Prime Minister, though he had spoken in favour of the Guysborough branch as of the Musquodobit branch, and though he had issued a card claiming to have been the originator of the idea, and stating that he had brought the matter to the attention of the House, and that a million dollars had been voted—which card was distributed among his electors—yet when he attained office and came to deal with this question, he cancelled the contract with the construction company, returned their $50,000, and put us back where we were at the time the project was started. The road my hon. friend from Queens-Shelburne referred to has therefore gone on and is being constructed.

At the last session of the House I was endeavouring to find out from the Minister of Railways whether he really intended to take any action in the matter, and in that connection I wish to quote from 'Hansard', April 4, 1911-12, page 5621:

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will provision be made in the supplementary estimates for a branch line from Sunnybrae to Guysborough?

Mr. COCHRANE: There is provision made for a survey. I have told the hon. gentleman twice that we intend to investigate this matter during the coming summer.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I would like to say to the

minister that the survey has been pretty nearly completed. The contract has been let.

It should be noted that the Minister of Railways on that occasion, in reply to the question as to whether anything was to be done during last session, said that provision had been made for a survey, and that he intended to make an investigation during the coming season. The coming season has passed, however, and as far as I know, he has not made any survey or taken any action in the matter. That, of course, was also a disappointment, because he led us to hope he was really contemplating something when he made the statement that provision had been made for a survey, and that he was planning something during the coming season. The only thing I have been able to detect that he has done since that time was to file with the registrar of deeds at Guysborough a notice cancelling the right of way for the securing of which steps had been taken by the late Administration. The usual steps had been taken when the survey was made by the late Administration, and the right of way was filed in the office of the registrar of deeds at Guysborough. Notice was given to the proprietors that these lands were to be taken for the purpose of building the Guysborough branch. During the last summer my hon. friend the Minister of Railways filed a notice with the registrar of deeds notifying everybody that this was cancelled, that he would not, of course, require this right of way, and in effect that he did not intend to take any steps in regard to it.

I have received from the municipal council of the county I have the honour to represent a petition in this matter to be presented to the Minister, and I think it would be advisable to present this petition now. I fear anything I could say to the Minister as an opponent of his in politics could have no effect, but when I tell him that about one-half of the men composing this municipal council are men of his own faith in regard to political matters, perhaps he will pay a little more attention to their statements:

We, the municipal council for the municipality of Guysborough now in session this twenty-third day of January, 1912, having in mind the requirements of this municipality and knowing the great need and want of railway facilities for the people of this county who have anxiously waited while other parts of the province and Dominion were being served in this respect, and having in view the efforts put forth during the last five years to secure a railroad for the county of Guysborough, which was at last bearing fruit to the extent that the late Dominion Government did call for tenders, and their last Act before laying down the reins of power was to sign and fully execute a contract for the construction of this road;

And, whereas it seems by the public press that the estimates brought forward by the present Government at Ottawa now in session contains no money for this much needed work;

Be it therefore resolved that we, the municipal councillors for the municipality of Guysborough assembled, do unanimously approve of the act of the late Government in signing and executing the contract for this work, and we would therefore request the present Government to continue the construction of said railroad.

It is further resolved that the municipal secretary shall prepare copies of this resolution and send same to the following parties: Right hon. R. L Borden, Hon. A. K. MacLean, M. P.; John H. Sinclair, M.P.; E. M. MacDonald, M.P.; Senator A. C. Bell and C. A. R. Rowlings, Esq.

(Sgd.) A. CHIP. GIFFIN,
(Sgd.) W. A. AIKEN,
(Sgd.) D. S. HENDSBEE,
Commissioners.

Moved, seconded and passed that the resolution pass. I hereby certify the foregoing a copy of resolution passed by the municipal council, January 23, 1912.

J. A. FULTON,
Clerk.

In the discussion in regard to this matter on previous occasions, the minister raised an objection as to the traffic that would be found to exist on this particular line. I am not here to say that at the commencement this line would pay expenses—I am not certain that it would. But it seems to me there is a chance of developing good traffic on that line. It passes through an agricultural country; through a country well wooded, and plentifully supplied with large quantities of timber. It reaches one of the finest ports of the Dominion—Country Harbour—where the terminus of one of the branch lines is, as well as the port of Guysborough, which is not very far from Canso, one of the finest fishing districts on the coast of North America. This road will, however, not altogether be a solution of the question of developing the fishing industry of that district. The road goes only as far as Guysborough, while thirty miles beyond that, if extended, it would touch the town of Canso, which would be a great advantage indeed in the developing of the fishing industry of that town. I am certain there is no point in eastern Canada, if not in North America, where a large fishing business can be carried on with such success as at Canso. Canso projects out into the Atlantic and forms one of the finest regions to be found on the coast. As proof of this, I may say that on the 1st day of January the fishermen of that little town, the population of which is only 2,000, and in spite of the inclemency of the weather at this season of the year, took in 300,000 pounds of fresh fish in one day; that is to say 150 tons of fish were landed at that

point in one day. Of course, this is not usual, but it shows the possibilities of the fishing industry at that point. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways mentioned ten carloads a day as a possible traffic to warrant the building of that line. On this particular day there would be at least fifteen carloads of fresh fish landed at that point. The difficulty of marketing this catch is very great, and the price to the fisherman is very small on account of the fact that we have no proper transportation facilities. Our best market is, perhaps, that of Boston, and if we had a daily boat running from Canso to Boston, it would enable the Atlantic ports, such as Canso, White Head, Country Harbour, &c., to pick up the fish caught on the coast and deliver it to the markets of Boston. This would perhaps serve just as well as a railway line, but my hon. friends opposite do not believe in trade with Boston. They are opposed to that kind of trade; they pretend to fear it might not be to the advantage of the country, and for that reason I cannot press upon them too strongly the fact that they ought to be willing to make some sacrifice to put these fishermen in touch with the home markets of Montreal and Toronto.

Of course unless we can get some guarantee or other it is impossible to develop this splendid industry that exists at our very doors. I said a moment ago that the position of the Prime Minister in this matter is somewhat indefensible in view of the position he took when the matter was before the House prior to his coming into power. But what has transpired since? The question is what steps will be taken now? Is there any hope that any move will be made in regard to this particular branch line? I pointed out that he committed himself favourably to this branch, that he issued a card in which he stated that he was in favour of it and when he came into power he did not carry out the promise he made on that occasion. The Minister of Railways is quite familiar with this matter. It has been brought before him a number of times. I trust he is giving it some consideration. If we are to believe the stories we see in the newspapers there is some fear that we may lose him from this House, that he may be translated to a higher sphere. It is stated that it is quite possible he is going to represent the King in the great province of Ontario. I do not know whether or not there is any truth in that rumour, but I would say to him that before this happens, before we lose the benefit of his counsel and advise in the House of Commons, he should introduce a large and comprehensive measure to solve this important question of the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway. I would suggest to him that to round out his career as a statesman in the Canadian House of Commons, he should take hold of this matter with a strong hand, in a business way and deal with it and when he does so he will not forget to straighten out matters in regard to the projected branch lines in the county of Guysborough.

Mr. LOGGIE: Mr. Speaker, so much has been said on this important subject that I do not intend to take up the time of the House for more than a few moments. This matter was discussed a year ago and at the close of the discussion I understood it to be the policy of the Government of the day to retain the Intercolonial railway and also to build new branch lines and to take over the present branch lines that are feeders to that trunk line. Not only is that true, but as has already been made known to the House, it is the policy of the Government of to-day to extend the usefulness of the Intercolonial railway, as was made known at the time of the last election. In view of that, the statements made in the press are somewhat alarming. Let me read, under date of January 17, these words, referred to by the hon. member for Westmorland to-day.

> If you were closely connected with the Government you would learn that the Intercolonial railway will likely be sold or leased shortly. He said that the actual transference had been under consideration for some time and he understood that the contract had already been made out.

These are the words of Mr. Lodge, the president of the Maritime Board of Trade and also the president of the Board of Trade of Moncton, where the headquarters of the Intercolonial railway are. It seems to me it is incumbent upon the Minister of Railways to let the people of Canada know if there has been such a change of policy in regard to the retention of the Intercolonial. It is not necessary to make any defence for the retention of this railway and its continued management by the people. It was clearly the intention of the fathers of Confederation that this railway should be owned and operated by the people of Canada in the interest of the provinces that then joined the compact of Confederation. So I say it is incumbent upon the Government of the day to give the territory adjacent to the trunk line the necessary transportation. The hon. gentleman from Digby referred to the fact that the Government in power until a year ago did not go on with the work of taking over the branch lines. The hon. gentleman did not give the reason why that was not put into execution, but he knows or he knew very well that it was found that the Act was not adequate, that there was not suffi-

cient power or scope in the Act for the satisfactory giving up by the owners of the branch lines and the hon. gentleman knew very well too that the then Minister of Railways had an amendment to that Act ready to place before Parliament when dissolution came about so that it is hardly fair for the hon. gentleman to say that the late Government were not proceeding with their work in an energetic manner.

I would like to again remind the minister that when he is considering the extension of new branch lines there is in his department a petition for a new branch line from the town of Newcastle to Tracadie. The section of country to be served thereby is very important, the fishing and lumbering industries and the agricultural industries ought to be served. I said, I think in 1905, when this matter was first brought before the House, that it was incumbent upon the trunk line to give the adjacent territory the necessary transportation facilities. It has been well said that a short line of itself can hardly be made a paying venture. It has also been pointed out that a large proportion of the rolling stock is unsuitable for a trunk line but would be quite suitable for branch lines, and in that way the country at large would be served. Hon. gentlemen have also referred to the fact that the Maritime provinces are not going ahead as fast as other portions of Canada, and that soon our representation will be reduced. Let me say that if there is anything that will lessen that possibility it is to give increased transportation to those portions of the country that have not now adequate railway facilities. The matter of parcel post was talked of in the House a few days ago and it was argued that it would reduce express rates. Let me point out to hon. gentlemen that there are many sections of the county which I represent that have no railway facilities, and therefore could not have any express offices. So that if places that have express offices are entitled to lower rates, and those lower rates can be brought about by a parcel post system, surely it is more incumbent still upon the Government that villages which have no railways and no express offices should be given the transportation facilities necessary for the development of the territory in which they are situated.

I want to draw the minister's attention to how the operation of branch lines retards the trade of the country through which they pass and which they serve. Let me illustrate what I mean by giving the rates on the Caraquet railway. The hon. minister perhaps knows that at Caraquet and Shippigan there are large fishing firms and that the products of the fisheries in that section is a very large one. The through rate of freight for export of dry fish from Shippigan to New York is 30 cents. The portion charged on the Caraquet railway for seventy miles is nine cents, the seventy miles being from Shippigan to Gloucester Junction, and from Gloucester Junction to New York, a distance of 765 miles, the rate is 21 cents. Thus we have an arbitrary charge of nine cents for seventy miles when the rate for the balance of the route to New York for export is twenty-one cents. Let me also give the rate for canned goods, not for export but for local consumption. The rate from Tracadie to Gloucester Junction, a distance of seventy miles is fifteen cents, and from Gloucester Junction to Montreal, a distance of 533 miles, the rate is twenty-three cents. That is what we are charged on branch lines and that is retarding the business interests of the country which those branch lines serve. If the Intercolonial was managing the branch lines, as has already been pointed out, much of the necessary expense of managing sixty or seventy miles could be done away with. Therefore in view of the whole situation and in view of the fact that the policy of both parties is the same, surely there is no possibility of the conjecture made in the press being realized that there is an intention to lease or sell the people's railway, the railway which was built as a part of the compact joining the provinces by the sea to the western provinces. Much has been said to the effect that this railway does not pay the interest on the capital invested, but is that any answer? We do not expect the canal system to pay any interest, and are the Maritime provinces not the best customers of the manufacturing centres of Canada? Are the Maritime provinces not among the best customers of the manufacturers of Ontario? Do we not use, per capita at any rate, as large a proportion of the manufactures of the great cities of Montreal and Toronto as any other part of the country? I hope there is no truth in the suggestion that it is the intention of the Government to lease or sell the Intercolonial. There have been many alarms of that kind in the past, but they have always turned out to be not well founded. I hope that when the Minister makes his statement it will be along the lines of what he said twelve months ago, namely, that he will go on with the policy laid down by the Liberal party, and amend where it is not suitable, so that branches can be taken over in an equitable and business-like manner as between the Government and the owners of the branch lines.

Mr. CARROLL: I do not intend to argue upon the general principle contained in the resolution which has been under discussion this afternoon and evening. I think it is freely admitted by members on

both sides of the House, as it is certainly admitted by the people of the country generally, that a trunk line of railway is not a financial success unless it is fed by branch lines. If we look over the history of railways in this country we will find that they are fed by branches, and that until those branches were built the main trunk lines were not the financial successes that their promoters hoped they would be. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the county which I represent is situate the city of Sydney, which is the eastern terminus of the Intercolonial. It is the home of the great steel and coal industry of the Dominion Coal and Steel companies. There is one part of the county of Cape Breton which is very well served by the Intercolonial railway, but there is another and more important part of that constituency which is not benefited by the Intercolonial railway, or by any other road. During the last session of this Parliament I brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals the condition of affairs in the eastern part of that constituency. The city of Sydney has a population of 18,000 or 20,000 people. It is the terminus of the Intercolonial railway. To the east of the city of Sydney we have a population, including the town of Dominion and Glace Bay and the mining centres of Louisburg and so on, of well nigh 50,000 people. Those people have a railway known as the Sydney & Glace Bay railway. It is operated by the Dominion Coal Company, not as a traffic railway, or as a passenger railway, but as a coal carrying concern. I pointed out to the minister at that time that these 50,000 people in South Cape Breton had to pay a double tariff on all freight which came into that part of the riding. I also pointed out that there was a remedy of two kinds which might be availed of; first, that the Government should obtain running rights from Sydney to Louisburg, or that they could take over the railway which runs from Point Tupper to St. Peter, as a branch line of the Intercolonial railway, and extend that railway to Louisburg through the magnificent country of the Miras, Gabarus, Louisburg, Morien, Glace Bay and into the city of Sydney. If the minister has not up to this date investigated the conditions there as I pointed them out, he should undertake it at once if he has the business capacity we are led to believe he has. I understand that representations have been made by the Board of Trade of the city of Sydney to impress upon the minister the necessity of taking over the railway from Point Tupper to St. Peters and extending it to Sydney. I apprehend that in the interests of South Cape Breton and of the whole of Cape Breton island, the better plan would be to take over the whole of this branch line and extend it as indicated. It has been said by certain people that the Government should not take over branch lines which would not be feeders but milkers of the Intercolonial railway, but I would point out to the minister that so far as that branch line, and the extension of that line is concerned, it will be in no wise a milker of the Intercolonial railway, but in my estimation will be of inestimable benefit as a feeder. My hon. friend from North Cape Breton has pointed out that the island of Cape Breton is separated in two parts by the Bras d'Or Lakes and by the St. Peters canal. The eastern part of that island has no railway communication which is of any benefit whatever to the people. We have, some 15 or 20 miles from the village of St. Peters, which is at present the terminus of the St. Peters road, the harbour of Louisburg, which is open to navigation for twelve months in the year, and which I may say is one of the finest harbours in the world. We have there a grand country, rich in minerals. The provincial mining reports are filled with literature showing the vast resources of that territory. If the Intercolonial railway were extended to the town of Louisburg, it would be instrumental in developing these mineral resources, as well as the farming and fishing industries. After leaving Louisburg, we come to the most thickly populated portion of Nova Scotia, and a portion of that population is catered to by the Sydney and Louisburg railway. As a convenience to the people of that district, this railway is not only absolutely worthless, but in some respects a burden, because it simply makes the people of this district pay as much freight for the forty miles between Sydney and Louisburg, as they would pay from Montreal or Halifax to Sydney. I want to point out to the minister, the counties of North and South Cape Breton are the best paying portions of the Intercolonial railway. The Auditor General's Report for the year ending 31st March, 1910, gives the full earning of the freight and passengers as follows:

Montreal	$736,883 18
St. John	594,346 30
Halifax	833,674 17
Sydney	801,679 46

It will be seen that that portion of the Intercolonial railway which operated in the Sydneys is second in earning capacity to no portion of the Intercolonial railway. But that is not all; the local cost of handling business in the city of Sydney is only $32,603.51, as compared with over $98,000 in the city of St. John and $109,393.91 in the city of Halifax. I have not the figures of the cost of handling freight and passengers in Montreal, but I dare say they are at least in proportion to the cost in St. John and Halifax. The net standing of these three terminals, St. John, Halifax, and Sydney, is as follows:

Sydney.. .. ..$789,676.95
Halifax.. .. .. 724,300.26
St. John.. .. .. 496,117.68

Therefore, so far as the earning capacity of the Intercolonial railway is concerned, the Sydney end of the railway is the most paying portion of the road. I do not lay it down as a principle that because that is so, we should get any better terms than any other territory, through which the Intercolonial railway runs, but I do maintain, and I put it to the Minister of Railways as a matter of justice, that this being the case we should get at least as fair a deal with reference to railway facilities as is given to other portions of the Intercolonial railway, and which I do not think we are getting. I have good reason for believing that if this branch line were taken over and extended to Sydney it would be a very material factor in building up a far greater trade in the eastern section of this country than we have at present. It would develop untold mineral resources, resources that are lying latent at present for want of transportation facilities; it would develop one of the very finest agricultural regions in eastern Canada and it would also develop some of the very best fishing centres in the Maritime provinces. It would give to the present population of 50,000 people a far better chance of living, and of getting their freight without the enormous cost they are compelled to pay now. It would in addition to that bring to that country, with the development of the minerals, fisheries and agricultural resources, a population which I believe would be double what it is at the present time. Now I am not in a position to state whether the hon. Minister of Railways has taken this proposition into consideration. I say he should take it into consideration, not because there is any need of it—and the need is there—but because it is a good proposition.

Mr. MACDONALD: I do not propose to speak at very great length. I may say that though I did not have the opportunity of hearing all the debate to-day, I admire the energy, the capacity and the confidence of my hon. friend the member for Westmorland, who has again this year laid before the House, the hon. Minister of Railways and the Government, the necessity of doing something in regard to this question of branch lines. I doubt very much, however, whether any result will come from my hon. friend the Minister of Railways or from this Government; and the reason is because, when my hon. friend will not merely refuse to consider the question of purchasing branch lines or taking any steps in the way of acquiring them, but will actually throw over propositions that have been entered into by previous ministers, to which the faith of the country has been committed, and will decline to do anything with them, there is not much use in my hon. friend from Westmorland coming to the Minister of Railways and asking him to propound a general proposition. In my constituency there was under operation, in good faith by the department, in furtherance of an agreement which had been arrived at and pending, legislation being passed, a line of railway for six miles connecting a very large coal mine.

Mr. COCHRANE: Had it been signed?

Mr. MACDONALD: It had been agreed upon in general terms between the Minister of Railways and the company having the contract.

Mr. COCHRANE: You said it had been entered into.

Mr. MACDONALD: If my hon. friend wants to escape from his responsibility to the community, because the minister had not actually signed the document and because the legislation had not passed Parliament, he is welcome to do so. That is not a legitimate reason to put forward. If my hon. friend decides upon a policy to-day in his department, he certainly would not decline to assume the responsibility for that policy because he had not signed some paper. He declined to operate that line of railway which the Government of Canada were obtaining without the expenditure of a single cent of money or without committing the country to any obligation of any serious character, or which would weigh against them in any way. In furtherance of the understanding that had been arrived at, there was put into operation the railway which gave service to the people interested. When my hon. friend found that that was so, and that there was really a branch line projected which had come into existence, my hon. friend was so much opposed to branch lines and the scheme advocated by my hon. friend the hon. member for Westmorland, that he withdrew the train service, and although the people interested have importuned him from that day to this, my hon. friend told us in this House a few weeks ago that he could do nothing and would do nothing in regard to it. Take another proposition for the construction of a railway in the constituency of my hon. friend from Guysborough, where his leader had pledged not only the faith of his party, but his personal honour, to the people of Nova Scotia in regard to the construction of that branch line of railway, where in addition to the pledges given by men whose word carries great weight, you consider that the Government previous to that of my hon. friend had gone so far as to actually spend a portion of the vote that

had been given for the acquirement of a line of railway that formed part of that proposition, what does my hon. friend do when he comes into office? The first thing he does is to try to stop the payment of the cheque to the company which had sold that railway to the Government. When he found that he could not stop it, my hon. friend proceeded to give to the people who live along that line of railway, which is part of the Intercolonial to-day, no satisfactory accommodation, none of those privileges and none of those rights, which are accorded to men who live along the line of the Intercolonial. He stands and his leader stands absolutely slated, refusing to recognize the pledge to the people of the province of Nova Scotia, and declining to implement in any way the numerous promises given by their leader and by their candidates in the counties interested in regard to these matters. Now, I say to my hon. friend from Westmorland, although I admire the energy which he has displayed and the information which he has given to the House, that I think all his energy and all that he has said has fallen on deaf ears.

Mr. COCHRANE: What you have said is doing so.

Mr. MACDONALD: My hon. friend is surely not going to take that position, that the people who happen to live in one province of the Dominion are to be told they are not to have those privileges, those rights which come as a matter of natural consequence from the operation of a railway system by a government or a company, I care not what it is, because there happens to be a trunk line of railway running through a particular section of the country. Is the policy of this Government and of this Minister to be that at no time are the people who control that trunk line of railway to be allowed to obtain the control of the branch lines in connection with it, or to go on with the construction of additional branch lines and open up the country outside of the trunk line of railway? Let me remind this House as I have already done in the past, that there is this duty thrown on the Government controlling the operations of the Intercolonial, that as the country through which that railway passes develops, as the possibilities of satisfactory conditions arising through population increasing or through the development of industrial conditions come along, it is the duty of the Government to go and give the people interested necessary railway communication. The Government alone can do so; and if my hon. friend will not give it to the people, why does he not give running powers over the system to the transcontinental systems of the country? I know there are hon. gentlemen who say the Government ought not to do so. As a Nova Scotian, I say to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, and to the Premier of this country, coming from the same province as myself, that they have no right to stand over the Intercolonial, and decline to give the people, who are interested in branch line communication, some business connection with the rest of the country. When they refuse to do so, I say as a Nova Scotian that we want the transcontinental railways to have running rights over that piece of railway called the Intercolonial railway, so that if my hon. friend will not give the people interested in these branch lines accommodation, the transcontinental systems of this country may be asked to do so. They will do so. If the Grand Trunk railway, the Canadian Pacific railway or the Canadian Northern railway were operating the Intercolonial railway to-day, they would deal with this branch line proposition; and the two branches to which I have referred, which my hon. friend and his Government have declined to deal with, would have been put into operation long ago by any one of the great corporations of this country. And if he will not do his duty, if his leader, though from that province, will not do his duty, then will he give the transcontinental systems of this country a chance to come in? He should give us in Nova Scotia a chance to go to the transcontinental railways and ask whether they will not give the accommodation to the people which he refuses. If he will not do one thing, let him do the other. The interests of the people of the Maritime provinces cannot be thrown away, they cannot be disregarded in this fashion. My hon. friend can spend millions in localities to further the local interests of premiers and other gentlemen who look forward some day to going back for re-election; but he will not spend one-thirtieth part of the amount he is willing to dump into one constituency, to give to the people of three or four constituencies, the commonest facilities for their business needs. That is the situation, and hon. gentlemen on the opposite side will not venture to deny it. They cannot deny it.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Inverness): At this late hour, I do not wish to lengthen this discussion, but merely to make a few remarks. I will not go into the history of the case, for that has been attended to by other members who have spoken. But there is one particular branch line in which I have an interest. I may appear selfish in devoting all my remarks to that particular branch line. Had it been at an early hour, I would have led up to it through more general considerations. I refer to the line running from Orangedale, in the county of Inverness, to the harbour at Cheticamp in

this same county. I brought this matter to the attention of the House last year, in discussing a resolution similar to that which we have before us to-night. I accompanied a delegation from that county last session who waited upon the minister to impress upon him the importance of this line. After laying the matter before the minister, and, I think, impressing him with the importance of the line from a transportation standpoint, I suggested that he send an engineer from his department to look over the line and find out if all our representations were not true. The engineer went to the county, travelling over the line; and I am glad to say that he has—at least I believe he has—made a very favourable report. While in the county he took occasion to report to every second man there that it was a wrong thing that this line had not been built long ago, that the resources of the country would fully justify its construction, and that it would now surely be built. I happened to get some figures which I believe will bear out my statement that the engineer has placed in the hands of the minister a report favourable to that line. I must refer to a few of the industrial developments that would go on as a result of building this line. The first is the dolomite areas at Whycocomagh. These areas have been looked over very carefully by the engineer, and he was quite satisfied that a large industry could be developed at this place. I may say, the development of this mine has been delayed on account of lack of railway facilities. The Dominion Iron and Steel Company, have found this property of such value that they have purchased it. I think hon. gentlemen will agree that this institution does not buy anything that is likely to prove valueless. They would look into the property carefully before purchasing. They have purchased this property and I have no doubt at all, with a view to developing it. But, under present conditions, that is impossible; development must await railway facilities. Then, we find at Lake Ainslie, a first-class deposit of barytes. The engineer reported on that, I believe, and I think it will be found that an estimate was made by several engineers of the amount of barytes that could be manufactured and shipped from these deposits. They say that fifty thousand tons a year could be shipped. It was found that it would be possible to find a market for that amount; and, so far as the quantity in the ground is concerned, it is unlimited. Certain capitalists have gone in there and have erected a plant. But they found great difficulty; the great question to be the matter of transportation. But, in the face of all their difficulties, they have done

considerable work there. They haul the product to the Inverness railway, a distance of eight or ten miles by boat in summer, and over the lake ice in winter, and ship it over the Inverness railway and then over the Intercolonial railway. Hon. gentlemen who are aware of the great cost of transportation over two railway systems can realize the difficulty this company has to contend with. On the other hand, if they had the railway accommodation that this proposed line would give them, they would certainly ship much greater quantities. We come then to the large coal deposits of Ste. Rose. The estimated exportation of coal from this mine is 600,000 tons a year. That, I understand, is the estimate of the engineer. It is a first-class property, the coal is of first-class quality, almost in inexhaustable quantities. We cannot hope to have work done at this place, because there is no possibility of getting the coal on the market except by this line or extension of the Inverness railway north. The Government has spent sums of money to improve harbours along Inverness coast, but harbours cannot meet such demands as those which exist at Ste. Rose, inasmuch as we are not blessed with such harbours as are found along the southern coast of Nova Scotia. As we go north in the county we come to gypsum. The gypsum in North Inverness is now regarded as important. It is more important since a large plant has been erected, and even now, in spite of all the difficulties, they are manufacturing and shipping on the average between 75 and 100 tons a day. I understand that the manufactured article sells between $8 and $12 a ton. Any one acquainted with the almost unlimited quantity of that mineral, its first-class quality, and the large demand for this product in the markets of the world, will understand that, with railway facilities, an almost unlimited industry could be developed.

I may say that the fishing resources of this part of the country are most important. I am sorry I have not the statistics at hand, but I referred to this matter last year in detail. The value of the fisheries along this coast last year was in the vicinity of $100,000, but that is only small as compared with our hope for its development if we had the modern facilities for placing the products of the fishermen upon the market, and in a marketable condition. We have no refrigerator cars, and our only way of sending fish to the market is by way of salting. As the hon. member for North Cape Breton, and the hon. member for Bonaventure have pointed out, the handicap to the fishermen of having to salt down their fish is almost insurmountable. I am positive that although fish to

the value of $100,000 are being exported from this part of the country if we had railway facilities the amount would be five times as much.

The forest wealth of the country is quite important. It has practically received no attention up to this time, because we have no railway facilities. I have not referred to the farming industry of that section of the county to be served by this proposed line. From Orangedale through Whycocomagh, the Lake Ainslie, South West Margaree and through the settlement adjacent to the Margaree river, Grand Etang and Cheticamp, are found the finest farming country in eastern Canada. The Margaree valley is known to everybody acquainted with the island of Cape Breton as a splendid farming district. I have confidence in the business capacity of the Minister of Railways, and I feel that with the report he has in his possession, obtained by his own representative—a gentleman selected by himself, and no doubt possessed of ability to do the work—I feel that this branch of railway will be built from a business standpoint . He has laid down a condition last year which I am satisfied this particular line will measure up to, and I am confident in leaving it to his own very exacting judgment. If he will give the matter about ten minutes attention, he will see this is a project that he must grasp as a business man. I must call the atention of the House to the fact that I had the promise of the late Government to construct this line of railway, and I did not go on my knees to that Government to induce them to build it because of desire to strengthen my political position. I placed it before them as a business matter, and they saw clearly that this was one case in which they would have no difficulty in discerning the necessity for action, and it was quite evident that the construction of this line of railway meant increased earnings for the general system of the Intercolonial railway.

I feel I should lay particular emphasis upon the business value of this line. I do not propose to reflect upon the other lines, and I know that the road advocated by the hon. member for Richmond is an important line, and that its extension to Louisburg will be of great benefit to the district concerned, as well as to the Intercolonial railway. I hold, however, there is not one branch line which possesses the merits of this line from Orangedale to Cheticamp, and I am prepared to substantiate this not only by actual facts and figures, but from the report of the engineers sent out by the Minister of Railways himself. I trust, therefore, he will be governed by this report, and I feel sure that realizing the necessity, he will take the proper steps in the matter.

There are several other matters in connection with this railway to which I would like to refer—matters which, I am sure, would help to convince the Minister of Railways of the absolute necessity of definite and immediate action; but, as the hour is late, I do not wish to further impose upon the indulgence of the House.

Mr. GRAHAM: I presume I need not preface my few remarks on this matter by saying that the subject is not a new one. Having given some study to the condition of Canada in its general development, I look to the great development of the eastern part of Canada during the next five years, and to its improvement in every regard. We have been growing at a very rapid rate, and devoting a great deal of our energies, first to bringing people to Canada, to assist in the cultivation of our untilled millions of acres, and then, as the corollary, in carrying out the duty we owe to these people in giving them transportation facilities, that they may be contented and happy in their new location, and reap the reward they ought to obtain as pioneers in a new land. The eastern part of Canada is, to my mind, showing signs of great revival, and I think that any student of latter day affairs, if he looks closely into this phase of Canadian activity, will agree that unless some blunder is made, the dawn of a greater prosperity in the Maritime provinces and the eastern portion of Canada is upon us.

No one will deny that whatever renders aid to the development of any part of Canada will help and assist the development of the whole country, and we cannot discuss the problem of the Intercolonial as relating only to the people of the Maritime provinces and Quebec. As an Ontario man, I have always contended that the people of the province to which I belong have reaped a benefit, and are now reaping the benefit of the operation of the Intercolonial railway. The people of both East and West reap great benefit from any expenditure we make on our harbours, on our canal systems, and on the deepening of the St. Lawrence, and anything we do to develop any part of Canada must necessarily redound to the benefit of the whole country. The question of branch lines is one which had been strongly urged upon me, when a member of the Government, by the hon. member for Westmorland ; so much so that, in discussing the matter, the hon. member for North Toronto, now Minister of Trade and Commerce, instead of helping me along with the matter, was rather facetious in saying I was trying to get rid of the importunities of the member for Westmorland. In the introduction of the first measure involving the taking over of branch lines I must admit I did not have the sympathy of hon. gentlemen in

opposition that I expected to get. I want to make two exceptions—the present Prime Minister, then leader of the Opposition, favoured the Bill I brought in, and the member for Cumberland spoke strongly in its favour. Aside from these, I think I did not have much support from the Opposition. The Prime Minister, then leader of the Opposition, in replying to some of the criticisms directed against the measure, said he accepted that Bill as the acceptance by this House of the principle of the leasing of the branch lines of the Intercolonial. The Bill was discussed and finally passed by the House. The Senate, I think, introduced some amendments; we did not accede to the amendments, but had a conference; and substitute clauses were introduced and the Bill went through.

The subject is one not easy to deal with —and in this my sympathies are with the Minister of Railways—but it is easier to deal with now than when it was first introduced, because it has passed through a good many difficulties that were then in the way, or which can be more easily met now than they could at that time. However, it is not without extreme difficulty as I will point out. This Bill was introduced. In endeavouring to carry out that measure we found that owing to the different conditions of the various roads, some in fair condition and some run down and scarcely operated, some paying, some not paying, some that would pay, some that would never pay, some that would be revenue-producing, some that would be a burden, it was almost impossible to frame an Act that would apply to all the railways and work it out. In the session of 1911 we went a step further and introduced a resolution naming several lines of railway.

There are two conditions existing: in Quebec and in New Brunswick there are branch lines in existence; in Nova Scotia, generally speaking, they need branch lines where they do not exist. These conditions had to be met in different ways. Consequently estimates were placed before the House for the construction of several lines in Nova Scotia where lines did not exist, where, I believe they ought to be constructed. I will go further than that. When I first entered this House, after studying the question carefully, after looking at the vast revenue, after being impressed with the need of transportation, which to-day is perhaps the great need of the people, I decided that even where it will not pay, the Government of Canada ought to undertake to give the people of Canada reasonable transportation for their products and themselves. That applies to some lines possibly in Nova Scotia, I shall not discuss in detail these various lines. There is no doubt about the business principle involved in the case of those that would pay. They should undoubtedly be acquired, but in that province, particularly where the Intercolonial is the only trunk line, where it took possession of all the good paying territory in the years gone by, practically pre-empted the paying territory, the through traffic, if it is not to help in the branch lines there is no help for the people living remote from the trunk line because no company, except in the expectation of selling to somebody, will undertake to build a branch line unless it is sure of a return in some way. That being the case, in Nova Scotia, I recommended building several lines in that province, some of which would pay and some would not pay for years. But, in the first place, the people would have the transportation to which they are entitled and it would protect the trunk line belonging to the Government from some other line in later years stepping in and taking what might prove good feeders to the Intercolonial railway. In New Brunswick several lines were under discussion. Some lines in New Brunswick are not being operated properly. I received many letters telling me that some of these roads had been subsidized by the provincial and possibly by the Dominion Government, but had run down, that not a dollar was expended in repair and the people along the lines many of whom had been induced to go in there, perhaps with some small industries, were not getting the service to which they were entitled; during some portions of the year the roads were closed down. That was not fair to the people of Canada. If we had not the revenue, if we were not paying subsidies, if we were not priding ourselves that we were spending more money than any other country of the same population in providing transportation facilities, there might be some excuse. But with the existing circumstances and the advancement of the last few years there was no excuse. Consequently I recommended leasing some lines in New Brunswick as a start, and I did not confine myself to lines I was sure would pay. In Quebec I recommended the leasing of certain lines. This resolution was placed before the House. The Vale railway, to which reference has been made, is a small line running from New Glasgow out six miles. The people are not accommodated along the road by the company, they merely haul the coal. I entered into a tentative agreement, subject to the approval of Parliament, with these people that we would make a certain provision with them for their freight rates for a number of years for their product and the road would become our property. I thought it was good business from the standpoint of the Intercolonial railway and it certainly was a boon to people along the line. The resolutions then introduced were a start only but they carried out the prin-

ciples of the Bill adopted by this House in 1910 and put in a practical shape the requirements or the details of the propositions we were prepared to make with regard to these particular lines. Possibly the conditions attached in this Bill for these lines would not have applied to some other lines but these were the lines indicated and I want to call the attention of my hon. friend from Westmorland to one or two which he said should be taken over; they were included. The railways included in that resolution were:

The Quebec Oriental railway, extending from Matapedia to Paspebiac, a distance of about 100 miles;
The Hampton and St. Martins railway, extending from Hampton to St. Martins, a distance of about 30 miles;
The Albert railway, extending from Salisbury to Albert, a distance of about 45 miles;
The Moncton and Buctouche railway, extending from Moncton to Buctouche, a distance of about 28 miles;
The Caraquet railway and Gulf Shore railway, together extending from Bathurst to Tracadie, a distance of about 85 miles.
The York and Carleton railway, extending from Cross creek to and beyond Stanley, a distance of about 10 miles;
The International railway, extending from Campbellton to the St. John Valley at St. Leonards, a distance of about 113 miles;
The Cape Breton railway, extending from Rivière du Loup to Connors, a distance of about 30 miles;
The Temiscouta railway, extending from Rivièee du Loup to Connors, a distance of about 113 miles;
The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, extending from Sackville Junction to Cape Tormentine, a distance of about 30 miles;
The Elgin and Havelock railway, extending from Elgin to Havelock, a distance of about 28 miles;
The Kent Northern railway, extending from Kent Junction to Richibucto, a distance of about 27 miles;
Including the company's rolling stock in each case.

There were certain provisions attached to that resolution. It was a resolution, as hon. gentlemen know, that had to go through the Committee of the House and if the details would not be applicable in every case and they were fairly restrictive I admit, they could have been changed in committee. The reason this did not become law is quite evident. Another large subject loomed up on the horizon and many Bills, dear to our hearts as ministers and members, were slaughtered. But I absolutely stand by the principle as to taking over the branch lines in New Brunswick and in Quebec and building new ones in Nova Scotia. Surely where they will be of assistance to the Intercolonial railway and in addition to that, where the people ought to have the transportation, and we in the Dominion of Canada owe it to these people to give them the proper transportation in these sections——

Mr. COCHRANE: Do you still adhere to leasing or would you purchase?

Mr. GRAHAM: It would all depend. I see the force of my hon. friends contention. In some cases I would lease, in some purchase. I would approach it as a company would approach a branch line company desiring to acquire its property.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does the Minister of Railways refer to long leases, for 99 years?

Mr. COCHRANE: Or on a percentage basis.

Mr. GRAHAM: The conditions existing would govern.

Mr. HAZEN: The regulations provide for leasing.

Mr. GRAHAM: As I said it provided for leasing as a start and I picked out these particular lines. But it concludes by saying that it does not mean that we had to lease any of those if we could not make proper arrangements. My hon. friend will read it on page 5958 where he will see the conditions. If those could not have been leased on proper terms, then I would certainly have come to the House and asked for power to purchase some of the lines. But it does not change the principle, and that is what I am discussing just now. If the Government is going to retain the Intercolonial as a trunk line, it ought, in the interests of the people, look after those sections that are distant from the trunk lines. There is something further I wish to say to the hon. Minister of Railways. If he is going to dispose of the Intercolonial railway he ought to get the branch lines.

Mr. COCHRANE. There is no notion of disposing of it.

Mr. GRAHAM: I am glad to hear that. But if that were contemplated, and I appeal even to those who are in favour of disposing of it, it would be better business to have the branch lines of that railway when negotiating with a company than to leave it open so that some other company could secure them. It would be a better property with the branch lines under the control of the owner of that property than it would be without them.

Now, there are other points in connection with this matter that I might discuss, but it is pretty late. I just want to add, and I do no wish to make any political reference, that as Minister of Railways and Canals in the late Government, I approached the question after a good deal of thought and discussion as to what was the best thing to do. Any person who thinks this is a small problem to work out is very much mistaken. The details cannot be absolutely

decided until you come in contact with each road separately. It is not a small thing to do, but this Parliament has approved of the acquisition of branch lines, or of a portion of them at least, and we ought not to hesitate, we ought not to delay. One hundred years ago it was a different proposition, but railway communication in Canada to-day is looked upon as almost as necessary as the ordinary road which passes our doors, and the man who is removed from railway communication is out of the world to a large extent, so far as making money out of his calling is concerned, or in any other way. I would strongly favour any measure that would proceed to carry out that principle. The details are a different matter. I am prepared to discuss the details when they are laid before the House, but I believe the Government should not hesitate to provide for the people of Nova Scotia where they have not proper railway facilities in connection with the Intercolonial, and that in New Brunswick he should take over a certain number of lines, perhaps not all at once, but year by year, looking first to the lines that are not giving good service to the people, and next to the lines that would pay the Intercolonial. Perhaps that is putting it rather strongly, but one who has travelled over the country where they have not proper railway facilities, cannot but feel that the first duty of the Government is to provide good railway facilities for the people who have not them at present. Other people have not the facilities perhaps that they would have on the Intercolonial system, but the people who have no facilities or next to none ought to be our first care. The Temiscouata railway is one I had in contemplation and it would have been of immense value to the Government and to the Intercolonial system. The Dominion Atlantic is perhaps in the same catergory. We have been asked several times why he did not take over the Dominion Atlantic. That will perhaps come up for discussion later on. I was always under the impression that the Dominion Atlantic could not be acquired by the Government owing to certain information that was given to me before it was discussed by the Government. Probably the Canadian Pacific railway had arrangements quietly under way which precluded it, but I am not sure of that. However, the principle is all right, and I want to urge the Government as strongly as I can not to forsake the development of transportation in the eastern part of Canada, particularly along the line of the Intercolonial railway, because as I have already said, I look in the next five or six years to eastern Canada and the Maritime provinces surprising the rest of the Dominion in their development and progress.

Mr. RHODES : We have discussed this question for a whole day. It is a subject of vital importance to the people of eastern Canada as well as to Canada as a whole, and for that reason I regret to have to discuss it even briefly at this late hour. I shall promise, however, to make my remarks as brief as possible. I have followed the discussion on the part of the hon. gentlemen opposite with more or less care, and if I have been struck with one thing more than another, it is, not so much what hon. gentlemen opposite have said, but the apologetic tone in which they have said it and their changed demeanour with respect to this question, which, after all, has been more or less a question into which politics have been introduced. As a matter of fact, I think there was a consciousness on the part of most of them that they had not dealt with this question quite fairly in the past when they were in a position to deal with it.

> When the devil was ill the devil a monk would be,
> When the devil was well, the devil a monk was he.

Hon. gentlemen opposite are not doing well politically just now, and I think they are conscious that in the days when they were well politically, they did not prepare for the day of wrath which was coming more rapidly than they imagined, and which did come a little more than a year ago.

Mr. GRAHAM : You are on a branch line now.

Mr. RHODES : The hon. member for Bonaventure was broad enough to acknowledge the fact that we have a businesslike and progressive Administration on this side of the House, but even he exhibited in the mild way in which he discussed this question, the very consciousness of which I spoke a moment ago. I have here his very words. He said with respect to the building of a branch line in the county of Bonaventure, 'the time has surely come when this railway project should be taken up seriously by this Government.' That word 'seriously' implies one of two things, either that the matter was not taken up at all by him while he represented that county on the Government side for a period of ten years, or if it was taken up, it was not taken up seriously. It seems to me that that implication in his speech is an evidence that he had that consciousness when he spoke. With respect to the hon. member for Gloucester, I was not able to follow his remarks very closely, but I have here a memorandum of one remark which he made. He said with respect to the question of handing the Intercolonial railway

over to a private corporation, that the people of the Maritime provinces would not stand for it. I want to commend the hon. member for Gloucester to the hon. member for Pictou, who was reported in the press a few days ago as having stated his firm conviction that the salvation of the Maritime provinces lay in the handing over of the Intercolonial railway to some private corporation to be run. That juxtaposition is another evidence of the harmony, or the lack of it, that exists in the political family of the Opposition, that harmony that has been boasted of so often in days gone by. Another evidence of the harmony was seen in the remarks of the hon. member for South Renfrew, who is thoroughly optimistic regarding the opportunities in the East and the prospect of something being accomplished in eastern Canada during the next five years. The hon. member for Pictou was pessimistic and so they were in disagreement on that. Then, the hon. gentleman from Guysborough could not be in his proper frame of mind if he were not complaining; he complained in the first place that the hon. member for Bonaventure was kind enough to give credit to this Government for a business administration, and he then complained of the remark of the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) who said the Minister of Railways was a man who did things. I would refer to the hon. member for Guysborough to the statement made by the late president of the Halifax Board of Trade, one of the most prominent Liberals in Nova Scotia, who said in my hearing at Halifax, at the same time affirming that he was a Liberal, that in the present Minister of Railways, Canada had the greatest Minister of Railways she had ever had.

Mr. CARVELL: Tell us about the branch lines.

Mr. RHODES: If the hon. member for Carleton would permit me to say so, so far I have discussed branch lines just as much as the hon. gentlemen opposite, with this difference, that what I say is absolutely correct. If the discussion that has taken place to-day meant anything at all, it must have meant merely an affirmation of the principle embodied in the resolution which is before the House, because I submit, and here I come to the crux of the whole matter, there has not been on the part of a single hon. gentleman opposite one suggestion as to how this desired end was to be brought about. No solution has been offered as to how we are to acquire these branch lines; no single branch line was mentioned or data given with respect to it which would lead this House to believe that that branch line ought to be taken over. The hon. member for South Renfrew was good enough to recall the circumstance that I supported him, when he introduced the resolution in this House with respect to acquiring branch lines. I did make a few remarks on that occasion, and the position I then took I take now. I cite a few words of what I then said:

> I quite agree with the hon. member for South Lanark that the passage of this Bill will mean the approbation by this House of the principle of the acquirement of branch lines.

I do not think I need labour the argument on the question of principle. I believe that the acquiring of branch lines is as vital to the welfare of a trunk line of railway as are the roots of a tree to the growth of the tree itself. I believe we are only beating straw in discussing this question of principle upon which we are all agreed, and it seems to me that if this discussion is to be of any value at all, we must propound some solution. Let me say that if the hon. member for Westmorland, who was Minister of Railways for a number of years, and who supported the Liberal Administration for fifteen long years, had devoted as much energy to the practical acquiring of branch lines during that period as he has in exhibiting his vocabulary to this House since his Government went out of power, many branch lines of railway which to-day are privately owned would be a portion of the Government system of railways in this country. Their conscience is evidently hitting some of the hon. gentlemen opposite; they realize that when in office they did nothing with respect to this matter and they expect us to do in fifteen months more than they did in fifteen years. The hon. member for Bonaventure spoke eloquently with respect to the beautiful waters washing the shores of his constituency and how they were teeming with fish, but the fish were there in just as large a quantity four years ago. He told us that there was not a refrigerator car in Bonaventure county, and that complaint was as true two or three years ago as it is today. Did he make any practical effort while he was a supporter of the late Administration to remedy that condition of affairs? I think not. And, if this discussion is of any value at all, in view of the fact that we have had no practical effort made to solve the problem, it has only been a reaffirming of a principle which has been many times accepted by this House. In view of the lateness of the hour, so far as I am myself concerned, I would prefer to deal with this matter at another period of the session. I feel also, in view of the circumstances that the Prime Minister has been mentioned at different times to-day in terms which would call for a reply from him, I would be justified in moving the adjournment of the debate. For example, the hon. member for Guys-

borough said the position of the Prime Minister with respect to this question was indefensible; the hon. member for Westmorland had some comments to make on the lack of action on the part of the Prime Minister with respect to this question. The right hon. gentleman is unfortunately not in a position to be in the House to-night, and I know it is his wish that he should have an opportunity of discussing this question before it is disposed of. I move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. EMMERSON: I think we all recognize what the adjournment of the debate means. It means sending this resolution to the graveyard of resolutions, where they are never heard of and will never be resurrected. There is no resurrection day for motions that are adjourned in this way. I think, before that action is taken, with the presence of the Minister of Railways in the House, it is due to him, as it is due from him to the country, that he should make some observations with respect to the subject matter of the resolution. Naturally, we all regret that the Prime Minister is not able to be in the House, but my hon. friend from Cumberland need not for a moment put that forward as a reason why we should adjourn the debate, because the right hon. gentleman would never have an opportunity of discussing this resolution if the debate should be adjourned. It would be futile for me to attempt to oppose the motion but I think out of courtesy to the Minister of Railways the debate should not be adjourned until we have had some explanation from him as to the consideration that has been given to the subject by his department and by the Government.

Mr. ROGERS: I am rather surprised that at this late hour my hon. friend would try to detain the House further. I think the motion of the hon. member for Cumberland is quite in order, except in view of the fact that the First Minister is not able to be present to-night. We all know the deep interest the right hon. gentleman takes in the affairs of the Maritime provinces and I am sure that he will desire to take an opportunity of seeing that this resolution is not relegated to any place that will not give him an opportunity of dealing with it before the close of the session. I am sure, in view of the fact of the Prime Minister's absence, my hon. friends opposite will not desire at this late hour to continue the debate.

Mr. COCHRANE: I may say that I certainly would have made any observations or remarks I wished to make to-night, only that I am sure that the Prime Minister will not want to let some of the statements made by the mover of this resolution go unchallenged.

Mr. GRAHAM: When conditions were reversed a year or two years ago, the present Prime Minister insisted when we asked for an adjournment of the debate, and the then Minister of Railways promised that the motion would be brought up again in the House. If the hon. gentleman who is leading the House will say that this motion will have a place where it can easily be brought up again, it will settle the matter.

Mr. ROGERS: I have already said that I am sure the Prime Minister himself would be anxious to bring it up, as he takes a deep interest in the welfare of the Maritime provinces, and he will be very much interested in this question.

Mr. GRAHAM: If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, that is not answering my question at all. For to-night, this is the Prime Minister opposite me; so far as this House is concerned, he is leading the House. The Prime Minister, of course, would take opportunities to make remarks which would exclude the further discussion of this question with the exception of his remarks. Now, the hon. gentleman who is leading the House can say that this motion will be brought up again for discussion, or he need not do so. Of course I cannot compel him to. If the object of the adjournment is not to put the resolution at the foot of the list, my hon. friend has power to say so.

Mr. ROGERS: I may say to my hon. friend that there was no notion or intention on my part of placing this motion at the foot of the list. I think he should be satisfied with the statements I have already made; and knowing the conditions as he does, I am sure the Prime Minister will be anxious to take an opportunity of discussing this matter.

Mr. GRAHAM: If the Prime Minister were here he would say 'yes' in a moment to my request.

Motion agreed to and debate adjourned.

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

For a copy of all recommendations, correspondence, letters, telegrams and reports now on file in the Department of Justice, relating to the vacancy in the office of deputy warden of the Dorchester penitentiary, and the appointment of a successor to Mr. A. B. Pipes, who was promoted from the position of deputy warden of Dorchester penitentiary, to that of warden.—Mr. Emmerson.

For a copy of all contracts, correspondence, reports of engineers and Orders in Council in connection with the construction of a marine depot at Prince Rupert.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Government of British Columbia and the Government of Canada concerning the rights and claims of the Indians in the province, and of all Orders in Council with regard to same.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of all documents and memorials of the Government of British Columbia presenting claims for additional provincial subsidies, and of all correspondence and Orders in Council on the same.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of all papers in connection with a claim of L. A. Sauvé to certain building at La Pointe des Cascades, on the Soulanges canal, and of all correspondence on the same. —Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of all petitions since the 1st of October, 1911, addressed to the Governor General in Council or to any member of the Government, asking for a remission and the adjustment of duty on cement, of all letters to the ministers individually on the same, of all correspondence and of all Orders in Council.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

For a copy of all letters, correspondence, telegrams, representations, requests and reports on file in the Department of Railways and Canals, or in the offices of the Intercolonial railway at Moncton, or among the records of the Government railways managing board, or in the office of the assistant chairman of the Government railways managing board, relating to or in any way connected with the water supply system at Dorchester station on the Intercolonial, or relating to the absence of and, the total failure to provide a supply of water for drinking or other purposes at that station, or in connection with the dwelling of the station agent in the station house; and also of all correspondence, letters, requests, recommendations and reports relating to the alleged necessity of additional clerical or other help or assistance at the station.—Mr. Emmerson.

For a copy of all plans, proposals, diagrams, specifications, reports, surveys, requests, correspondence, letters, telegrams and of all other communications and documents in possession of the Department of Railways and Canals, relating or in any wise appertaining to the proposed steam ferry service for all seasons of the year between the mainland of New Brunswick, or of Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, whereby a connection could be made between the Intercolonial railway and the Prince Edward Island railway, by the transfer of railways cars over and across the waters of the straits of Northumberland by means of said proposed ferry, together with a statement of all estimates and figures as to the total cost of the installation of such ferry and the items of said estimate or estimates in detail.—Mr. Emmerson.

For a copy of all proposals, offers, agreements, reports, estimates, letters, telegrams and of all other communications or documents in the possession of the Department of Railways and Canals, or of the Prime Minister of Canada, or of any other department of the Government, filed with said department, or any of them, since the first day of January, 1910, relating to or in any way appertaining to the question or proposal of acquiring any or all, or any one of the lines of railways connecting with the Intercolonial railway along its line, and serving as a feeder or feeders of said railway, either by lease, purchase or otherwise, also of all proposals, offers, requests, applications, petitions, memorials or other documents, and of all letters, telegrams and other communications and correspondence, relating to or in any manner appertaining to the acquisition by any railway company of running rights, so called, or the securing of a leasehold or other interest involving the rights by any railway company to operate its trains over the rails of the Intercolonial railway, together with a copy of all answers, letters, telegrams, correspondence and reports relating thereto, on the files of the Department of Railways and Canals, or of the Prime Minister, or of any department of the Government.—Mr. Emmerson.

For a copy of all letters, papers, telegrams and other documents in connection with the strike of firemen and other men employed on the D.G.S Earl Grey, in the year 1912 and 1913.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all evidence, letters, telegrams and other documents in connection with the investigation into the stranding of the D.G.S. Earl Grey at Toney river, county of Pictou, in the spring of 1912; of the reports of the commissioner investigating the same, and of all correspondence, telegrams and documents in connection therewith, and of any departmental action in connection therewith.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a return showing the names of all officials of the Marine and Fesheries Department who have been dismissed or removed in the county of Pictou, the reasons of the same, the evidence taken at any investigation held in regard to them, and the reports of said investigations, the names of their successors, and a copy of all letters, charges, complaints and recommendations from any person or persons in regard to the said removals or dismissals, or in regard to the appointment of their successors.—Mr. Macdonald.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, House adjourned at 12.15 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, January 21, 1913.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

APPOINTMENT OF TRANSLATOR.

Mr. BORDEN moved:

That the recommendation of His Honour the Speaker, as to the appointment of Mr. Louis Noailles as translator in the Translation Branch of the House of Commons, presented to the House on Tuesday, the 14th inst., be concurred in.

Motion agreed to.

EXCHEQUER COURT ACT AMENDMENT

Hon. C. J. DOHERTY (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 84, to amend the Exchequer Court Act. He said: Under the Patent Act as it now stands, a party applying for a patent, where

the patent is refused, has the right to appeal to the Governor in Council. The purpose of this Act is to substitute the Exchequer Court for the Governor in Council for the purpose of such an appeal. I think the reason why this change is deemed desirable may fairly be considered to be obvious. Apart from giving an appeal to the Exchequer Court and giving the Exchequer Court exclusive jurisdiction in these appeals, the Bill refers to the Exchequer Court any pending appeal or appeals.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPRIEVE OF YACOLOFF.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville): Would the hon. Minister of Justice kindly afford the House some explanation with regard to the report of the other day concerning the reprieve of the man Yacoloff, who was to have been executed on Friday? I do not intend to cast any doubts upon the expediency of the action taken by the court to criticise the manner in which the court was convened. But many people desire to understand what has been done in the case of this man, who, as I understand, had already been reprieved for the third time and now is granted still another reprieve. I understand that there is a report from the medical authority in the case that the man is insane.

Mr. DOHERTY: The circumstances under which this reprieve was granted are these: It is true that there had been a previous reprieve, in fact, two previous reprieves. The first was very early, and under circumstances which certainly involved no hardship on the accused, and called for no explanation. The second one was granted because it was then represented that the man was insane, and not in fit condition to be executed. The court granted a delay of two months to enable the parties acting on behalf of the accused to establish that condition. This being done I took steps, to ascertain as far as possible the condition of this man. I obtained reports as to it. The two reports did not agree, and I think I am quite safe in saying that neither of these reports were to the effect that the man was absolutely insane. The parties representing the accused, so far as I was aware, did nothing towards establishing insanity. Under these circumstances the information that I had before me was not, in my judgment, sufficient to justify intervention. At the last moment, the day before that fixed for the execution, the parties representing this unfortunate man communicated with me, and it appears from what they said that their inaction was due to what was an entire misunderstanding, and they represented that if it were not for this misunderstanding—which, as I understand, was as to the effect of the reports—they would have been able to establish conclusively facts demonstrating their affirmation of this man's insanity. I did not think that I should, with that suggestion of insanity, and with this positive affirmation that the inaction was due to a misunderstanding, allow the execution to go on without affording an oportunity to the representatives of this man to establish, it they could, their statements in regard to his condition. Of course, in an ordinary case a last-moment representation of that kind would probably be entitled to no consideration, but the information before me, while it did not establish a case for intervention, did present some indication that the representation that the man was insane might possibly be susceptible of establishment. It was not possible at that moment that the Government could, because of the absence of His Royal Highness the Governor General, pass and have approved an order for the reprieve. But under Article 1063 the judge of the court has power, for any reason that he deems sufficient, to reprieve any prisoner, and I felt it my duty to lay before the judge what seemed to be a quite sufficient reason why he should reprieve the prisoner and to request that he should do so. I take it there can be no doubt that, so far as the judge is concerned, the representation and request I made to him was an amply sufficent reason for his action, and so far as the responsibility is concerned, I take that responsibility entirely upon myself. I say that because I understand there has been some—perhaps not criticism, but some suggestion that there might be room for criticism of the judge's action. I wish to make it perfectly clear that I put the matter before the judge, under the circumstances I have indicated and made the request above mentioned, and I feel that whether I was right in doing so or not, he had under the circumstances, ample reason for doing what he did.

Mr. LEMIEUX: As I have raised the question in regard to this matter, I wish to say that the explanation of the hon. Minister amply justified him and the judge in acting as they did.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC THREE PER CENT BONDS.

Bill No. 76, respecting the purchase by the Government of the Grand Trunk Pacific company's three per cent bonds.—Hon. W. T. White (Minister of Finance)—read the second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

BANKS AND BANKING.

Hon. W. T. WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved second reading of Bill No. 36, respecting Banks and Banking. He said: When I introduced this Bill to the House I referred at some length, at greater length, indeed, than I had intended, to the principal changes which had been introduced in the revision. It is not my intention to go over the ground which I covered upon that occasion. This Bill is to be referred to the Select Standing Committee upon Banking and Commerce, and all who desire to be heard will there receive a hearing. The Government recognize the importance of this measure, and any proposal of a practical character put forward before the Banking and Commerce Committee, which will improve the Bill, will receive, of course, full discussion and most careful consideration.

I think it has generally been admitted upon the occasion of the revision of the Bank Act in connection with the decennial revision that the present Act has, on the whole, worked very well, and given satisfaction. I desire to point out very briefly to the House the increase which has taken place in connection with the business of banks during the past 20 years. The total amount of assets of the chartered banks of Canada are to-day about one billion five hundred million dollars, about six times what they amounted to in 1891, and about three times what they amounted to in 1901. Deposits have kept about a similar pace. Deposits with the chartered banks of Canada are to-day about $1,000,000,000, representing about six times the amount on deposit in 1891, and three times the amount on deposit in 1901. The amount of current loans and discounts is likewise about $1,000,000,000, representing, curiously enough, the same proportion, about six times what it was in 1891 and about three times what it was in 1901.

There are two matters to which I particularly desire to refer, supplementing what I said upon the occasion of the introduction of the Bill. The first is as to the provision in the Bill respecting audit, and later I shall talk for a little while upon a question not immediately connected with the Bill, but which was referred to during my presentation of the Bill to the House, that is, the question of the Dominion note circulation, about which there appears to exist a good deal of misunderstanding on the part especially of a certain section of the press. The provision as to audit in the proposed new Act is designed of course to afford an additional safeguard to protect the banks themselves, the shareholders and the depositors, against fraud and dishonesty on the part of officials of the banks. Since the last revision a number of failures of banks have taken place in Canada, and the question has been very much discussed in the press and otherwise, as to whether some system of inspection, either by the Government, or by the banks, or some system of audit might not be useful to obviate a recurrence of such failures.

With regard to Government inspection, which has been put forward on more than one occasion, in my judgment, in connection with a system of banks such as we have in Canada, it would be entirely ineffectual and illusory. It would create a false sense of security in the minds of the public and, I think, in the minds of the shareholders of the banks, and I think it would tend to relieve the directors from a sense of responsibility which I think they should have respecting the administration of the affairs of a bank. There has been some confusion of terms as between the words 'inspection' and 'audit.' 'Audit,' I think, technically refers to a verification or checking of work that has been done, of work completed, or of statements made. 'Inspection,' in public estimation at least, implies not only audit but also an investigation and pronouncement as to the character of the assets or securities of an institution.

At the outset, I desire to call the attention of the House to what I regard as an undoubted fact, that the very essence of banking is the loan upon personal security, upon personal credit, as opposed to loans upon security such as the loan companies make, or such as insurance companies make, or in which insurance companies invest their funds. In other words, the primary purpose of banking is to loan upon personal security, and the very basis of the character of a security, that is to say, notes, note discounts in the banks, is the character and standing and reputation of the parties making those notes. That goes without saying, I think, but attention has not been sufficiently called to it. I desire to emphasize that feature that of $1,500,000,000 of assets of the chartered banks of Canada no less than $1,000,000,000, or between $900,000,000 and $1,000,000,000 consists of current loans and discounts, discounts of commercial paper throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion.

There is another feature of our bank system to which I desire to call attention, because it is impossible to discuss the question of audit without referring to it, and that is the geographical distribution of the branches of the Canadian banks throughout the Dominion and elsewhere. As the House knows, the branch system of Canadian banks is the English and Scotch system as distinct from the American system, which is not a branch system. The Canadian banks to-day have no less than 2,800 branch banks in Canada and about

seventy-seven branch banks outside of Canada. These branches are distributed throughout the Dominion and I hope I may not weary the House if I indicate where they are situated, as the subject is important:

Ontario	1,075
Quebec	467
Nova Scotia	110
Prince Edward Island	14
New Brunswick	75
Manitoba	196
Saskatchewan	372
Alberta	254
British Columbia	224
Yukon	3

It will therefore be seen that there are nearly 2,800 branch banks distributed from Halifax to the Yukon across a continent as large as Europe. In addition there are seventy-seven branches of chartered banks outside of the Dominion. There are branches in Seattle, Spokane, Portland, I think, Vancouver, and in Mexico. There are many branches in the West Indies, Cuba, Porto Rico, and, in Newfoundland, there are thirteen.

Mr. EMMERSON: How many in New York?

Mr. WHITE: I think that in New York there is no branch in the technical sense; there are agencies. I do not know how many banks have agencies but most of the principal banks would have agencies in New York city.

Mr. EMMERSON: How about Minneapolis?

Mr. WHITE: I am not able to say whether they have agencies there, but I am rather inclined to think that there are none; certainly very few. In connection with the proposed inspection by Government, I desire again to emphasize these two points, first, that loans upon personal security form the very essence of banking and current loans and discounts form sixty per cent of the entire business of the banks and, secondly, that Canadian branch banks are widely distributed over the Dominion and outside of the Dominion. I therefore am of the opinion that it would be quite impossible for this, or for any Government to institute a system of branch bank inspection. It would be ineffectual, it could not be efficient, it could not pronounce intelligibly upon the character of the loans because I am sure I need not point out to the House that in order to pronounce upon the character of loans made all over a country such as this a knowledge would be requisite of local conditions, of industries, of companies, of men and of the entire mercantile and commercial conditions of Canada. That work, as far as the banks are concerned, is carried on to-day by their staff. The local manager knows the local situation. He is authorized, speaking generally, to make loans up to a certain amount. When he makes a loan up to a certain limited amount, $1,000, $3,000 or $5,000, he promptly informs the head office and usually sends a statement of the affairs of the party. When application is made for further sums, up to $10,000, he makes a recommendation that goes to the superintendent of the particular district in which the bank is situated, British Columbia, Manitoba, the Maritime provinces, or any other province, and the inspector of the district, the manager so to speak of the district looks over the recommendation for the proposed loans and he passes it on to the head office with his recommendation. Then these loans are taken in hand by the head office officials, given further consideration and if they are approved, the credit is extended and the necessary authority given. Generally speaking, that is the system that the banks themselves adopt in regard to the making of loans to individuals and I submit in answer, not to anything that has been said in this House, but to what has been said in certain portions of the press, that Government inspection, for the reasons which I have given, would be entirely ineffectual and illusory. It would only have the effect of creating a false sense of security upon the part of the public. I desire to say here—I may have occasion to say it again—that the best security of the public must always be the integrity and ability of the officers and directors of the chartered banks. Notwithstanding certain failures that have occurred, I personally hold the view that the officers and directors of the chartered banks are men of a high order of ability and integrity.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How many failures have occurred since the last revision?

Mr. WHITE: I will come to that matter shortly. This matter of an audit or inspection is not new. It came before the House twenty years ago in the decennial revision of that period when the then Minister of Finance, now the Minister of Trade and Commerce, brought in a bill in which he provided for a system of audit. I desire to read for the information of the House a few statements then made with regard to the question during the course of the debate which then took place. I hope the importance of this subject will redeem my words from dullness because I am dealing entirely with a business subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE: Sir Richard Cartwright, upon the occasion of the introduction of the Bill by the Minister of Finance made the following remarks:

I can conceive of no possible mode by which any auditor or inspector can ascertain the real intrinsic value of the notes which a bank discounts, which form by far the greatest portion of its assets, and whose value depends entirely on the solvency and standing of the men who make them. I have never, myself, been able to see how that difficulty was to be overcome; and I think that the Government, in making any of these provisions, should take special care to see that bank shareholders and the public are not lulled into a false security by the idea that the proposed audit system, or any other that can be devised, will secure good management and care on the part of the banks.

The Hon. Edward Blake, who followed Sir Richard Cartwright said:

As to the audit system, I must say that I concur in every word the hon. member for South Oxford has uttered. I agree that if our present system of auditing is in any respect defective in theory, if it does not provide an adequate legislative recognition of the duty of the shareholders or the authorities to secure a proper audit, we ought to make such a legislative recognition. But with reference to most institutions which are engaged in enormous transactions in the lending of money, especially to those lending money on personal security, I hold that it is absolutely impossible for any auditor to make an audit which will indicate the real position of the bank.

That was the opinion of Mr. Blake. Then there are similar opinions expressed by a number of speakers and among others by Sir Donald Smith, now Lord Strathcona, Canadian High Commissioner. After the discussion the then Minister of Trade and Commerce said that, in view of the representations that had been made to him in respect to the audit clauses he had decided to withdraw them. There is just one further reference to the past and that is to a speech of my predecessor, the Hon. Mr. Fielding, made in 1900 upon the occasion of the decennial revision of that year. The question was raised by my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce if any attempt had been made to strengthen the position of depositors in these banks by way of increased government supervision in any way. The answer of Mr. Fielding was:

No, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Finance Ministers who preceded me found great difficulty in adopting any system of government inspection.

The difficulties which then existed seem to have continued. As to these difficulties, the chief are the two I have mentioned: in the first place, the impossibility of Government auditors pronouncing upon the character of current loans and discounts; in the second place, the immense number of branch banks which would have to be inspected, necessitating not only a very large staff even for audit, but, to be absolutely effectual and scientifically correct, an audit practically upon the same day. I may say that the branches of the chartered banks in Canada have increased since 1900 at the rate of about three or four a week. In 1890, the number of chartered banks in Canada was, I think, only three or four hundred. That was the position upon the occasion of the last revision.

Since 1900 there have been a number of failures of chartered banks in Canada: the Bank of Yarmouth, total assets $820,000; the Ontario Bank, total assets $17,000,000; the Sovereign Bank, total assets $18,000,000; the Bank de St. Jean, total assets $914,000; the Bank of St. Hyacinthe, total assets $1,580,000; and the Farmers' Bank, total assets $2,000,000. Speaking generally, the record of the Canadian chartered banks in the matter of failures, has been of the very best. True, a large number of banks have failed, but they have usually been comparatively small banks. I do not wish to say for a moment that the smaller bank affords less security than the larger bank; it depends entirely upon the management and the character of the business done. But the record of Canadian banks shows that the total losses, so far as the public are concerned, that is to say, the noteholders and depositors, have been less than one-half of one per cent upon the total liabilities of the chartered banks of Canada at the time of the failure. I think that will appeal to the House as a very fair record, notwithstanding the number of failures of comparatively small banks which unfortunately has occurred. In view of the failures which have taken place since 1900, the question of affording additional safeguard against fraud and dishonesty has been canvassed publicly, and the banks themselves have given a good deal of attention to the matter. One of the pioneers in this was the Bank of Nova Scotia. The late general manager of that bank introduced a system of audit very similar to that which I have introduced into the present Bank Act. Before touching upon that I desire to point out certain phenomena in connection with bank failures which I would ask the House to bear in mind in considering the effectiveness of this head-office audit which I propose.

In the first place, I desire to call the attention of the House to the system of bank inspection which is in vogue in the chartered banks of Canada to-day, and which might be described as a system of internal audit, whereby the head office is kept advised of the transactions of the branch offices and under which the trans-

action of the business of the banks is safeguarded in these branches. Some of these banks have not only an inspecting system but an audit system, and some of them combine the two and they have an inspector or inspectors who not only inspect the banks—that is investigate all the loans, check over the securities, make reports on the current loans—but who actually audit the accounts of the several branches. Under that system the banks keep a very careful check, so far as head office is concerned, upon the administration and business of the outside branches. I took the trouble to look very carefully into the system so as to satisfy myself how far it went, and I find that in some of the larger banks—I have no doubt it is the system in vogue generally—the inspector visits the branch offices and not only checks over cash and securities and notes under discount, but he looks very carefully into the loans, considers the statements made by the borrowers, and generally he advises the head office with regard to the character of these loans and the character of the entire business of that branch. In the bank failures that have taken place in Canada, it will be found that the inspection system of the banks—that is, their internal audit system—has worked fairly well, because the fraud and dishonesty which have wrecked Canadian banks have been generally—always, so far as I know—not at the branches, but at the chief office of the bank.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Hear, hear.

Mr. WHITE: As a general manager, or a president active in the affairs of the bank, has prevented the inspector or been able to prevent the inspector from making a thorough inspection of the head office accounts and has been able to keep concealed from the inspector and other honest officers of the bank the true state of affairs, and has gone on with speculation or peculation, or fraud, until the bank has come to grief, I desire to make that point, because it has a bearing upon the provisions which I have introduced respecting audits. That is to say that up to date, so far as we can judge, the inspection carried on by the banks themselves has been effectual so far as branch offices are concerned, and, the trouble has been at the head office.

Coming back to what was done by the Bank of Nova Scotia, and what is done by one or two other banks as well to-day, we find that a system of head office audit has been introduced, the idea being that the auditor appointed by the shareholders, being unable of course to audit all the branches of the bank to which I have referred, audits at head office the returns made by the inspectors to the head office of the bank. In addition to that of course, he audits carefully the head office, and he checks the cash, securities and vouchers of the head office of the bank. The advantage of that check is two-fold. In the first place, there is the positive check of an auditor going over the accounts at the head office and verifying entries and checking over securities, so that he is able to report to the shareholders that the statement presented for their consideration at the annual general meeting is correct and represents the true position of the bank so far as his information and belief go. I will read the form of that auditor's report from one of the banks, which at present adopts the system. It is appended to the annual statement:

> We have examined the books and accounts of the bank at its head office and at five of its principal branches, and have been duly furnished with certified returns from the remaining branches, and with all information and explanations required by us. The bank's investments and the securities and cash on hand at the branches visited were verified by us at the close of business, November 30, 1912. And we certify that the foregoing general statement of liabilities and assets as at November 30, 1912, is in agreement with the books, and in our opinion exhibits a true and correct view of the state of the bank's affairs, according to the best of our information and the explanations given to us.

Further, in connection with that, in taking up the question of an audit which might afford not an absolute safeguard, because an absolute safeguard is impossible—as I said, you must rely in the last analysis on the ability and integrity of the officers and directors of the bank—but a safeguard which would protect , afford protection from at least some of the irregularities which have occurred, in fact from most of them, I considered very carefully the question of English legislation upon the same subject. I find that under the English Companies Act of 1908, there is a provision similar to the one which I have embodied in this Act:

> That every company shall at its annual general meeting appoint an auditor or auditors to hold office until the next annual general meeting; if an auditor is not appointed, then the board of trade may on the application of any member of the company appoint an auditor.

The powers and duties of the auditors are substantially the same as in the Act which I have presented to the House. The important words which I have quoted from the auditor's report, which I have just read, are that the balance sheet, which has been the subject of the audit, 'exhibits a true and correct view of the state of the company's affairs according to the best of the information and the explanations given to us.' I may say that appears for the first time in the English Companies Act of 1908.

I think I can make this general statement, that the provisions for audit incorporated in this Act, with the changes which have been rendered necessary by reason of our different situation, put us substantially in the same position as the most advanced legislation in British countries. I believe that the provisions in Australia are the same as those which I have read from the English Companies Act; and the latest amendment, as I have indicated, to the English Companies Act is in the year 1908. I am hoping, therefore, not only for the very great positive check this audit would have, but for the very great advantage of the moral check. I know myself, speaking from my own experience, and I have said this before, that the moral effect of a firm of auditors going into an office and making an investigation, and the knowledge that that investigation will be made and that the accounts will be checked, with the risk of detection of any irregularities, is very strong upon any staff. Therefore I am hopeful that this provision will be effectual in preventing certain frauds which have unfortunately and most calamitiously occurred in the past. Take the case of the Ontario Bank to illustrate. The general manager of that bank was engaged in speculation in New York. He had, I believe, duplicate accounts at the head office, and the head office was not inspected by the inspector of the bank. Monies would be remitted to New York, and of course they would be charged to the correspondent in New York and credited among the assets of the bank at Toronto. Those monies were lost, but no entry was made showing the loss. Further monies would be sent, similar charges made to the correspondent in New York, and credits as a balance owed from New York at the head office. That went on until, according to the books of the bank, very large amounts were owed to the bank from New York. These of course stood, so far as the books were concerned, as an asset of the bank; but in reality the money had been lost in New York. The correspondent appeared to be reliable enough; but no inquiry had been made by an auditor as would have been done in the usual course as to the amount of money which the correspondent held at the credit of the Ontario Bank. Any auditor, in verifying the assets, especially so far as they consisted of balances, would have communicated with the banking house or correspondent shown by the books to be indebted to the bank, and would have asked them to verify the amount of the balance in which they were shown to be indebted to the bank. Therefore an audit of head office, with the right which we have given to auditors to go into any branch, because that is expressly given, and make an investigation, will, I think, tend very much more effectually to safeguard the business of the bank than has been the case in the past. Just let me repeat that, that in addition to verifying the returns from the branches and inspecting the head office itself, the chief office of the bank, the auditors, if anything of an unusual character attracts their attention or excites their suspicion, may investigate the office of any branch; and in that way become aware how the business is carried on there, and whether everything is in correct order or not.

There is one other feature. Following the English Act, and I believe the general principle that the shareholders are the proprietors of the bank, just as they are of a company, I have made the provision that the shareholders shall appoint these auditors. Let me point out in connection with the failures of Canadian banks that the loss has principally fallen upon the shareholders. Noteholders, except in one or two cases, or perhaps three, have been paid in full. Depositors, with the exception of the Farmers' Bank, which is still in liquidation, and a few others in which a comparatively small dividend was paid, have been paid in full or a large percentage of their claims. Therefore, the loss has fallen almost entirely upon the shareholders. Now, banking is a business, and, like any other business, ought to be conducted on business principles. The proprietors of a bank, those who put in their money and take the risks, are, of course, the shareholders; and it would be but a trite observation that it is in the interest of the shareholders that they should take every precaution to safeguard their own interest. Under the theory of the English law—and, I may say, the theory of the law of the most of the provinces of Canada, because the same system is in vogue with regard to loan companies and trust companies and others—the auditors are particularly the representatives of the shareholders, and properly so. I was asked, on the occasion of the presentation of this Bill, whether the directors might not, by proxies held from the shareholders, in reality appoint the auditors. That, of course, is quite possible. But I have two osbervations to make in regard to that. The first is that, under the provisions of the Act, notification must be sent to the shareholders at least ten days before the meeting at which the auditors are to be appointed, and thus every shareholder will know who are nominated as auditors for the coming year. The second is that, so far as I know, there are no cases on record of collusion between the directors of banks and the auditors. The losses have taken place, as I have indicated, principally at the head offices, through the general manager or some head official going wrong. So far as I know—I speak subject to correction

—that there is no case of a board of directors being in collusion with the auditors. This is true not only of the banks but of the loan companies. I may be wrong, but at least no such case has been brought to my attention. The directors are large shareholders, and are as interested, or should be as interested—apart from collusion or fraud—in having a proper system of audit as any of the shareholders, whether minority or otherwise. Therefore, it seems to me, the board of directors would not be likely to use its influence to have a firm of auditors appointed who would, in collusion with the officers of the bank or with the directors, conceal transactions of a criminal or dishonest nature.

Now as to giving of proxies that is a matter of convenience. Shareholders of our banks living in different parts of the country and in different parts of the world, must attend the annual general meeting in person or by proxy. If they decide not to attend in person, I do not know of any legislation that will compel them to attend. And if they desire to give a proxy to any individual, an attorney or even a director, to represent them, based upon the confidence they have in that attorney or director, so far as I am concerned, I can see no reason to apprehend any abuse of that elective power. Further, in order to safeguard the interest of shareholders and depositors, there are of course, very severe penalties in the Act, and we have added to these to a certain extent. An offense against the Act is punishable by five years' imprisonment; and we have in addition to the provision I have read, introduced a further provision making directors liable for negligence. Under the existing law, as I explained to the House when the Bill was introduced, a director is not liable for negligence; there has to be brought home actual knowledge. The onus is upon the Crown, I think, to show some actual intention, some guilty knowledge on his part. It was, I think, the intention of the Act as originally drafted to provide liability for negligence, but, by reason of certain decisions of the courts, liability for negligence disappeared. We have attempted in this Act to impose a penalty for negligence on the part not only of directors, but of officers, inspectors and of every person who has to do with the management of the bank.

With all these safeguards, I certainly hope that the Bank Act has been materially improved. I realize of course, that dealing with an Act which touches so vitally all the interests of the country and under which chartered banks possessing assets to the amount of a billion and a half of dollars, are operating, it is wise, if that Act has given satisfaction, not to tamper with it unduly. That would be my view. In other words, we should make haste slowly in regard to changes; we should feel our way trying to improve as each revision is made.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the punishment for negligence?

Mr. WHITE: It is punishable with three years' imprisonment. Negligence, of course would have to be shown. I think that, on one hand, the Act should not be so drastic as to prevent good, capable business men from giving their ability to the administration of banks, and, on the other hand, it certainly should be emphasized that when men take upon themselves the responsible duties of directors not only of banks, but of other institutions, they are really in the positions of trustees for the shareholders, and a very high order of diligence should be demanded of them. And this is particularly the case when the public are interested, as they are in the case of banks.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): The hon. gentleman says the audit system was more or less founded on the system adopted by the Bank of Nova Scotia?

Mr. WHITE: No, I said, in substance, the Bank of Nova Scotia has been the pioneer in adopting a system of inspection, which might be described as a system of head office inspection, but in which the auditors had access to all the reports of the inspectors of the banks and might, in their discretion, visit any of the branch banks and make inspection.

Mr. LANCASTER: Is there anything in the Bill that would prevent the offices of manager and president being held by the same person?

Mr. WHITE: There is no change in that respect in the Bill. If my hon. friend desires to raise that point before the Banking and Commerce Committee, I need not assure him, he will receive a full hearing, and we shall be very glad to discuss it.

Mr. LANCASTER: I know that it is not usual for the offices of president and manager to be held by the same person, but there is nothing in the law to prevent it being done. I think it would be well to forbid by law the holding of these two offices by the one person.

Mr. WHITE: The hon. gentleman is correct in saying that this is not generally done. But there are one or two cases—one at least—in which the president and general manager are the same man.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any definition of 'negligence'?

Mr. WHITE: I need not tell my hon. friend, who, I understand, has been a

judge, and is learned in the law, that the courts have never defined negligence, and that it is unwise, I think, to attempt to define it. I would say negligence is a question of fact, and it is impossible, I think, to lay down any rule as to what is or is not negligence. No doubt a law could be enacted under which certain acts could be held or deemed to be conclusively negligible, but nothing like that has been provided. The word 'negligently' is used, but whether a director has or has not been guilty of negligence is a matter of fact, and will have to be determined with due regard to all the circumstances under which he has been placed. No doubt the question will arise as to his diligence in attending meetings, in examining reports, and as to whether any notice has been received by him as to any irregularities, but it would be quite impossible for anyone to define what is negligence or what is not. My hon. friend will probably agree it would be unwise to attempt it; at any rate I have not attempted to do so in the Act.

So far as the question of government inspection and audit is concerned, I think that is all I have to say on this occasion. Upon the introduction of the bill I referred to the additional safeguards which had been thrown around the incorporation and organization of banks, and I think it unnecessary for me to retrace that ground again. A question has been asked me as to whether all the banks should not guarantee the deposits of each, in the same way as the note circulation is now guaranteed. I think it would be a sufficient answer to point out that the deposits of the chartered banks of Canada amount to no less a sum than a thousand million dollars, and that the circulation of a fund of five per cent would necessitate the deposit of fifty million dollars, to say nothing of the real objection to such action, which is that it is not good law to make all the banks responsible when they have no hand in the administration of each for the losses which might arise through maladministration.

Mr. NESBITT: That is what you do with reference to the bills issued.

Mr. WHITE: Bills are in a very different position. It is of the utmost importance that they should circulate as legal tender, and be subject to no depreciation. That is a very valuable privilege given to the banks—that of circulating their notes to the extent of their fully paid capital, and in the fall, during the crop moving period, to a certain percentage of their capital and reserve.

Mr. NESBITT: But they all pay out a certain amount which guarantees any one bank.

Mr. WHITE: It is absolutely limited in amount to the paid-up capital and to the percentage of capital and reserve, and therefore the amount is definite; and not only that, but these notes are coming in from time to time through clearances, and are redeemable in gold; and the Canadian Bankers' Association has, under the legislation, general supervision over the note issue of the several banks.

Mr. ROSS: Does my hon. friend think the privilege of having the note issue of the banks guaranteed as great a privilege as having a monopoly of the deposits of the people?

Mr. WHITE: I think they are entirely different. The notes are in a different class from the deposits, because, as I say, they circulate from time to time in the hands of the public, and the public, whether depositors in a particular bank or not, take these bank notes, and it is absolutely necessary that some provision of a very strong character should be made, whereby those notes should be absolutely redeemable; hence the provisions in the Bank Act that all the banks contribute to a fund, limited of course in amount, because the note circulation itself is limited to the amount of paid-up capital, with the exceptions I have mentioned; whereas in the case of deposits there is practically no limit, and if all the banks guaranteed all the deposits of each, a number of the banks would be inclined to be a great deal more reckless than they have been. They would be able to obtain deposits on the guarantee of all the banks, and if all the banks had no hand in the administration of each, the result would be the anomalous position of the well-managed institutions becoming responsible for the maladministration of illy-managed banks. I do not think legislation of that kind has ever been proposed in a British country, but it is in operation to-day in one place, and it is breaking down there. The one place in the world where that legislation is now in effect is in the State of Oklahoma, and the result is that all the banks, or a great number of them, are taking out National Bank charters.

Mr. ROSS: Is it not optional there with the banks?

Mr. WHITE: It is legislation, and the banks, to avoid it, are taking out National Bank charters. It seems to me the mere statement that all the banks should be responsible for the administration of each without having any voice in their administration, is not only anomalous but absolutely unsound and unfair. It seems to me that cannot be controverted.

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury and Queens): Has the hon. minister considered the ques-

tion of relieving the shareholders of banks from the double liability?

Mr. WHITE: I have not considered that, and there is no provision for it on the Act. I think, having regard to the fact that the public attach very considerable importance to the additional security of the double liability, that in dealing with the banking situation of Canada as it exists to-day, it would be exceedingly unfortunate to disturb it. If we had not the past or the present to deal with, but an entirely new situation, it might be advisable—I do not say it would be wise—but it might be advisable to consider the propriety of limiting the liability to the amount of paid-up capital, as in the case of corporations, because, undoubtedly, a larger number of people would then be likely to invest in bank shares.

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury and Queens): How is the law in the United States as regards liability?

Mr. WHITE: I am unable to say what the law of the United States is in this regard. There are so many special and state bank laws that I do not recall at present what the provision is with respect to the liability of shareholders under the National Bank system, but I am inclined to think there is no double liability.

Now, I come to one other matter which, while not directly dealt with by the Bank Act, is cognate, and as to which some questions were asked me before the recess, that is, as to the Dominion note circulation, which is, I understand, $22,500,000 of free money, secured dollar for dollar against gold. There has been a curious misunderstanding on the part of the press, or a certain portion of the press, with regard to the position of the Dominion note circulation, and one journal, the Toronto Globe, has apparently been entirely misinformed with regard to the true position of reserves held by the Dominion and of the Dominion note circulation founded thereon. My attention was called to an article, which is similar to a number of articles that have appeared during a course of months, and I think it well to take this opportunity of pointing out the true facts, so that discussion of this kind, based upon misleading or erroneous information, may be terminated. It is headed: 'Our Needless Gold Reserve,' and reads:

It will be unfortunate if the Dominion Government fails to end the financial folly of taking gold out of one hole in the ground and stowing it away in another. The Dominion has outgrown to a ridiculous extent the law regarding the gold reserve for the redemption of Dominion notes. It requires a gold reserve in the treasury of twenty-five per cent against the first Dominion note issue of $30,000,000, and dollar for dollar against the additional issue. When that law was established the total issue did not seem likely to materially exceed the partly secured $30,000,000. But owing to subsequent growth there is now in the treasury, according to the November statement, $7,500,000 gold against the first $30,000,000 of outstanding notes, and $85,748,000 gold against the additional issue. It is a foolish waste to be thus stowing away gold in vaults.

If the twenty-five per cent reserve were extended to, say, the first $80,000,000 of note issue it would release $37,500,000 in gold now held idle. The holding of this entails a loss of about a million dollars a year. Banking interests are adverse to this change. They do not want the Dominion to make a profit on its note issue. That issue is kept outstanding by the law requiring the banks to hold about half their reserve in Dominion notes. This is of the nature of a forced loan from the banks without interest, but it is the only material charge made for the valuable privileges enjoyed by the banks. They naturally hope to get rid of it by making the Dominion issue unprofitable and thus removing the inducement. The law now makes the Dominion paper issue largely unprofitable through the waste of holding idle gold, and the time is ripe for the needed amendment.

That appeared in the issue of the Globe of December 21, 1912, and is one of a series of articles dealing with the same matter. Now, as I have said, there is a very curious misapprehension on the part of the Globe and of other journals dealing with that question. The fact is that of the amount of gold referred to, $75,000,000 is in the large legals, Dominion notes which are legal tender as between banks of $500, $1,000 and $5,000, and it represents the gold stored in the Dominion vaults convertible at once by the banks. The banks, as I have said, hold these $75,000,000 in large legals. In other words, that amount is not in the hands of the public at all. I desire to say further that there is only $21,000,000 of the entire Dominion note issue in the hands of the public, the balance being the $75,000,000 of large legals and about $18,000,000, I think, of one's or two's which the banks keep for till money. So that in reality the gold is held by the Dominion Government for the banks. The banks have to keep reserve of course. As a general thing they keep about ten per cent, or a little over in Dominion notes and specie instantly convertible into gold for the purpose of protecting against their deposits and the presentation of their notes.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): They are called certificates.

Mr. WHITE: These large ones are called certificates.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): They should be so set out in the returns.

Mr. WHITE: They are so set out in the returns. I have a copy of the returns here, and they show $500, $1,000 and $5,000. The

point I am making is that this money is not in the hands of the public. It is simply stored there; partly it is reserve. I think it is not necessary for me to refer further to that.

There is one other matter to which I desire to refer and then I think I shall have concluded my remarks. There has been a suggestion—I do not know how seriously made, but it is certainly interesting reading—that the Dominion should make a very large note issue, of say $100,000,000, $200,000,000, $300,000,000 or $400,000,000 of Dominion notes. I do not know whether it is suggested that those notes should be redeemable or irredeemable, but I suppose they are to be redeemable, because, if irredeemable, they would be fiat money, and I need not tell the House the consequences of the inflation of the currency by issues of fiat money. That matter has been threshed out years ago. We have fortunately the advantage of the lessons of history in that respect, extending over the early part of last century in England until 1844 when the Peel Act was enacted, under which the banking of England, with certain exceptions to which I shall refer, is required to hold pound for pound in gold against its note issues. The financial history of England during the first half of last century is a history of commercial disaster due to inflated paper currency, to inflated note circulation. All the evils flowing from inflated note circulation can be read in the history of that period by anyone who cares to inform himself upon the subject. The same dominant features presented themselves, prosperity, inflation, the demand for gold; and hundreds and thousands of people were ruined, not once, but many times throughout the course of the first fifty years of last century. In the same way the United States experienced the evils of inflated paper currency in the beginning of last century and up to the resumption of the payment in gold in 1878. All the evils I have mentioned as having been present in England occurred in the United States. I took the trouble to look up the history of the greenback and I found that the greenbacks were at a discount of 5, 10, 15 or 20 per cent as the case might be, up till 1878, when the specie payments were resumed. Now, so much for fiat money. I do not understand that anybody suggested that, but certain of the press seem to indicate that that would be a desirable thing in order to supply the needs of the country. With regard to the large issue of Dominion notes against a reserve of say 25 per cent, I desire to place myself on record as absolutely against it on the ground that it is unsound finance.

Mr. EMMERSON: How did it happen that there was in 1878 a resumption of specie payments in the United States.

Mr. WHITE: Well, all those evils that I have mentioned had been present in the United States. As an aftermath of the war of that period currency was at a discount as compared with gold and there were violent fluctuations in the prices of commodities, with the result that the currency in circulation either in that country, or in our country for that matter, would not be accepted as legal tender, but payment was demanded in gold. As a result of that there was an agitation for resumption of specific payment and there came a time when the United States felt that they were in a strong enough position to resume. There was one member of the House who continually said: The way to resume is to resume; that is to place credit on a gold basis and that is finally what was done. Now, I desire to say what I was about to say when the hon. gentleman interrupted me, that it is not sound finance for the Dominion of Canada or any other country to issue its note circulation unless it is secured absolutely by gold. We must not confuse the form and the substance. A Dominion note, that is a promise to pay on demand, a Dominion five, two, or one dollar bill, is only money because it calls for gold and can be instantly converted into gold. Any other finance is absolutely unsound. There is now issued an amount of $22,500,000 unsecured by gold and I say that the issue of that amount under the then conditions was unsound finance. But it was done because the Dominion desired to raise money by the issue of its notes and it was not in a position to pay them in gold when they came in. Therefore, they made a provision whereby the banks were compelled to keep forty per cent of their reserves in Dominion notes so as to hold these notes out. Is the situation in the Dominion safe to-day? I say it is and for this reason. If we read the financial history of the United Kingdom from 1800 to 1844 we find that what was done under the Peel Act of 1844 was substantially this. They asked: How many notes of the Bank of England have remained out in all the panics that have occurred, that have not been presented for redemption in gold?—and they found that there was a certain number of notes that they could point to with certainty as remaining out. Therefore, in the Peel Act, provision was made whereby the Bank of England should, up to that amount, issue its notes as against government securities or obligations but that beyond that they must issue pound for pound in gold. That is the rule to-day. The issue department of the Bank of England is entirely distinct and separate from the other branch and a Bank of England note as

secured by gold cannot be issued but as against gold.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Not commercial paper endorsed by another bank?

Mr. WHITE: I am speaking only of note circulation. I am not speaking of notes in the ordinary commercial sense; I am speaking of bank notes. The Bank of England, therefore, beyond the amount of circulation which they can count on for a certainty as always remaining out in the hands of the public, must issue its circulation against gold. Now, take the situation in the Dominion to-day. The one and two dollar bills are the small change of the Dominion, and, as I pointed out a little while ago, from $21,000,000 to $25,000,000 of these notes are in the hands of the public. They are the small change of the Dominion, they are not likely to come in, they stay out and they constitute a constant factor. The amount may be increased in time but it is a constant factor. Up to that amount there is no reason why the Dominion note circulation should not stand as it is without change although in theory it is unsound. But when you suggest that the Dominion note circulation should be increased away beyond that amount, up to $50,000,000, or $100,000,000 or $200,000,000, or $500,000,000 against a gold reserve of from ten to twenty-five per cent of that amount, I do not believe it is necessary to do any more than state that proposition because I think it carries its own confutation in the face of the facts. I must ask the House to excuse me for taking up so much time in connection with the presentation of the second reading. There are a number of minor matters that have been brought to my attention by several hon. members, for instance the registration of liens, that, no doubt, will be discussed in committee or in the House at a later stage. The Government recognize the extreme importance of this measure and we will be glad to consider, in the committee or in the House, if presented in the House, any suggestions of a practical character that will tend to the improvement of the Bill. I have found by experience that if you change one clause of the Bank Act you will find it related to a great many other clauses and therefore I would suggest that any amendment as to detail should be removed rather in the committee than in the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is there anything in the Bill about bank mergers?

Mr. WHITE: Yes. I explained upon the occasion of the introduction that I have introduced a provision into the Bank Act whereby two banks cannot merge unless the minister, or, as my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) suggested, the Treasury Board,—I would have no objection to that—consents to the boards of directors making the agreement. I pointed out at the time that under the present act the boards of directors of two banks make an agreement first. That is not made public. Then they call meetings of the shareholders and the shareholders approve of the agreement. Then it comes before the Treasury Board and the Governor in Council, it gets the sanction of the Governor in Council and then the so-called merger, or sale of assets to be strictly and legally correct, is complete. It has been found in practice that it has usually gone as far as that the inspectors of each of the banks have spent a good deal of time examining into the affairs of the other and it has gone so far that it is very difficult indeed for the Governor in Council to oppose the merger. Serious consequences might follow, the people might not understand it, it is a very sensitive situation and in order to guard that I have introduced a provision whereby, at the outset before the agreement is entered into, the minister or the treasury board shall give consent.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That is satisfactory.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario): As I understand it, the provision relating to the audit of the bank is taken from the English Act. In addition to the system of auditing in England or Scotland, have they any system of inspection?

Mr. WHITE: A system of audit is the only system they have adopted in England or Scotland. There is no system of government inspection. There may be a system of internal inspection of some such character as that which I have indicated as being in existence in connection with the Canadian banks. The provision which we have introduced is modelled upon the latest English legislation adapted, of course, to the wide extent and conditions of this country, and which legislation, as far as I know, is as advanced as any similar act.

Mr. ROSS: The hon. Minister of Finance has referred to the Ontario Bank in his statement, and he has mentioned what caused its failure. I would like to ask him if he can tell me whether the assets which the Ontario Bank left of themselves were sufficient to pay the note holders and depositors? I asked the Deputy Minister to give me a statement offhand and he said he thought not.

Mr. WHITE: I am unable to inform my hon. friend definitely as to that. The Bank of Montreal, I believe, took over the Ontario Bank as a running business, and

some litigation arose which I think was carried to the Privy Council. It was generally supposed that the good-will of the bank and its several branches was of very great value, and the contest was as to whether the banks which took over the Ontario Bank did not get the best of the bargain. I am not able to say, and I do not think anyone can say, how it worked out, because that would involve investigation as to all the accounts and so on. I should think that the assets of the Ontario Bank were very substantial in character; but whether they were quite sufficient—I am certain they were as to the noteholders—to pay the depositors on liquidation, I am unable to say.

Sir EDMUND OSLER: I think perhaps I can answer that. There was a call on the double liability of the Ontario Bank shareholders, which was responded to pretty well. That paid off the noteholders and all the depositors, and I think from the knowledge I have that there would be a considerable return to the shareholders.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): In the present revision of the Canadian Bank Act, there appears to be more than usual interest taken by the country generally, and therefore I was pleased to hear the Minister of Finance say, on behalf of the Government, that the fullest and frankest discussion possible was desired, and that the Government would consider any amendments proposed, and if they possessed merit would accept them. The practice of Parliament in dealing with the Bank Act is, that after its second reading it should go to the Committee on Banking and Commerce and there be fully considered and again re-committed to the House. I am disposed to agree with the suggestion of the Minister of Finance that on the whole it would be better for those having amendments to propose to the Bill to reserve them for consideration first by the committee. I trust the Minister of Finance will make it possible that there may appear before the committee when dealing with this very important measure, some representatives of the banking and financial institutions——

Mr. CARVELL: They will be there.

Mr. MACLEAN: And also that those having any complaint against our present banking system may have a full opportunity of being heard. By this means, I am sure the country will obtain a more accurate idea of our banking Act, and that I submit, is very important. Like most hon. gentlemen in this House, I am not very well acquainted by practical experience or otherwise with the fundamental principles of the banking and currency system of this country. It is indeed a very complex and difficult subject, and I think only those who have more or less experience in banking and currency and financial affairs generally can have a comprehensive grasp of the subject. I trust, that in the consideration of this Bill and of any amendments that may be proposed to it, the subject will be approached without any political colouring and free from any preconceived notions. It is extremely important that the banking system of our country should be founded upon a scientific basis. It is not a subject for compromise; if we compromise in our Banking Act and fundamentals of economics errors will creep into our banking and currency system, and some day disaster will follow. Therefore, it is eminently desirable that there shall be the fullest and frankest discussion of the matter. So far as I am personally concerned I concur in the remarks made by the Finance Minister, that, after a trial of our present system in this country for a great number of years, it has, on the whole, been found to work well, and has met the needs of the country and of its people reasonably well. I think it has proven effective in many respects in which the banking systems of other countries have failed. Our branch bank system provides an easy method of transferring currency to the various sections of the country, as required at certain seasons of the year. It has had the effect also of mobilizing the cash reserve at certain centres when there is a financial crisis imminent; it has relieved this country almost entirely, with one exception, of money panics, which, in the United States, are of frequent occurrence, and which come in a severe form with almost absolute certainty, at least every decade. Our branch bank system makes it possible to have that unity and co-operation in banking in this country which, with all that may be said against it, is preferable to the independent system prevailing in the United States; the branch bank system gives to Canada, at least the possibility of leadership in banking. I think it has minimized the number of bank failures in this country. The bank noteholders have practically lost nothing, and according to the statement made by the Minister of Finance the loss incurred by the depositors has been on the whole small. Our banking system has given an elastic currency which is very important indeed and which has never failed, although very much strained in 1908. I think it can also be said of our branch bank system that it has given reasonable banking facilities to the country generally, by which I mean that branch bank offices are to be found in almost every town and village of this country, although of course, it may be open to question whether or not any particular office

grants sufficient facilities to its customers. It has also affected an economy in the use of currency, which also is a very important thing; but, better still, our banking system has created an almost perfect credit system in this country; and the business of Canada which has grown very rapidly indeed is largely a credit business. I doubt if it would have been possible to have established so sound and almost perfect a credit system, if it were not through the agency of the branch bank system. On the whole I say that system has been a good one, and should not be materially altered, except for good and sufficient reasons. Of course experience has disclosed in our Banking Act certain weaknesses; it has been shown that certain amendments are desirable, that certain abuses have crept into that system which must be corrected by this Parliament; but on the whole as a system it certainly has much to commend it. There are so far as I can gather but three important different banking systems in the world. The first is what is called the Scotch Canadian system; that is a system of a small number of strong banks with agencies scattered over the country; that is the system prevailing here and borrowed, I understand, from Scotland, where that system still obtains. There is the system obtaining in the United States, where they have the individual or unit bank system; they have in the United States to-day I think over 27,000 National and State Banks; it is not a system extremely well thought of in that country by its own bankers; it has often been referred to as being a series of banks and not a banking system. In Europe and in Britain, they have what is generally known among bankers as the central reserve system; there the bank note issue is confined to one central bank; the note issues are made against gold and commerical paper deposited with these central banks by other banks. That is the system at least which prevails in England, France, Germany, and in almost all European countries; it is a system which has stood in France since the time of Napoleon; and it has been a very successful system indeed. It seems to meet and measure the needs of the country. I do not propose to say anything further of a general nature in reference to our banking system; but I desire to devote just a little time to the main amendments proposed by the Bill now before the House for our consideration.

The most important amendment proposed by this Bill is that relating to inspection. This proposed amendment has often been discussed in Parliament before, and has been the subject of a great deal of discussion out of Parliament in recent years. I appreciate to the full the force and logic of the remarks made by the Minister of Finance as to the limitations of any system of inspection which anybody can suggest. Whether that inspection be performed by the Bankers' Association, by shareholders' auditors, by Government or any other agencies, it certainly will have its limitations; it will not prevent insolvency in banking institutions; it is not an infallible system; it cannot be. At the present time the system in vogue among our banks is that of inspection of the several agencies by the officials or servants of the bank itself; and it has been usually referred to as an internal audit. The difficulty in making an efficient external audit is obviously due, as the Minister of Finance has pointed out, to the fact that the banks themselves being in control of their resources, loan them out without consultation with any auditor, or any government, or anybody but its officers and the audit follows the loan. Therefore to make any audit system absolutely effective against loss, it would be necessary for the auditor to determine the value of the securities of the bank, and if they were in his judgment insecure, to make them secure as early as possible by an audit, which would obviously be impossible. There is a value nevertheless to inspection, whatever form that inspection may take. This was very well pointed out by an eminent American banker, Mr. James B. Forgan, who as a younger man was I think connected with the Bank of Nova Scotia, and who understands the Canadian banking system fairly well, but who is to-day one of the most successful and eminent of American bankers. In a pamphlet which I have in my hand, he was discussing the efficacy of Government supervision; and I wish to read it because it expresses my own views very clearly, not necessarily upon the point of Government inspection, but as to the general effect of inspection by any person in any form. He says:

> The efficacy of government supervision by examination lies primarily in its restraining influence on bank management. The knowledge that the banks are to be examined holds the officers in check. This followed by the criticisms of the comptroller——

That is the United States Government official who under their law makes the examination.

> —based on the examiners' reports is efficacious in inducing or compelling bankers to comply with the law and with proper banking methods and to face and provide for losses as they occur. This should afford the public reasonable assurance. Such are are the benefits to be derived from governmental supervision and the degree of their accomplishment is the measure of their efficacy. All external supervision is, however, based on the examination and consideration of transactions after they have occurred. It

cannot control the making of loans or investments at the time they are made. It has no control of initiative management. It cannot, therefore, be held responsible for errors of judgment or lapses of integrity. Its business is to discover such and its efficacy depends upon its ability to do so. It is at best a human device and in common with all such devices its limitation should not be ignored or forgotten.

So, according to Mr. Forgan, it is possible that considerable good may follow government inspection; and one of the matters for our consideration is the system of inspection of audit which should prevail. Now, the bankers of this country, some years ago, at any rate, were not in favour of any form of external inspection or audit. When the manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia introduced their audit system, I do not think it found favour with the Canadian banking fraternity generally. They took the position that, the shareholders of the bank being the proprietors, it was not a matter of concern to others what system of inspection, if any, was adopted. Now, I do not admit that this objection to an external inspection of audit is sound. The banks of this country receive in deposits from the people over a billion of dollars, three-quarters of which is interest-bearing deposits. They advertise throughout the country their capacity for caring for the deposits or savings of the people. And it is a fact, I think, that practically all the savings of the people of this country are entrusted to the chartered banks. I speak subject to correction, but I believe that the Government savings banks claim only two or three per cent of the total savings of the people of this country which ultimately reach chartered and Government savings banks for deposit. Now, inasmuch as the banks of this country have made themselves the trustees for the people to the extent of a billion of dollars, I think that Parliament has resting upon it the obligation to provide the most efficient form of audit or inspection of our banking system. And the whole question is, what that form of audit should be. Further, as to the contention which the Canadian bankers raise against external inspection and which I mentioned a moment ago—namely that shareholders were the proprietors of the bank and therefore should have the direction of the affairs of the bank, there is this to be remembered: Canada is a large country; it will seldom happen in the banking history of Canada that any shareholders' meeting will attract any fair proportion of its shareholders. Furthermore, shareholders are to be found not only in Canada, but in the United States, Great Britain and other parts of Europe. So, after all, the management of the banks under our system has fallen into the hands, generally, of the manager and directors, or a portion of the directorate. This is an additional reason why Parliament should seriously consider the propriety of placing additional safeguards around those who are shareholders and depositors of our banks. There is this further to say: That, unfortunately, at least in the past, all directors have not manifested that interest in the affairs of their banks that they should have manifested; and unfortunately it is true that many of our banking disasters have been due to lack of interest, and perhaps worse, on the part of some directors. The success of our banking system, the success of any banking system, therefore, is largely determined by the character of the men who are the directors and managers, and the degree in intelligence and honesty they apply to their duties.

Now, I have no doubt there will be a variety of opinions as to the form of audit which Parliament should prescribe in the Banking Act. I admit the full force of every word the minister has said with regard to the limitations, in effect, of any audit or inspection system we may adopt. But still, I venture the suggestion that, inasmuch as the minister admits the desirability, and necessity, of meeting the public demand for some form of additional inspection; inasmuch as the shareholders' appointment of an auditor as proposed can mean little or nothing in this country and that ultimately it must be a directors' audit and not a shareholders' audit; and further inasmuch as experience has unfortunately shown, that all directors do not manifest that interest in their banks which they ought to manifest, and do not consider themselves as holding a high position of trust, the appointment of the auditors for the purpose of inspection of our chartered banks should come from some other source. Other hon. members may have other suggestions to make Personally, I wish to suggest two systems as being preferable, on the whole, to that suggested in this Bill. I say, inasmuch as the Government has decided that some additional inspection must be provided by the Banking Act, I beg to suggest that it would be better for the Government to take this matter into their own hands. Let the Government establish a staff in the Department of Finance, at the head of which shall be a strong man who has had a considerable business and banking experience in this country. I do not say that Government inspection will prevent bank insolvency, or that the reports and inspections of this inspector will be infallible. But I think there would be advantages in the plan I suggest. I believe it would work out a greater uniformity in the form of banking inspection; I think it would have the effect of establishing closer and more confidential relations between the several

banks and the official; and I believe that banks, when in difficulties of one kind or another, would rather confide their troubles to such an official, than to an auditor appointed in the manner prescribed by this Bill.

There is another suggestion which is, perhaps, worth considering—although, on the whole, I personally do not favour it as strongly as I do the appointment of an inspector by the Government—and that is the appointment of an auditor or a board of auditors by the Bankers' Association. I have already pointed out the objections to the appointment of auditors by the shareholders. I have said that in the first place you cannot get the shareholders' auditor appointed by any meeting truly representative of the shareholders. I am told that bank directors are almost always compelled to send out to shareholders proxy forms to make sure that there shall be such an attendance at the meeting as will permit the lawful transaction of whatever business is to be performed. I have pointed out also that bank failures are largely attributable to the bank manager or some of the directors; so it seems to me that, to be logical, the appointment of this auditor must not rest with the shareholders' meeting.

There would be another advantage in having a government inspector of banks and a staff for that purpose. I think that the banking Act should contain further provision for the closer inspection of every new bank during its promotion period and for the first few years following its establishment. Our experience with new banks in this country in recent years goes to prove that it is necessary to watch them practically all the time during the first two or three years of their career. If this staff, presided over by a competent man, was created, its services would be available for many other purposes. I therefore think that on the whole, the best method of inspection is not that proposed by the Act, but that we should have inspectors or auditors appointed by the Government and failing that by the Bankers' Association.

I did intend to say a few words respecting bank failures in Canada, but it is hardly necessary that I should, because the minister has very fairly and comprehensively covered the ground. In the United States their experience has not been so fortunate as ours. On reference to some statistics, I find that from 1890 to 1909, that 369 National Banks closed, and only 18 were restored to solvency—an average of over 19 a year. I find also that from 1890 to 1907, 1,376 State banks closed, an average of 72 a year. During that period there has been an average failure of National and State banks combined of 90 a year, with an average loss to depositors of something like $11,000,000, and with great losses to general creditors.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario): What is the percentage?

Mr. MACLEAN: I have not figured out the percentage.

Mr. EMMERSON: What is the percentage of the total number?

Mr. MACLEAN: The United States has 27,000 banks, State and National, but I cannot give my hon. friend the proportion.

Mr. ROSS: Does my hon. friend say the average loss to depositors was $11,000,000?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, as relating to State and National banks, from 1890 to 1907.

Mr. ROSS: Is that the average loss of each bank ?

Mr. MACLEAN: No, the general yearly average. So far as bank failures in this country are concerned, I think we have been extremely fortunate, but during the last few years there have occurred some failures which have inflicted great loss and discomfort upon a large number of the people of this country, and if we can throw around our Bank Act any further safeguards in the way of inspection or otherwise, tending to protect the interests of depositors, shareholders and others, and to minimize further bank failures, it is plainly our duty to do so.

I now wish to say a few words with respect to the clause of the Bill relating to the merger of banks. I do not see what possible good can come of the amendment proposed by the Bill in respect to mergers or bank amalgamations. As I understand the amendment proposed by the Minister of Finance, it simply provides that the amalgamation of any two banks requires his consent, in addition to the consent of the Treasury Board now required by law. If that be a correct statement of the law as it now stands, and as proposed to be amended by the present Bill, there really is not a great deal in the proposed amendments. The matter of bank amalgamation has been discussed a good deal by the press of Canada, particularly during the last year, and every one has been obliged to give more or less consideration to the question. The amalgamation of banks is one of the facts of modern business life. Like all amalgamations of business concerns, there are in it both good and bad features. So far as bank amalgamations are concerned, I assume that the vital issue so far as the people of this country are concerned is how the combined resources of the banks so amalgamated shall be used ; whether

or not they shall be at the disposal of the people of the country, in the manner and form best calculated to advance the interests of the country and the people. It cannot be said, I think, that under our system, bank amalgamation necessarily limits banking facilities, because we find in Canada such a competition among the different banks in the establishment of branches that it will rarely happen that any particular part of the country will find itself lacking in banking facilities—that is, in the availability of a branch of some particular chartered bank. The question which concerns people in connection with bank amalgamation is whether or not it limits the possibility of legitimate customers securing the banking accommodation they require. Bank amalgamation, I suppose, will continue. It is occurring in other countries. In the United States it is a matter of common occurrence. In England, while in 1813 there were something like 940 banks, to-day there are but between 40 and 50, all practically in London. France has but three large banks to-day with branches throughout every part of the republic, that is outside of the Bank of France itself. Now, banking amalgamation, per se, is not necessarily a bad thing. There have been many instances of bank amalgamation in Canada when it was eminently desirable and important that it should take place. One took place only the other day when the Banque Internationale, I understand, was absorbed by another Canadian chartered bank; and I am sure that that amalgamation was certainly in the interests of Canada and of the business public, and I trust in the interest of both banks concerned. In the cases of the Ontario and Sovereign banks, it certainly was of great importance that they should be absorbed as they were by stronger banks, thus minimizing the loss to their shareholders and depositors. I will go further and say that it is always desirable that a weak bank should be absorbed by or amalgamated with some stronger bank or itself made stronger. This idea is put very clearly in a book, which I hold in my hand, containing an extract from some American financial journal dealing with weak banks. It expresses my view very well. It says:

> A weak bank in the financial system of any state has no more right to continue in business than has a weak bridge in a public highway. The duty of the public authorities and of public opinion in the one case is the same as in the other. Once an element of weakness has developed, the defect in the structure is to be remedied without delay, so as to make it capable of bearing the full weight of its proper burden, or the thing should be closed up. The weak bank takes away legitimate business from the bank that is safe, and does injury to the business as a whole by spreading general distrust. It should therefore be put out of existence. With no less expedition than we put out a fire or block up a highway or suspend traffic on a tumbled down bridge. This is not a case in which sentiment, social standing of officials, or hesitation to sacrifice an old institution that has outlived its usefulness can be considered. If a bank is weak it has either got to strengthen itself or go. The machinery of the law cannot be invoked too speedily.

I thoroughly agree with the opinion thus expressed by that financial journal. In a country where business is largely done upon credit supported by the banks, it is desirable that we be rid of weak banking institutions. But, of course, there is room for protest on the part of the public against the amalgamation of banks individually strong. It is only natural that the public should protest against the concentration of large amounts of capital in the hands of two or three banks, each bank being largely under the control and direction, in the last analysis, of very few men. It is only natural that the public should fear disaster from such concentration of capital, from the placing of such tremendous banking resources in the hands of a few people. It is only natural that they fear the creation of a money monopoly. I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to venture at this stage any remedy for such a condition as monopoly, if it now prevails in the country; or if it is likely to occur in the near future. The important thing, I take it, is, after all, that we see that in some manner or other the management and direction of the financial resources of this country are in the hands of competent and honourable men who shall not only remember their duties to their shareholders but the larger and broader duties which they owe to the public at large. I think when we reach a condition in this country when there may be such a thing as a money monopoly, this Parliament, and the people of this country, may well be trusted to work out some remedy which will be quite effective. When the Bill is before the Banking and Commerce Committee I shall have some amendments to propose on this point.

The Bill further provides for the giving of permission to banks to make loans upon stored grain. So far as I am personally concerned, I rather favour the insertion of this provision in the Bill. I do not know that it will widen very much the credit which banking institutions may give to possible borrowers in the western part of Canada, but it is only natural and logical that our Bank Act should contain this provision, particularly in a country like Canada, where our grain is all harvested at one time and where we have experienced, and, I have no doubt, will again, difficulty in having that grain transported by our railway systems from the source of production to the elevators early in the season, thus

requiring a great deal of it to be stored locally. Therefore, I think it is only wise and fair and in the interests of the people of certain parts of this country that this amendment should be made to the Act. Some time or other I think it may prove of considerable advantage to western borrowers. The details of this amendment, however, must be carefully and equitably worked out.

Mr. SCHAFFNER: Would the hon. member care to give the reason why he thinks this clause will not widen the credit of the banks?

Mr. MACLEAN: The Canadian banks are commercial banks, and, as the Minister of Finance has stated, loans are largely made upon the responsibility of the men applying for them; in many cases bank loans are perhaps moral loans. What I mean is that loans are now frequently made to certain applicants, not upon their material worth, but upon their standing in the community. In the West I should think that to-day loans are made to farmers owning threshed grain, without any banking lien. It is given on their personal credit. The power to give to the bank a lien may not necessarily increase largely the volume of credit given to such farmers.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is it not true that loans are generally made on statements? Would a bank to-day loan on the standing of a man unless he made a statement?

Mr. MACLEAN: I suppose the statement may reveal the standing of the man. I would be very glad if banks would make a loan merely on statement. I wish now to refer briefly to the provisions of the Bill respecting the establishment of a central gold reserve. I trust that when this Bill is placed before the Banking and Commerce Committee we shall have a very full explanation of this section from the Minister of Finance. I have not been able so far to satisfy myself that it will help very much to extend the bank circulation. I can understand banks desiring or preferring to issue their own notes against gold or Dominion notes rather than to circulate Dominion notes but it does seem to me, though I do not propose to argue it at any length whatever, that the proposal of this central gold reserve amendment does not afford any great opportunity for the expansion of our circulation. Our banks, fortunately, up to the present have been able to give us practically all the circulation which the demands of the country from time to time require.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Oh.

Mr. MACLEAN: I think only in one case were the banks obliged to limit their banking operations owing to a want of circulation and that was in 1907 or 1908 when a momentary stringency prevailed in this country, and in the United States, where practically every bank was obliged to suspend payment, and the result of it was felt through the whole of this country. In that year the Dominion Government were obliged to suspend the Legal Tender Act and they took power to issue under Order in Council, which was afterwards confirmed by Parliament, Dominion notes, not against gold, but against security which was to be made by the banks to the extent of $10,000,000. On that occasion the banks availed themselves of the opportunity of this additional circulation to the extent of a little over $5,000,000 during the cropping season in the Canadian Northwest. There have been from time to time many suggestions as to the best manner in which to give an increased currency circulation and, of course, there must be some method worked out for doing this, because Canada's business progress is very great, her population is increasing very rapidly and there should be an increased circulation. It is hardly likely that if the provision enabling banks to issue circulation to the extent of 15 per cent in excess of their combined capital and reserve were continued in force they would avail themselves of it to any greater extent than possible because I understand that bankers allege that it costs them about 7 per cent, which practically eliminates all hope of the bankers making any profit out of that excess circulation, consequently they will not encourage it.

Mr. EMMERSON: How does it cost them 7 per cent?

Mr. MACLEAN: They have to pay the Government 5 per cent for the issue and this goes into the consolidated revenue fund. Then, they are obliged to print their bills and there would be other expenses. I have no personal knowledge of what it actually costs our banks.

Mr. EMMERSON: The destruction of bills would minimize that.

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, occasionally there might be some profit in that way. The Minister referred to a suggestion which, I think, came from the newspaper edited by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) who, I am sure, we will be pleased to have participate in the discussion of this Bill. It has been suggested by others, that the banks should increase their capital. That criticism has been made of the banks and I think it has some foundation. I think that the banks should take steps, in view of the rapid expansion of business, to increase their capital. This would partially meet circulation demands.

It has also been suggested by others that the chartered banks maintain an unnecessarily high reserve thus taking out of circulation a great deal of money. What force there is in that criticism I would hardly venture to say.

There are a few other matters which I did intend to refer to very briefly. The Minister has referred to the suggestion that some form of a guarantee to depositors be made. It is possible that some system may be worked out doing this without injustice to our banking system, or to the shareholders, or anybody else, but I must confess that I fail to see it myself. I think the suggestion is fundamentally unsound and that it would be hardly possible to work out any such protection to depositors. This is altogether a different question from the guarantee of the redemption of notes. I understand that the circulation redemption fund was not established with the view of guaranteeing notes because they were amply guaranteed in being a first lien on the assets of the bank. Unless that were true I do not imagine that the banks would guarantee to redeem one another's notes. It would happen that when a bank became insolvent a great number of its notes would be in circulation and it would be a great inconvenience to the public, if there were no means of redemption immediately available to note holders. The notes bear interest and they would be redeemed by the bank liquidator at some time, but it would entail a great loss upon a great number of people who would be temporarily out of their money and that was the reason why there came the establishment of the bank circulation redemption fund.

The matter of compelling banks not to issue notes a second time in order to keep the issue as clean as possible is a suggestion which has been frequently made in this country and one which I think has some merits, but it is one which can be discussed in the Committee on Banking and Commerce. Another protection frequently suggested in this and other countries against minority control of our banks is the curtailment of the voting powers of the shareholders of banks, by the way of giving each shareholder but one vote irrespective of the number of shares he holds. That is the regulation and law respecting the voting power of shareholders of the Bank of England and there is a great deal to be said in favour of it. I shall not detain the House at any greater length at the present time, because any suggestions which I may have in the way of proposed amendments to the Bank Act I shall submit to the Committee on Banking and Commerce when it is dealing with this Bill.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Just a few words before the House rises for the dinner hour, and I shall continue my remarks when we meet at eight o'clock. I wish to refer to the two speeches which have just been made. We have heard a most Conservative speech by a conservative Minister of Finance, which I do not think quite voices the sentiments of the Conservative element in this country, and we have had also a very slightly liberal criticism of that scheme by a prominent Liberal who is probably the spokesman for his party on this question. I confess, I am somewhat seized with that heresy which the Minister of Finance condemns, namely, an increase in the national note issue of this country. The Finance Minister quoted Sir Richard Cartwright as saying the policeman is a false security, but I do not believe that. I believe in public inspection of banks for this country, and I will unfold the reasons for my belief later on. If we have policemen in ordinary affairs, we can have a policeman in banking matters as well. There was another thing that was said by the Minister of Finance and by his friendly critic in favour of the Bill, and it was, that depositors in nearly all cases of bank failure had had their money returned. Eventually they had, but a great many depositors were out of their money for a long while, and suffered great distress thereby. The hon. gentleman quoted Mr. McLeod, late manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, as having instituted a system of audit by the shareholders, but he did not tell us that Mr. McLeod had circulated a pamphlet throughout the country, in which he urged that we must have public inspection of banks in Canada. When I come to argue the case, I think I will be able to show that there is good reason for public inspection of banks and that no harm will come of it. They have public inspection in the United States and it does a great deal of good, and when the minister says these inspectors cannot pass on all loans, as a matter of fact the examiners of the United States do pass on them and are competent to pass on them and good results have followed. If, as the minister said, a private auditor could go into the head office and some of the branches where there is a large business, so can a public inspector of banks, he can do a great deal more good than can the mere inspector of the shareholders. When I come to speak after recess on this question, I shall dip somewhat slightly into the Act concerning Dominion notes, into the Act creating the Postal and Government Savings Banks, and other laws which are involved in national finance.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 67, to incorporate the Canada Public Trustee Company.—Sir Edmund Osler.

Bill No. 68, to incorporate the Dominion Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Bennett (Simcoe).

Bill No. 69, respecting Ebro Irrigation and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Ross.

Bill No. 73, to incorporate the Peoples Trustee and Security Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 74, respecting the York County Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. Macdonald.

BANKS AND BANKING.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Speaker, in discussing this Bill of 1913, to revise the Revised Banking Act of 1901 (really made over forty years ago), it is first necessary to set out some of the defects in the present banking and currency system; and, for brevity's sake, I intend to designate the existing law as the 'old law,' and the proposal now before the House as the 'new law.'

Among the defects of the old law and of the existing system are the following:

1. The insufficient protection of depositors.

2. The facility with which banks are merged and amalgamations made.

3. The partial surrender by Government to the banks of the function of emitting currency. The powers of the banks in this respect are increased in the new Bill.

4. The insufficiency of circulation for business purposes; and this is, I take it, the paramount evil of our banking system.

5. The sterilization of the Post Office Savings Bank system and the Government Savings Bank system, both of which were created in the public interests by special Acts, and whose usefulness is largely being destroyed by active or secret opposition of the chartered banks, and perhaps by silent neglect of Government.

6. The tendency of the present law to set apart the savings of the people in the banks for the purpose of business, rather than the use of any of it for building purposes, as is prevalent in the United States. In that country the savings of the people on deposit with the savings banks are devoted to investment in mortgages on real estate and building improvements.

Having stated these evils, and as there is nothing in this Bill which deals in an effective way with them let me discuss for a moment the first one, namely, the insufficient protection of depositors. All the Government proposes to do is to allow the shareholders to appoint an auditor, in addition to the present audit, which is made by the bank's own officials. This is no improvement, because we know that the management have the proxies of the shareholders in their own hands, and any additional auditor will be an employee of the shareholders, whose interests are often contrary to the interests of the depositors. In other words, the depositors should elect the auditor, or as I contend, the state which represents the depositors and the whole public, and therefore my contention is that we must have a public inspection of all banks, rather than a mere shareholders' audit. The public will be surprised to learn that the actual deposits in the defunct Farmers' Bank were used, and are being used to-day as fast as they can be realized on, to redeem the note issue of that bank authorized by the present Banking Act. The paid-up capital had been exhausted; there was not sufficient money in the vaults of the bank to redeem the notes; and at this moment any money being realized by the liquidators, and it is the depositors' money, is going to the discharge of the note issue, which is bearing, until redeemed, three per cent interest. So you will see that the depositors' money in the banks to-day in Canada, in case of bad management, at least, must first go to the protection of the notes put out by the bank! The state, and not the banks, should issue all notes of circulation, and they ought to stand on their own bottom, as I will produce later on. In the United States there is no danger to depositors of a preference over them of the notes paid out by the banks.

The provision of a public inspection in the interest of depositors and the public is to be found in the United States, and no one to-day can say that public inspection of the banks in the United States has been injurious to anybody; it is a great benefit to the public. The most creditable thing in the national banking system of the United States is that the secretary of the treasury can put national inspectors in national banks where he has reason to believe wrongs have been committed, and have been committed, and have them cleared up, and the bank liquidated if necessary.

What is the use of fining or even imprisoning directors, who have made improper returns, long after the crime? What is wanted is protection before the crime. The new Act says that the directors and managers may go to jail for making false returns. We want a system of public inspection that will check the managers at the beginning, and public inspection would have prevented the Farmers' Bank from ever

opening its doors; and public inspection should begin at the inauguration of the bank, and should be made regularly from that time on. Under the present law the attention of the Finance Minister has been called to evils that were said to exist, and which he was unable to prevent, and under the present Act will still be unable to prevent. And why should the Government protect its own deposits ahead of the ordinary depositor, the public? Do they distrust their own law?

Now, I come to my second objection to the present system, and it is this: Mr. Speaker, I fear a money trust, and I wish to repeat it, I fear a money trust; and I say it again to this House, I fear a money trust.

You recall the verse:

> Then up spake an old sailor,
> Had sailed the Spanish main,
> I pray thee put into yonder port,—
> For I fear a hurricane.

I fear a hurricane and therefore I shall try to pilot the way to 'yonder port.' What is it that threatens to-day the great republic alongside other than this fear of a money trust? The whole of the natural resources of that country, even the industries of the country, are gradually going into the hands of powerful trusts controlled by a few very wealthy men, and worst of all, even almost the whole savings of the public in the banks are being gradually concentrated in New York, in the hands of almost these same few people, and being used rather for the advantages of these trusts and those who control them than for the public at large and for the general business of the community. Wall street, the greatest evil in the United States, is financed by this concentration of bank resources in New York. The people there fear a money trust, and the revelations now being made in Washington before a special committee of the House of Representatives have startled the entire country, and have drawn admissions from the plutocrats themselves that the danger point has been reached, and if they were not, as they claim themselves to be, eminently honest and trustworthy persons, a financial catastrophe would follow if this concentrated capital came into the hands of unreliable men. Are we moving on the same lines in this country? I think we are, and therefore I say I fear a money trust.

There is not sufficient protection in this Bill against mergers. I disapproved at the time, and I still disapprove, of the recent amalgamations that have taken place in this country, particularly during the last three years; and still others were contemplated, and were only held off by public criticism and not by any law or Act on the part of the Government. It has been so easy to consolidate banks in the States, and especially so in New York, and the power resultant therefrom has been so enormous that every temptation exists in this country to follow that lead. What they do in the United States they will do in Canada unless Parliament imposes a check. We would be blind to our own interests if we did not take advantage of the evils that have been created in the United States. We now know what these evils are and we should not facilitate their introduction into Canada; and we must always remember that the trust evils in the United States, whether it applies to the industries or to the great necessities of life are manipulated by the same men that manipulate the banking trust. The great proof of the money trust in the States is found in the system of interlocking directorates. A few men representing the immense consolidations there sit on many boards and carry out the one policy, that of the great trust, in that way. The same thing is happening here. The chief executive of the Canadian Pacific sits on the board of the Bank of Montreal and may be slated for the highest office in that bank. That is one reason why I fear a money trust. The Canadian Pacific is probably the greatest depositor in Canada.

In Canada the conditions are such as facilitate the growth of the same evils here. The great West of the United States was settled before the trust epoch began; the Canadian West is being settled in the face of a great railway trust, of trusts more or less dominating agricultural implements and many other manufactures; more or less of a beef trust; a greater or lesser trust in buying grain and cattle in the West; and what now looks like a bankers' trust, or money trust, and by the aid of which all other trusts are strengthened and maintained. All the trusts are bound to get together. It, therefore, looks as if the people of the Canadian West are to grow up in the presence of a system of trusts, and this must have a most discouraging effect unless we have a progressive government, and deal at once with the evils that exist or are in process of being established in the West. For instance, the people of the Canadian West to-day have to pay higher freight rates, higher telegraph rates, higher express rates, and worst of all, higher rates of interest to banks, which are enfranchised by federal legislation; and the keynote of federal legislation should be equal treatment in all parts of Canada.

Not only does this Bill not prevent bank mergers or make them impossible, but it has another evil; it makes more difficult the formation of new banks; and what we want in this country is more banking facili-

ties, more banks and a scattered management of banks rather than concentration. It may or may not be a good thing for the promotion of new banks to go out and solicit subscriptions to shares and the payment of commission to those who dispose of such stock. This Act prevents any payment of commission, and now there is no means of starting a bank unless a number of wealthy men can get together and with their own resources and in face of the hostility of existing banks organize a new one.

And another thing, the smaller banks in Canada to-day are in constant dread of the bigger fish in the pool swallowing the smaller ones at a gulp. Any member of this House can find this out for himself by his own local investigation, if he cares to do so.

And now I come to my third objection of the system, namely, the preference given to the note issue of the banks over the note issue of the Dominion, and of the introduction of new clauses in this Bill, which must eventually end in the further locking up, if not disappearance of, Dominion notes, one of the best currencies in the world, and acceptable everywhere, like United States greenbacks. Our bank notes are not accepted in the States, our Dominion notes are; and our five-dollar bills, which would be like gold, are carefully kept in cold storage by the active hostility of the Canadian banks. They would sooner pay out Bank of England notes than a Dominion five-dollar bill. They do not wish to see the Canadian people become acquainted with such a fine and far-circulating document of exchange. I am an absolute believer in the currency of this country being in the shape of Dominion notes, and that the banks pay out nothing but specie or Dominion notes, as may be required for circulation purposes.

At present, under the Dominion Notes Act, which was passed many years ago, when the population of Canada was much smaller than it is now, and when business was not one-twentieth of what it is, we provided for an issue of $30,000,000 of Dominion notes, secured by a twenty-five per cent. gold reserve. Any further issue of these notes beyond that thirty millions was to be secured by gold, dollar for dollar; and at the present moment the total issue is in the neighbourhood of one hundred and fifteen million dollars. The eighty-five million excess of the thirty millions provided by the Act is secured by gold deposits, and government notes have been issued against this; and these notes are practically gold certificates and used mainly by the banks for clearing-house purposes only. The balance of these notes which may be in public use, are in $1 and $2 bills, and they form a very useful

Mr. MACLEAN (South York).

factor in our currency. They go everywhere; they are protected from counterfeit; and they are considered by everyone better than gold. If the ones and twos are so good, why not fives and tens? It is true we have issued $5 notes, but the banks have taken pains that only on very rare occasions are these $5 bills allowed to get out. The banks absorb most of the state issue at present. The $1 and $2 bills are in circulation because the banks cannot issue such denominations; but all the rest of the Dominion notes are issued as a convenience to the banks, to avoid the cost of taking care of their own gold; thus imposing on the Government of this country the cost of guarding it. We not only have to guard their gold, but we have to pay for the printing of the certificates which we issue to them, and maintain the Receiver General's offices and storehouses to guard this gold. We even have to police it. And just when I am on this point I desire to say that I would much prefer that we should be guardians of this gold than have it put into the hands of the new gold trust in Montreal that is created by this Act, and as to whose integrity the public have only the same guarantees that they have of bank directors. Who is to guard these guardians of the new gold trust? In other words, the money trust becomes the custodian of the gold, whereas at the present time the state holds the gold, and we all know the State is safe—or at least, I hope it is safe. I would ask the minister now if he mistrusts himself or his assistants, and will he tell us now that the gold stored with him is intact?

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): So far as the audit carried on by the Department of Finance and the Auditor General's Department can establish the fact that the gold is in the vaults of the Receiver General, it is there.

Mr. MACLEAN: And the country knows it is there. I am therefore, altogether against this Act, which will minimize the issue of Dominion notes, which increases the note issue of the banks, and which places the guardianship of the gold reserve in the hands of the banks, when the federal treasury should be the guardian to the end of the security of the public. In other words, the net effect of this Act will be that instead of $115,000,000 of Dominion bank notes being in circulation, and another $100,000,000 of notes, we will have, roughly, $200,000,000 of bank notes, and these alone.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds). I think the hon. gentleman has misconstrued the Act. The large legals will still be issued by the Dominion Government against gold for purposes of clearance.

Mr. MACLEAN: And there will be an increase of bank notes, as I take it, issued against gold stored in Montreal.

Mr. WHITE (Leeds): Against any additional gold, or against Dominion notes.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is exactly how I take it. My fourth objection is that we have not sufficient circulation for the needs of the country. I meet men every day who are complaining of their inability to extend their business—and extension is the keynote of Canada—because of the lack of money, and the lack of banking credit, and the diversion of money into other enterprises, some of them outside of Canada, that should be consecrated to home interests and industries. Our great want to-day is money and the banks apparently seem to be in league that we should only get such money as they have or have control of and which they use for their own profit, rather than for the development of the country. Go where you will, you meet with this money famine; and it is the fact that, in the development of banking, various states have repeatedly had to interfere and interfered more or less successfully, in a way, to increase the currency and available monetary resources of their respective countries. The states of Europe have all had to take it up. Germany has taken it up, France has taken it up, Russia and Japan have taken it up, Italy has taken it up, and other countries have taken it up, and they have found means, independent of the banking organizations of the country, to increase the money or equivalent of money in their own countries. And there is a thing besides bank notes and money in banks, called credit, and the great function of banks is dealing not only with actual money but credit. They sell credit and are possessed of this thing called credit which they deal in; and I claim that the state itself is possessed of this same thing called national credit, and it can be used, and used effectively, by means of a generous issue of state notes against a gold reserve and the resources of the country, to the general advantage of the country and without any great detriment to the banks, and certainly to the great convenience of the people. There is no consideration in the new law of the enormous growth of Canada and the need of money for its development, and no suggestion of the employment of the public credit of Canada by way of national notes for the granting of relief and advancing progress. We take no leaf out of the book of the most progressive nations of the world. This is a banker's Bill, not a public measure. I will return to this topic later on in my remarks.

Now, let me come to my fifth objection, which I have described as the sterilization of the laws we now have creating post office savings banks and Government savings banks. All our banks have what they call savings bank branches, and they claim to encourage small deposits which, to all intents and purposes, can be withdrawn without notice, and which can be chequed against. Our Post Office Savings Bank has not been growing as it should have done, and as a matter of fact we all know that the banks have tried their best to discourage or discredit deposits in the Post Office Savings Bank. The Post Office Savings Bank can be and as a matter of fact is taken to very small settlements and out-of-the-way places and has been of great convenience, but I do not see in this Act, or other Acts, any attempt on the part of the Minister of Finance to improve the Post Office or Government Savings Banks. Some of the latter have been closed and the deposits transferred to the Post Office Savings Banks; but what I want to say is that the minister is not improving the Post Office Bank and keeping it abreast with savings banks of the ordinary banks. For instance, we must remember the roundabout way of getting money out of the Post Office Savings Bank accounts by means of first filling in a form and sending it to Ottawa and then a permit for withdrawal is returned by a later mail. Why cannot a depositor cheque against a local post office account; at least a man should be allowed to have his cheque marked 'good' and if the postmaster does not happen to have the funds in hand the holder can cash it elsewhere, and a cheque so certified by the local postmaster should be the best possible circulating medium; or at least it ought to be an excellent document of exchange until such time as it can reach a bank or business centre.

And I know further that there have been times when it would have been in the interest of this Government to have increased the rate of interest on Post Office Savings Bank deposits, but the banks have strenuously opposed any such increase. I would ask the Minister of Finance to compare our Post Office Savings Bank system with the more modern systems and perhaps with that of the United States. Even in England, I understand, you can withdraw a pound on demand at any time and if good for a pound it should be good for all the depositor has to his credit. If savings banks or the banks allow a depositor to cheque against them, why can not the Dominion do it?

When I speak of the Post Office Savings Bank I have in mind a number of other progressive measures which are related to our post offices. I believe in a parcel post system, and I take the speech of the hon.

Postmaster General of a few days ago that he is a believer in that system. I also am a strong believer, not only in a post office savings bank and a parcel post system, but I also believe in a postal telegraph system, in charge of our postmasters. In other words, I think it is possible, and it is a public duty to supply all over this country post offices for letters, with a savings bank, with a telegraph, and a parcel post service, and a money transfer service, all in one building, no matter how small the centre; and if you can attach to this a public-owned telephone system, you have a consolidated public organization in each little hamlet that would maintain at least two officials and give a service in most respects night and day, with the exception of night banking. If anybody can suggest a better contribution to the improvement of the business and social conditions of our various communities than these I have suggested, I shall be glad to hear it. Therefore, I say the Government should make improvements in our Post Office Savings Bank and public money transfer system, and also introduce the other improvements I have suggested. It is true that my arguments are in favour of a public banking system more or less in co-operation with private banks, and I am coming to that far-reaching proposition later on in this discussion. I am not afraid of the principle of public ownership being at least partially applied to banking.

Now, to come to the last defect of the present system: I would say that it offers no banking facilities in the matter of building homes or building factories or business places, or for the loaning of money on real estate as security. In the United States the great bulk of the savings of the people, and I mean by the people those who have small accounts, go into what are called savings banks, all of which are organized under state laws and under such stringent conditions that the directors are limited very largely to the investment of the deposits of such banks to loans on mortgages and for the purchase of mortgages. One great trouble in this country to-day is to get money for building purposes. In the United States there seems to be an abundance of money for this purpose to be obtained from the savings banks. In our country there is a very great scarcity of money for such purposes, and, although we have loan companies especially created for this end, they are not able to find sufficient money or to sell their debentures as they would like to outside of Canada; and I would appeal to the experience of members in this House if there should not be a better system in this country for obtaining money for building improvements. And, contrary-wise, I would like to know why the banks of this country are restrained from lending money secured by mortgages on real estate. I cannot at this moment say if this is done in other countries or not. The national banks in the United States are restrained from lending on real estate, and are practically commercial or business banks, the savings banks in that country do this important function; it is an open question in my mind whether our banks should not be allowed to lend on real estate security, under conditions. It is true that the banks do secure themselves later on by taking mortgages, but they must make a demand for such, and the borrower must confess to some kind of insolvency to permit this being done; and nothing hurts a business man so much as when he is called upon by a bank to give a mortgage on his real estate; and it is known that banks take letters from borrowers to the effect that when the borrower is called upon to put up his real estate, he must do so. It would surprise a good many, and it would surprise the public inspector of banks—if we had such an official—to see how many of these undertakings are filed away in the strong boxes of our banks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have dealt with what I consider the defects of the existing system and the defects of the proposed system, and I pass to my second topic, and that is an analysis of our present banks and banking system, as evidenced by the November bank returns; and when I deal with these I am not going to quote the exact figures, but it is sufficient that I deal with them in terms of millions. I find, roughly, that the banks in this country get their available funds from the following sources:

1. There is the paid-up capital of the banks, roughly speaking, 114 million dollars. This 114 million is paid in by the shareholders of the bank. But where do they get the rest of all their money?

2. I find that the second item is the reserves of the banks that have accrued from the profits of the banks, except in a few cases where it includes premiums paid on shares for additional capital; just what this is I do not know, and I do not propose to take it into consideration. This second item is, roughly, 106 millions, and most of which represents profits taken out of the public after good big dividends have been paid to the shareholders on their shares.

3. The third item is the banks' own note issue, and this amounts to 115 millions, an amount rather in excess of the paid-up capital. For this, like for the previous item of reserve, the banks do not pay one cent. They have the privilege of a note issue equal to their capital, and recently we gave them the privilege of a 15 per cent excess, in certain instances, to their bank

capital; and now, if I understand this Act aright, they are to be given an additional power of issue for which they have to put up gold costing them 3 per cent, as they now pay 5 per cent on their emergency issue.

4. Their fourth item, and it is their main source, is their deposits, divided into two sections: public deposits of the federal and provincial Governments, representing 36 millions, and deposits of the people, representing $1,011,000,000, or 11 millions over a billion of dollars, of which roughly speaking, 376 millions are deposits on demand, without interest, and 635 millions deposited on notice, and which are supposed to pay 3 per cent, and which 3 per cent, as a matter of fact, by an agreement between the banks cannot be exceeded, and if one bank had the audacity to offer more than this he would find the Bankers' Association would by concert or by stealth have his scalp. I believe that the smaller banks would do more business if they were allowed to pay a little more for deposits; but if there is anything they are afraid of it is to do anything that will bring down upon them the bigger banks. The small banks to-day are at the mercy of the big banks—a deplorable thing. And, when I say this I think I am expressing the real views of the smaller banks, and a great many persons as well.

When I totalize all the available resources of the Canadian banks I find it sums up $1,462,000,000, to which the banks themselves have only contributed $114,000,000, or a good deal less than ten per cent. The banks find ten per cent, and the people ninety per cent of all the available resources of the banks. The banks do not pay on an average more than about one and a half per cent. on all this money, and they lend it to the Canadian people at not less than six per cent, and sometimes eight per cent, and return to their shareholders ten per cent on shares, and in some cases a great deal more; and they do not share one cent of all their profits with the public, which gave the ninety per cent, and who gave them their franchise as well.

This Bill proposes to continue for another ten years this condition of affairs. I say that this is all wrong. Other countries have found a way to nationalize their finances to limit the banks to a fixed rate of interest to limit the rate of discount, to limit the amount to be realized by way of reserve, to limit the amount of dividends to be paid to shoreholders, and to compel the banks to share any excess of profit that is left after providing for those things with the State. I ask hon. gentlemen to refer to a small pamphlet which I have received, and I suppose other members have received, signed by Peter Ryan of Toronto. As far as I can gather its facts are correct, and if correct, they are most interesting reading; and I ask the Minister of Finance what he has to say on the methods of the national banking systems of many countries as set out in this document? Would it not be a good thing if we had something like it in this country?

Now, let me come to my third, and might I venture to call it my constructive criticism. It is all very well to be critical and attempt to pull down a system, but it is quite pertinent to say to one who assumes this role, what do you propose in its place. In view of the success of national banks, of real national banks that you find all over Europe, in America, even in Japan—I use the word national with reference to State banks rather than to the national banks of the United States—my suggestion is that Canada should have a great national bank or state bank somewhat on the lines of the Imperial Bank of Germany, the shares of which are largely owned by the public, but which is absolutely regulated by the state in the public interest.

The Imperial Chancellor is the president, and Finance Minister of Prussia is the vice-president. This bank issues notes which practically form the national currency; and I must say to the house that in view of the fact of the enormous needs of this country for money, and the fact of this country's wealth and natural resources, more or less the property of the people, and in view of the fact that the nation owns railways and canals, and other great public works, and for which I admit it is more or less in debt, and in view of the fact most of all of the enormous credit that we as a nation have in the eyes of the world, it would be advisable, nay absolutely desirable and essential that we should use the credit of Canada as a nation as a means towards the enlargement and expansion of the vailable funds for public use in the way of money or credit just as the banks do the same thing with their resources. If our banks can use their credit and I contend, as has been admitted in the United States, that most of the banks deal in credit rather than gold or bank notes; and if they can do it, why cannot the state do it? What is passing in my mind therefore is that we take two or three of the largest banks we have in Canada and consolidate them into one large bank called the Bank of Canada with a capital of at least a quarter of a billion of dollars and make that bank the bank of issue for what would be national notes, and that that bank would lend these to the other banks, instead of allowing the banks to issue their own notes, on proper security at a rate of 2 per cent or 3 per cent to be enlarged hereafter or what would be practically the same thing by the

state sharing in the profits of the banks as they do in Germany.

Mr. CURRIE: Is it not a fact that these states which the hon. gentleman refers to as having national banks have borrowed millions of dollars from these so-called banks?

Mr. MACLEAN: I will grant that. We should do our own financing in Canada and borrow from our national bank, if it is properly organized, and that is what I wish to come to. This bank would be different from what is proposed for the United States by the Aldrich Commission, but it would be practically national and it would be a bankers' bank, and it would also be the bank of Dominion government and the bank of the provinces and the bank of our great corporations like the railways and other large concerns. The national notes that this bank would issue would be secured by a gold reserve of at least 25 per cent as well as by the resources and the credit of the country at large, and such a reserve would be, in my mind, ample. These national notes would have the same world-wide currency that the United States notes have.

When I speak this way I am speaking only in the most general way. I do not wish at this moment to go further into details, I rather hope to elicit information in this respect in the banking committee where we will have the opportunity of putting questions to the bankers and others interested.

And having said all these things I now come to what is really my substantive proposal, and it is this: That in view of what I have said, and probably of what others will say in this House, it would be wrong, it would be a crime against the best interests of this country, to pass this Act as we now have it before us, and to say that it shall be our financial policy for the next ten years. I object to any such idea, altogether. What I suggest is this, that it would become this House, and it would be in the public interest, that we appoint a monetary commission of three or five of the best men we can get, even if we have to go to Europe for one of them, to make a study of modern banking conditions, and especially a study of the Canadian banking conditions, as compared with what is practiced in Europe, Japan, South America, and other countries, and that they make this special study in the light of the facts contained in the report of the monetary commission appointed by the congress of the United States, and which has recently been made public, and which is the subject of widespread discussion in the United States at this moment. Such a commission could report in twelve or in eighteen months, at least, and any bill passed this session should have no ten-years'-life clause inserted in it, but should be, at the most, for two years, until such commission could report.

Did the Minister of Finance ever consider the desirability of having the banks of England to do business in Canada? England is famous for its wealth, and especially is her fame world-wide by reason of her banking institutions. Could we not have the banks that do business in England do business in Canada? Would it not be a fine thing if the people of Canada were able to borrow English money and capital in this country from English banks doing business in Canada, and the scheme I suggest of using the credit of Canada for a large issue of national notes secured by a 25 per cent gold reserve, and distributed by the Bank of Canada that I suggested, would allow the banks doing business in England to come to Canada, open branches and avail themselves of the use of these national notes as well as their own funds to do business in Canada. We would then have real competition in banking in this country if ever we can get English banks to open houses here. I do not see how they could do business here and very well issue notes like our banks, although that would be possible; but to allow them to do business here and participate in the use of national notes would, to my mind, be quite possible. And, if we could attract some of the banks of England to come, why not some of the banks of France, where there is as much available capital as in England.

We are seeking by this legislation to create a bank trust, and to limit the banking facilities. What we ought to seek to do is to increase the competition in banking, and to get much more money for banking purposes. This Bill does not even attempt to do this.

It is true that in the United States they are afraid of a central bank or of a great national bank, and they have reasons more or less for their view, but I imagine it is because they, like us, are away behind, although they call themselves modern—they are a long way behind Europe. Europe leads us in agreat many respects especially in public ownership and public control. The state owns the railways in Europe. The state owns the postal system, which takes charge of all communications. It owns the savings bank. The state carries on a great life insurance business, and in many other respects the legislatures there feel that the intervention of government in the great public services of their people is more and more a necessity of the time. That is my belief as to Canada; I believe more and more in government participation. I believe in a state-owned railway from one coast to the other in competition with the private railway com-

panies. I believe in state insurance in competition with private-owned companies. Most of all, I believe in the state participating in the monetary organization of the country; and I believe in this especially because it is to the welfare of the people at large, and to the development of our enormous resources and our expanding business that the credit of the country as a nation should be used as the basis of a national system of currency intimately associated with our private banking organizations. I believe that the State should be the predominating partner in this great business.

These are the reflections that I have ventured to present to the House to-night in regard to this most interesting question of banking. For thirty years, nay, for forty years, we have had a system which we had to take because it was imposed upon us by those who organized banks in the old days and that system has continued from that time to this. We have not improved it, we have not tried to improve it. Let us now try to improve it by comparing it with the systems of banking which obtain in other countries that are more progressive than we are with respect to this question. They have made wonderful developments in Europe, in South America and in Japan in regard to banking. They have made the state a participant in banking and they have absolutely regulated all banks. We allow our banks to pile up enormous reserves for what purpose I do not know. They are piling up these enormous reserves and they are paying enormous dividends. The state regulates the dividends in these countries and out of the profits left the State insists upon taking its share for the franchise which it gives to the banks, There is, therefore, no inducement to banks to overcharge or to treat unfairly the outlying portions of the country. There is only one rate of discount in France and Germany to-day. In our West people are paying eight and ten per cent discount while six and seven may be the ruling amount here. That cannot be done under these modern systems of banking but here in Canada we have a system which is forty years old at least and has never been improved in one direction.

One of the most enlightened phases of political economy is the comparative study of the politics of one nation in the light of the political experience of another. They have made great advances in this respect in European countries and we should try to deal with our financial problems from their point of view. The people of the United States at some expense, have appointed a monetary commission which has recently reported, and to-day the uppermost question in that country is this creation of trusts and the concentration of the working capital of the country in the hands of a few men, which threatens almost the destruction of the American Republic, that great experiment in government. Read the revelations which are being made day after day in Washington; read the admissions of Morgan and the great big bankers that at last the danger point has been reached, and that if there be any more concentration of capital they cannot answer for what will happen.

That is a sad state of affairs, and we are rapidly reaching the same condition in Canada without our doing anything to prevent it. There will be more banking concentration in Canada, and almost immediately if we do not intervene. I fear for the future of this country, when all the banking resources are consolidated in two or three banks, without regulation, and under a charter which gives them a further franchise of ten years. It is a dangerous thing to allow our banks under the law to have ten more years to effect consolidation, and to allow them to do so without any regulation, or with only the insufficient regulation that is proposed in this Act. Not for one moment do I believe that the Canadian people will sit idly by and allow us to do such a thing, I can assure this House that the people of Canada expect some kind of substantial reforms in this Bank Act which we are now about to pass. I am not an enemy of our bank system; the banks have done a great deal for the country and they have done a great deal for themselves. I believe they would be quite willing to fit in with some kind of national banking system if we in this Parliament have the courage to put it up to them.

I believe the time has come when we will have to regulate the banks in the various ways I have suggested, and as they have regulated them in the more progressive countries of the world. I believe that the best way to reach that end is to appoint a monetary commission to study the subject for us. There are experts in Canada who understand the question pretty well, they can get first of all a good idea of our existing system; they can visit European countries; they can take advantage of what has been done in the United States by the Aldrich Commission, and in twelve or eighteen months they can present the result of their study to us, and in two years from now we can pass legislation which will immensely improve our Bank Act. Thus, without doing any injury to the banks, we can find a way to greatly enlarge the funds available for business in this country. It is more money we want. Our railways want money.

I believe Canada is becoming so large and expanding so fast that if we move on the right lines we can organize a Bank of

Canada with a capital of a quarter of a billion dollars, nay with a capital of half a billion dollars or a billion dollars, and we can associate with the great banking concerns of the Empire located in the Motherland. We are constantly talking of looking to the Motherland, and let us in some way link up the bank capital of the Motherland with our own capital, and let us have this great Bank of Canada that will be able to finance our great railways, to finance the Federal Government, and to finance our provincial and municipaal institutions and our commerce. Canada is rapidly growing in wealth; true, we borrow a lot of money from other countries, but let us try to attract the money of the Old Country to us in the shape of capital for our banking institutions. We have not been very successful in that direction. One of our banks did put out some of its stock in Europe, but eventually had to take it up in this country. We have not tried in the right way to get more European banking capital into this country, and I believe if we went the proper way about it we could get it. It is a fact that to-day the Canadian banks cannot increase their capital sufficiently for the needs of the country, and if to-day the Canadian shareholders do take up some of their own shares, it is only transferring the credit from one page of the ledger to the other, and there is no more banking capital in the country to-morrow.

Mr. DEVLIN: Can the hon. gentleman inform me how much British capital is at present invested in Canadian banks?

Mr. MACLEAN: I cannot answer that question in detail, but I know that capital of the Bank of British North America is largely British, although some time ago the largest shareholder of that bank was a Canadian. We also know by the bank returns that there are a considerable number of shares of Canadian banks held in the Old Country, but there is nothing like the number I would like to see. All banks are to-day trying to increase their capital; they have agents out and every time a shareholder comes into the head office he is importuned to take some shares in an authorized issue, and gradually the banks are thus getting a little more money. But the increase in banking capital in Canada is not at all commensurate with the business being done by the country and not at all commensurate with the requirements of the country. The whole question is therefore worthy of the fullest consideration of this Parliament. When I know how busy this House is and how much it has to do and how many questions we have to deal with, my contention is that the easiest solution—and it is the solution now adopted by all busy governments—is the appointment of a commission to get the facts and to make a report on the actual conditions.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Did not Mr. J. P. Morgan appear before a committee of Congress recently?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, Mr. Morgan was there.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was a committee of members of Congress?

Mr. MACLEAN: Yes, a committee of members of the Congress sitting in Washington now.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I thought you said the Monetary Commission was composed of experts.

Mr. MACLEAN: That is my suggestion. It would be of the greatest value to us to have the information taken by the Congressional Committee before us and I will try to get some of it before our committee, and when I do you will be surprised at the facts revealed as to the extent of the money trust that it being created in the United States. Any man in this country whose eyes are open can see the same kind of a money trust coming to Canada, to be concentrated in Montreal or Toronto. That money trust, in alliance with the railways and with other great industries and this system of interlocking directorates will be dangerous to our people and especially dangerous to the great West, if it is not regulated and regulated now, along the lines that they pursue in France, Germany, Japan and other progressive countries. Therefore, while we may send this Bill to the Committee and have it threshed out there, and while a lot of valuable information may be secured in that way, I appeal to this House that it is our duty not to extend this Bill for ten years longer. It is absolutely against the interest of the country; it is not in the interests of the banks themselves. I appeal for the appointment of a monetary commission; and I ask, whatever may come from this Committee back to the House, if we decide on a monetary commission, that the currency of this Act shall not exceed two years. If we do that, and if we give our people a chance to discuss the banking situation and to appear before the Monetary Commission, we will elicit facts that will be of great assistance, and we will develop a system which will be of advantage to the country. That is my contention here to-night.

I could go on for hours discussing the banking situation and the treatment the banks give the people. I do not agree with all the criticisms that have been made about the banks. The banks in Canada have at last come to see that they have

been given a great franchise in this country, but it took them years to realize that with that franchise there went a public duty. For a long time they refused even to extend their branches to various parts of the country. I remember very well hearing a general manager of a bank in Toronto not very many years ago, when a deputation came to him for a branch, saying, 'It is not the policy of my bank to extend our branches, and therefore I cannot do anything for you.' The banks are bound to deal with the financial interests of the people of this country; they have been rather high-handed up to the present; they have not felt it to be their duty to consult the people as to how long they should keep open, and if a man could actually see the manager of a bank to do business with the bank it was thought that a favour was conferred on him. As a matter of fact the banks are trying to do business with the public; they ought to take that attitude; they ought to thank the people for coming to do business with them. They have not quite got hold of the idea that a public franchise entailed on them the very greatest consideration towards the people; gradually they are coming to see it; but if we establish a great money trust, and there are other trusts in relation to it; and there happen to be men throughout the country who would dare to criticise these things and to object to them, what consideration would they get? That is what is feared in the United States to-day; hundreds and hundreds of people in the States fear that if the great money trust is created, the ordinary public will have a poor chance of getting consideration. The great temptation to our banks in this country to-day is not so much to accommodate the people as to make bigger profits by flotations; and some of our banks are more flotation banks than they are banks to serve the public in the ordinary banking ways; so while I do not criticise them harshly in that respect, and while I say that they are fairly trying to do a service to this country and are doing a great service to the country, they are not doing the service they could do, if we reorganized our finances on a different basis, and if we made the country a participator in our banking system. I heard the word 'fiat money' used this afternoon; I have heard that word used before and I take the definition of 'fiat money' to be what the Minister of Finance said here to-day; but I am not proposing, when I propose that the state shall share it in issuing notes, that I mean fiat money when I say money that has a substantial security behind it similar to what they have in Germany and other European countries. It may be true that the Bank of England really holds gold for each five-pound note that is out; but in other countries they issue national notes partly on a gold reserve and partly on the security of the other banks. I believe we can do the same thing in this country. All we want is to study the question to elicit the facts and see how we can graft a newer and better system on to the system we have, without doing any damage to the banks.

Mr. CARVELL: Will the hon. member tell us what exactly is the protection given to the note circulation in Germany?

Mr. MACLEAN: That is a mere detail; I will give that later. I want the Monetary Commission to elicit all these things for us. In this busy country we have not time to go into all these details. I want to state that I do not think I have spoken in vain in discussing this question as well as I could, if I can induce this House to take some kind of a progressive step, such as I have suggested, and to make a study of banking from an up-to-date point of view. We should not do a banking business in this country on a policy that was a haphazard policy selected forty years ago. Banking is progressive like everything else. The greatest force in business to-day is what is called business engineering or business organization; the Americans are coming to it rapidly; they will see that they have got a very inferior banking system over there; they know it caused panics, and they are now trying to better it. In the same way the people of Canada ought to be studying the banking institutions we have, and trying to improve them greatly, rather than simply attempting to perpetuate what we happen to have on the statute book to-day.

Sir EDMUND OSLER: I do not propose to follow the theory of the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in the discussion of the banking system. There are two or three statements made which I cannot allow to go unchallenged. Our banks are accused of making enormous sums of money by borrowing money. I think the hon. member said at one and a half per cent and lending it at six or seven per cent. No business is done in Canada or almost in the world on so little profit as banking is done. I will just give you one illustration. Take the free money that a bank has, that is to say its capital paid up, its reserves and surplus, its deposits on which it pays no interest and its circulation; that is a very considerable sum of money; but it is comparatively small in relation to the volume of business. No bank in Canada makes four per cent on that free money; the total profits are less than four per cent on the total free money the bank has, it takes the profit made on all exchange business and on all business of every other kind, to earn from

two and a half to three and a half per cent on the free money. You can easily see, such being the case, the absurdity of the statement that a bank makes five per cent. the difference between one and a half and six or seven per cent; therefore I do not think that statement should be allowed to pass unchallenged.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I beg to say to the hon. gentleman that I made no such remark. I said that the money that the banks had, including the note issue, the deposits and reserves, did not cost them on an average, more than one and one-half per cent.

Sir EDMUND OSLER: And that they let it out at six or seven per cent.

Mr. MACLEAN: I said that they let it out at six.

Sir EDMUND OSLER: If that were the case, banks would pay forty or fifty or perhaps sixty per cent on their capital. If you refer to the last bank statement and take out the four items that I have quoted —capital, reserve, circulation and free money—you can figure out the total profits made for the year. In the year just closed, I believe they have not made over four per cent on their money, and in most cases it is less than three per cent. The bank with which I have been connected for many years, I think, may be taken as a fair example. I give the figures from memory, but they are nearly correct. The paid-up capital is $5,000,000, and the surplus amounts to nearly $7,000,000; I think the bank's free money is $9,000,000 and its circulation $5,000,000. Although they have between $26,000,000 and $27,000,000 on which they pay nothing in the meantime except to the shareholders. And the total earnings last year—a profitable year—amounted to about three and a half per cent on this free money—between three and a half and three and five-eights. If they had loaned this free money at six per cent, it would have earned thirty-six per cent interest on the capital.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): What did the bank earn on its capital?

Sir EDMUND OSLER: On its capital and reserve——

Mr. MACLEAN: No, on its capital?

Sir EDMUND OSLER: It earned eighteen per cent. I may say that three-quarters of the reserve fund was paid up by the shareholders. The bank issued at a premium of two hundred and two hundred and twenty.

Mr. CARVELL: To what bank does the hon. gentleman refer?

Sir EDMUND OSLER: The Dominion Bank. I think you will find the figures in a general way apply to other banks. Now, the hon. gentleman seemed to be rather anxious about English capital. There is little English capital invested in our banks. One bank in Canada has a large English share list; but that is because it absorbed an English bank established by English shareholders in Canada. And there is one other bank with a large English share list. English investors do not tend to put money into Canadian bank shares. One reason is that they do not like the double liability combined with a management outside their own country. The second, and greater reason is that English, Scotch, German and French banks yield their shareholders very much larger returns than do ours. The English banks make from fifteen to twenty-five and twenty-seven per cent. Here, you get up to twelve and fourteen per cent. Our banks, therefore, have to look to Canada for the greater part of their capital, and their shareholders are limited. Canadians are from time to time increasing their holdings, and I think the banks are doing all they can to provide sufficient banking capital for the country. Another statement made by the hon. gentleman was that there is not enough money to go around. Of course there is not enough money to go around at any time. But I do not believe that in Canada, during the last five years, any man in legitimate business who ought to have money for his business has been refused. The banks have been anxious to increase their business and the rivalry between the banks for business is very keen. There has been no shortage of money for moving the enormous crops. I can say the same thing in connection with money for mortgages. There are millions and millions waiting in the banks and in Great Britain for loans on mortgages all over Canada. There is keen competition not only from Great Britain, but from France and Holland. Large sums are in all the trusts companies and loan companies anxious to loan on farms, on city property and on buildings. Not many years ago, on farm property in Ontario, the interest was eight and nine per cent. That is now the outside rate in far-distant parts of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and seven per cent is the rate for money on mortgage in Manitoba. Hardly a week passes but an organization is made in Great Britain or the continent to lend money in Canada. This is a favorite field of investment, because all the loan companies have been exceedingly successful. I believe that no money has been lost by British or other investors that has been secured by farm or city lands in Canada. Canada stands very high. I am not going to discuss the Bank

Act. I merely desired to refer to the two statements of which I have spoken.

Mr. DUNCAN C. ROSS (West Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, the object of the discussion, as I understand it, is for the House to devise means, or to perfect means already devised, to give to the people of Canada the best banking system that can be given, just as everything in Canada should be the best that can be given. It is because of my conviction that we are not giving the best that can be given, and that our banking system works out in a grievous wrong, that I make the few remarks that I shall make. I have listened with some pleasure to what the hon. member for West Toronto (Sir Edmund Osler) said. From what I could hear of his remarks, I judge he was trying to lead this House to believe —and I do not know that he found a very responsive audience—that the banks of Canada were not making sufficient money out of the people of this country. As I take it,—and I trust I have not misinterpreted the hon. gentleman's remarks—he was to use a common expression putting on a poor mouth in regard to the prosperity of the banks and the returns they were receiving on their investments.

Sir EDMUND OSLER: I think my hon. friend has misunderstood me.

Mr. ROSS: That was my interpretation of the effect of his speech; whether it is or is not correct I do not know. A few days ago I clipped from one of the Toronto papers—the Globe I think it was—a statement which shows just what the banks of this country have been making during the year 1912. I have for two or three weeks been watching the daily papers for the purpose of seeing the annual statements made by the various banks in Canada. I find they are making as high as 20 per cent, and none, as far as I could see, less than 16 per cent on their capital. From the return that appears in the paper I have referred to, we find that in 1912 the Bank of Commerce paid a dividend of 11 per cent, the Dominion Bank 14 per cent; Bank of Hamilton 11 per cent; Imperial Bank 12 per cent; Merchants' Bank 10 per cent; Molsons 11 per cent; Bank of Montreal 12 per cent; Bank of Nova Scotia 14 per cent, and four other banks, Ottawa, Royal, Standard, and Toronto, three of them 12 per cent and one 13 per cent. I think no one in this House can honestly contend that the banks of this country are not making good money out of the people of Canada. For my own part, I have no objection to the banks of Canada making good money as they render the country a great service, but I do not think we should get into our heads the idea that the banks of this country own Canada, and that they exist solely to supply dividends to their shareholders. They are given a charter by the Parliament of Canada to render a public service to the people. It is said by the admirers of the Canadian banks that we have the best banking system in the world. We hear it said quite frequently in this country, as well as by eminent financiers in the republic to the south of us. We hear it said by eminent financiers in England and on the continent, as the members of the Bankers Association themselves admit that we have the best banking system in the world. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in one respect their admission is correct; so far as the bankers are concerned, I think it is for them the best system in the world. In any case, I consider this a very important question and I consider that perfecting the Bank Act is more in the interest of the prosperity and greatness of Canada than some of the subjects we have been discussing in the House for the last week or two. I am constrained to believe as was stated by an old college friend of mine, Peter MacArthur, who writes occasional articles in the Globe, and is somewhat of a philosopher, that the Bank Act is receiving more attention from the masses of the people of Canada to-day than the lengthy discussion which has been going on in this House. I agree with what Mr. MacArthur says. I think that in this age of civilization, learning, culture and refinement, navies are somewhat of an anachronism. I hope I may live to see the day when they will become entirely such, but, in regard to banks, although sometimes they are a necessary evil when we have to borrow and pay back, they are sometimes a blessing when we have to borrow and can borrow, and at all times they are a necessity, and I propose discussing this measure on the basis of the assumption that the banks of Canada are an absolute necessity.

I do not dispute the fact that we have a good system. It is my sincere belief that the Canadian banking system is a thoroughly good one, but in which certain weaknesses are evident. It would be no credit—indeed, it would be a sorry reflection on the ability of Canadian financiers—if the banking system in this country was not as nearly perfect as human ingenuity can make it. Why should it be anything else? They have privileges in this country which the bankers of no other country enjoy. They pay no tribute to the Government; they have privileges in circulation which yield them a large profit, and—the greatest privilege of all—they enjoy a monopoly of the deposits of the people. It seems to me my hon. friend the Minister of Finance dealt in a cavalier fashion with the importance of that privilege. The Bank Act before us contains a clause that no individual, company, firm or corpora-

tion can use the word 'bank' in any manner, shape or form. The result is that when a charter is given to a bank in this country, it makes that bank the sole depository of the thrift, the wealth and the savings of the people. Such being the case, and the depositors being the foundation stone, as it were, of the success of the financial system in this country, it is my contention that the depositors of these banks should receive some consideration in the provisions of this Bill.

The banking systems of the various countries are quite different. That of Canada is not the same as that of the United States, England, Scotland or Germany. In all of these countries the banks have to pay to the government a certain amount of their profits, or give certain other advantages in the way of loans. In this country they have to do nothing, so far as I can see, except make profits for their shareholders, and secure their currency. We say our system is the only perfect one. We can hardly explain how it has arisen, but it has developed from a cycle of events in Canada until it has reached its present stage. Mr. Walker, an authority in whom my hon. friends would, I am sure, have confidence, made the following statement at the Bankers' Convention in 1893:

> In common with other social developments, modern banking is mainly the result of heredity and environment, and not of arbitrary legislation or the general admission in any wide degree of settled principles in the practice of banking.

I am quoting this to meet, to some extent, the argument made by my hon. friend this afternoon in regard to the system followed in connection with deposits in the State of Oklahoma. From what I can ascertain of the system followed in that state, it is evident that the state banks are required each year to place a certain percentage of their deposits in charge of a board consisting of the treasurer, and other officers of the government. This is done yearly until a certain maximum is reached, and all the banks are constantly responsible for the failure of any one bank. But the trouble is that the system is not compulsory. There are national banks as well as state banks, and as Sir Edmund Walker very wisely says, what may be a success in the banking of one country might not be a success in another country, and what might be a failure in one country might be a success in another. The argument of my hon. friend did not go to prove that that system had not been successful in Oklahoma. Even if it had been, my argument is, taking the judgment of Sir Edmund Walker, that that would be no evidence with regard to the success or failure of that system in another country where the Finance Department is so well managed as it is in Canada. Let me quote further what Sir Edmund Walker says:

> The student endeavouring to understand the science of banking, seeking to discover some body of principles underlying the practice of banking throughout the world is confused by the radical differences between the systems of the various nations and the complicated nature of the conditions surrounding each of these systems. The most cherished dogma of one country is rank heresy in another. The principles suitable to an old country, with a compact population, a highly developed railroad and telegraph organization for the distribution of commodities and information, and wealth enough to be lenders to other nations, are not applicable to a new country with a scattered population, imperfect means of distribution, and little wealth apart from fixed property—a country, indeed requiring to borrow largely from older and wealthier communities.

My argument is, and, the suggestion I have to make with regard to the amending of the Bank Act is that though a system may have been tried and may be proved a failure in any country—and he has not proved that it was so in the State of Oklahoma—it does not follow that if tried in this country it would be a failure.

Now, as far as I am concerned, this question is non-contentious. I am dealing with it simply in a business spirit and from the point of view of what I think is right for the people in the county of Middlesex who have suffered greviously during the last two years under the present system, and from the point of view of doing what is best in the interests of the whole of Canada. I think the banks in Canada should not be ungenerous but should have some regard for those who I say make their prosperity possible. In the statement issued by the Finance Department on November 30, 1912, we find that the paid-up capital of the banks of Canada amounts to $114,000,000 and that the reserve amounts to $106,000,000. That means, as I take it, that during the time those banks have been in existence they have made out of the people of Canada $106,000,000 in addition to the dividends paid to shareholders, or at any rate a large proportion of it. That shows that the people of Canada have not been ungenerous to the banks, and it is the duty of the banks at this time to do as they have done in times past, and concede some little protection to the depositors who make their institutions successful.

Let us go a little further and see what the relation is between the shareholders and the depositors, for these are the two classes of people who go to make the success of the banks possible. In the first place there is the shareholder who invests his money in the banks with the view of get-

ting a good profit, and he has got a good profit in Canada; and secondly there is the depositor who puts his money in the bank because it is an institution chartered by the people of Canada and he thinks it safe. He does so not for the interest he expects to get, but because he thinks that his money will be in safe keeping until he obtains a proper place in which to invest it. These are the two parties most interested in the banking system, and what are the relative positions? The paid-up capital of the banks is, I understand $114,000,000. The deposits of the people of Canada—I give the figures in the rough—amount to about $1,100,000,000. So here we have the shareholders putting into the common partnership $114,000,000, while the depositors put into it $1,100,000,000 and receive 2½ per cent in the aggregate for what they put in. I say 2½ per cent advisedly, for though the banks profess to give the depositors 3 per cent they do so on such a stingy basis that it really amounts to only 2½ per cent. They pay it out on a minimum monthly basis, and consequently it is not 3 per cent. But, on this $1,100,000,000 it is common knowledge that they pay on $360,000,000 no interest whatever.

Such being the case, what should be done to protect those people who have contributed not one-half but seven or eight times the amount of money that the shareholders contribute to the banks? Even if you take into consideration the double liability which applies to shareholders, the depositors have contributed to the funds of the banks four times the amount that the shareholders contribute. It is true that the shareholders are under the double liability, but it has not often been put into operation, and even if they are called upon to meet it, they know what is expected of them. Their money is placed in the banks purely as an investment and they have to take the fortunes of war and the chances that apply to investments. The depositor is only placing his money in a depository marked by the Parliament of Canada as a safe depository.

Let us consider what the banks have done in the way of developing the banking system of Canada. In this respect I cannot agree with the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). I believe that the banks have tried to do something to perfect the banking system in this country, and that they have been to some extent successful in that direction. I have some sympathy with the substantive part of the address of the hon. member for South York because I believe it would be a healthy thing for the banks of this country, and a proper thing for this Parliament, to have a thorough investigation of the banking system before the charters are renewed at the end of each decade. We know from experience in other lines of life that investigations have proved very useful. A short time ago there were some doubts as to the business methods of the insurance companies in Canada. The charges made were rather serious, and they were buttressed by rather strong evidence; and in the opinion of Parliament it was advisable to have an investigation into their methods. We know what the result of that investigation was. We know that it was to the advantage of the people of Canada, and that they have profited considerably from it. There have been rumours and more than rumours circulated throughout this country in recent years that one of the strongest banks in Canada had lost in a Mexican venture $7,000,000. I do not know whether it is true or not. In the Alberta Legislature it was stated that the manager of a bank in the West had secured to himself a large amount of money on account of certain loans which he had made to certain companies. These are grave charges, and if such transactions have taken place, or if there is any suspicion that they have taken place, the suggestion made by the hon. member for South York is a very good one, and a commission appointed by this Parliament to investigate the banking system in this country should go into them most minutely. Such an investigation would be very much in the interests of the people of this country. However, I do not agree with him when he says that the banks of Canada have not tried to perfect their system. Now, I will refer again to the book from which I have quoted already in regard to the currency question. A passage has just caught my eye which I shall quote in passing and with which I do not agree. The gentleman to whom I refer is Sir Edmund Walker. He is speaking of the issue of bank charters, and he thinks that charters should be granted for a longer period than ten years. He thinks that banks have too short a lease of life under their charters and he goes on to say that these charters have to be renewed every ten years, and continues:

> This insures a complete discussion of the principles underlying the Act, and of the details connected with the working of it, once in ten years. In the interval we are almost free from attempts by demagogues or ambitious but ill-informed legislators to interfere with the details of our system, but during the session of Parliament preceding the date of the expiry of the charters we have to defend our system from the demagogue, the bank-hater, the honest but inexperienced citizen who writes letters to the press, sometimes the press itself—indeed from all the sources of attack which institutions possessing a franchise granted by the people ex-

perience when they come before the public to answer for their stewardship.

I feel very sorry for the bankers. I do not intend to place myself in any of these classes; I am far from being a bank-hater, although I may be an honest, inexperienced citizen. I would rather be a bank-lover than a bank-hater. I think it would be a nice thing to have a bank such as Sir Edmund Walker has in his case. Sir Edmund Walker lays down four prerequisites of a successful banking system and I am going to quote a little further from this book:

It should create a currency free from doubt as to value, readily convertible into specie, and answering in volume to the requirements of trade. In saying this I do not wish to be understood as asserting that banks should necessarily enjoy the right to issue notes. Whether they should or should not issue notes must always, I presume, end in a discussion as to expediency in the particular country or banking system.

I think I should say frankly to the Minister of Finance that he has taken a right step in advance, although my hon. friend from York does not agree with me, in regard to giving increased elasticity to the banking system in connection with currency. I approve of that entirely as far as I can see it. Anything he can do to increase the currency of the country in an effective and safe way will meet with my hearty approval. The second prerequisite is this:

It should possess the machinery necessary to distribute money over the whole area of the country, so that the smallest possible inequalities in the rate of interest will result.

With respect to this prerequisite of an improved banking system, I am not going to speak of my own knowledge; but I do hear from members of this House, from the East and from the West, that there is a great inequality in the rate of interest that is charged between the East and the West and the province of Ontario. I am told by members of this House that a short time ago they could borrow money for five per cent and that now they have to pay six. I am told by members from New Brunswick that they have to pay six and seven per cent, whereas in Ontario we pay six per cent, and I am told that in the West there is no regard for that provision of the Bank Act which says that the banks shall only charge seven per cent interest. If that is so the investigation which my hon. friend asks for would bring the matter out and it should be attended to in some proper way. The third prerequisite is this:

It should supply the legitimate wants of the borrower, not merely under ordinary circumstances, but in times of financial stress, at least without that curtailment which leads to abnormal rates of interest and to failures.

I am afraid that in this respect our banking system can be improved. But, I am not going to deal with that, I am going to skip that and I am going on to what Sir Edmund Walker states as the fourth and last prerequisite of a properly constituted banking system:

It should afford the greatest possible measure of safety to the depositor.

That is a point I want to make. My contention is that under our present banking system there is absolutely no security to the depositors. The bankers have been wise with regard to the currency and I can explain to the House, if it does not already know, as I think it does, how it happened that the change was made with regard to the note circulation problem. Up to 1880 there was no note circulation fund whatever and even later than that there was no note circulation fund. But up to 1890 there was even no priority given in so far as note circulation was concerned and Sir Edmund Walker says in regard to that:

The change in 1880 was caused by the failure of a small bank with a circulation of about one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars, paying all creditors, note holders included, only fifty-seven and one-half per cent. The change in the Act now in force was due to the demand for a currency which would pass over the entire Dominion without discount, under any circumstances.

He also says that

At the renewal of charters in 1880 the circulating note was made a prior lien upon all assets; and at the last renewal in 1890 the banks, at their own suggestion, were in addition required to create in two years a guarantee fund of five per cent upon their circulation, to be kept unimpaired, the annual contribution, however, if the fund is depleted, to be limited to one per cent.

The action of the banks in this respect was most commendable, but if their action in that respect was commendable and if they changed their system because a small chartered bank with a capital of $120,000 failed, they should look to it and consider how many banks have failed, how much money depositors have lost and how many have failed since the last renewal of the charter. Since 1891, if I read the record right, nine banks have failed in Canada. Since the last renewal five banks have failed. Let us take the whole country since Confederation, 1867, in regard to the failures of banks and see how the depositors have been treated as a result of those failures. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance made a point this afternoon that only one-half of one per cent had been lost by depositors. That seems very small but just let us see the record. Since 1867, twenty-three chartered banks have failed. In all cases but two the noteholders were paid in full. In the case of the Mechanics'

Bank of Montreal, the noteholders were only paid 57½ per cent and in that of the Prince Edward Island bank, 59½ per cent. Let us see how the depositors have got along. In eleven cases out of the twenty-three they did not get paid in full, but they got the following amounts: 50 per cent, 57½ per cent, 96 per cent, 66⅔ per cent, 10 6-10 per cent, 99⅔ per cent, 59 per cent, 75½ per cent, 17½ per cent. From the time of Confederation down, twenty-three banks have failed and depositors in about twelve or thirteen of them have received less than the full amount of their deposits. The Minister of Finance states that the suggestion which I have made to him is not a feasible one. I cannot understand what the Minister of Finance means when he says it is not feasible, because the suggestion is simply this: There are $650,000,000 of deposits in the savings branches of our banks. This amount should be protected. The banks could not last for one year unless these deposits were there. These depositors should get something for their money. The banks are making an enormous amount out of these deposits and it only fair that you should do in connection with the depositors what you have already done in connection with the note redemption fund. I do not say that you should do it all in one year, but you should do it as you did it in the case of the note redemption fund. You should lay aside one per cent this year, one per cent next year and so on until you get five per cent, or three per cent, or whatever you think is necessary, to protect the depositors who have money in our banks. That would work no hardship whatever. I would even go so far, as to say that when this money is paid into the Exchequer, the bank should receive from the Consolidated Revenue Fund an amount equal to the interest which they would pay to depositors had it remained in the banks. If this money is put into the Exchequer, the banks should receive from the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada an amount equal to the interest they would pay if the deposits had remain in the banks. In that case, the bank would suffer no hardship, at most the only hardship suffered by the bank would be the loss they would incur by not handling the money themselves. The banks have given to them absolutely free the use of $116,000,000 of currency, for which they do not pay one cent unless it be two and one-eighth cents per bill which I am informed is the cost of engraving. If the Government of Canada would take from the banks an amount equal to say three per cent of their deposits, or, as I would submit, five per cent—three per cent would amount to about twenty million dollars and five per cent would amount to thirty million dollars—you would have ample protection for the depositors, and the country could use that money, which would be in the way of a forced loan from the banks at three per cent, while to-day the country is paying more than that for foreign loans. If that were done, then in regard to every bank that exists in Canada, there would be afforded absolute protection to the depositors, who after all, are those who make banking in this country a possibility. Let us see if that is not so. There are three banks in Canada all the depositors in which might not be protected under this system, but I am glad to say that the depositors in these three banks do not need protection. The deposits in the savings department of the Bank of Montreal are $97,000,000; Bank of Commerce $88,000,000; Royal Bank, $73,000,000. A fund of thirty million dollars would not protect the depositors in these banks if they were to utterly and absolutely fail, but such a thing is beyond the range of the most vivid imagination. The next largest bank has a deposit of $39,000,000, the next $34,000,000; a great many of them have under $10,000,000, and nearly all under $30,000,000 in deposits. My contention is that without injuring the elasticity of the currency and without depleting the country of its money, you would have secured the depositors in every bank in Canada, except as to the three banks I have mentioned, and I think every hon. member will agree with me that the depositors in these three do not need protection.

Now, what are the arguments in favour of this scheme? The first argument is that it is a fair thing to do because the depositors are the most important class which go to make our banking system a success, and they get the least out of it. The depositors have four times at stake what the shareholders have, even reckoning on the double liability; the interest paid them is small, and on that account they should be given protection. The second argument in favour of this scheme is, that it would do away to some extent with the necessity for a very close inspection of the banks. In connection with the note redemption fund, you have provision that the Bankers' Association can pass rules and by-laws in regard to the issue of notes that are put in circulation by all the banks, and, in a certain way they have supervision over all the banks to see that they are living up to the law. I do not see why a similar provision should not be put in this Act, giving the Bankers' Association further supervision over the banking system and the various banks, so that they could discover just what each bank is doing. If each bank, the big bank and the little bank, were responsible for the deposits in all the banks, I will guarantee

that the Bankers' Association will see—the Bank of Montreal will see, the Bank of Commerce will see, the Royal Bank will see—all the various banks that form that association will take good heed that the small banks do not encourage what the Minister of Finance spoke of as wild finance, or improper banking, or improper practices. It will be in the interests of these larger banks to inform the minister of any such thing occurring, and if his system of audit goes through, although I do not approve of it, he could immediately send an officer to look after that smaller bank, take it in charge, and put it again on the straight and narrow path. This scheme would certainly make the Bankers' Association interested in seeing that the banks do not do improper banking. The third reason in favour of the proposal is, that if, by such a system of protection, you make depositors feel absolutely safe, you will find, I believe, that the deposits in our savings banks will increase by leaps and bounds. I know from my own experience that the failure of the Farmers' Bank had a wonderful effect on the banks in our part of the country and that effect remains to this day. I know that after the Farmers' Bank failed, men who would not lend their money on mortgage up to that time were anxious to take it out of the bank and invest it in other channels. The banks themselves will profit, because if absolute confidence is inspired in the people, they will place their money in care of the banks, and the banks will be able to do a larger business. The Minister of Finance will agree with me that anything that tends to encourage thrift and saving on the part of the people and to cause them to put their money on deposit in the banks, will add to the prosperity of the country.

What are the arguments advanced against this proposition? One argument is, that the big banks would be compelled to do something for the little banks which would be unfair to them, because we are compelling them to help to build up their competitors. My reply to that is, that if it is in the interest of the people of Canada that the big banks should do this, it is their duty to do it and it is our duty to compel them to do it. The big banks of this country, and particularly the largest bank, has received enough care and protection and stimulus from the Government and the people of Canada to entitle us to demand from it any action that is in the interest of the general banking system of this country. As a matter of public spirit, as a small return for the advantages they have received in times past and are still receiving from the people of Canada, they should be willing to make some sacrifice to

place the banking system of this country on a stronger and firmer ground. The next argument against it is, that by its adoption you are creating a false security; but I cannot for the life of me see how that can be possible. The Government is in no way guaranteeing depositors; it is the banks themselves who are guaranteeing depositors. There can be no impression more deeply rooted in the public mind than that which at present exists and which was to some extent dispelled by the failure of the Farmers' Bank, that the Government of Canada, at the present time, does absolutely guarantee depositors. What are the facts about the Farmers' Bank? Hon. members know well the deplorable and lamentable results which followed from the failure of that bank.

The people of my district suffered by hundreds. I have a statement from the liquidator in which he says that there are $1,100,000 of deposits and that he has only got in some $20,000 of double liability. In my opinion, from the figures he has given, not one depositor in that bank will receive one cent. One of the members of the relief committee of the Farmers' Bank told me that the loss to the Farmers' Bank shareholders or depositors,—I think it was depositors—meant in the Province of Ontario the absolute distress of six hundred families—not six hundred men, but six hundred families. Men who had left the farm, or whatever was their calling, men in the middle walks of life, who were dependent on the little that they had put into the bank for their livelihood, were absolutely deprived of their means of livelihood. I know some in my own part of the country who had to go west and take up homesteads which the hospitality of the country gives free. While I am on the Farmers' Bank question, there is another point I should like to refer to. All through my part of the country quite a lot of pressure was put upon the candidates to promise that when they got back here, they would see that the depositors and shareholders of the Farmers' Bank would be absolutely reimbursed for their losses.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who said that?

Mr. ROSS: The depositors and their committees urged on the different candidates all through Ontario the making of that promise. For my own part, I thought it was an unfair advantage to take of any man, and I refused to make that promise. I told my people I would come back to this House, and if a Bill was introduced that I thought was fair I would support it; if it was not fair in my opinion I would oppose it, and that I would do the best I honestly could for them. I am depending a great deal on what I am told for the support of the amendment which I intend introducing in

the committee. I am told that on the other side there were twenty-eight candidates who had pledged themselves, as seriously as men could pledge themselves, that if the Liberal Government were defeated and the Conservative Government came into power, they would advocate in this House the reimbursement of depositors as well as shareholders, some of them went so far as to say: It is such a terrible calamity; we will not only do that; if Mr. Borden is returned to power, you will get interest on your deposits from the date of his election. I can produce a cloud of witnesses to prove that such pledges were made. I think that every one of those men who made such promises, or at least as many of them as got into this House, will be absolutely bound by their assertions to back me up in this resolution which goes for the protection of the depositors by the bank.

If it was right for the country to reimburse the depositors and shareholders, surely it cannot be wrong for the Government of this country to provide a fund out of the Bank's own Funds to see that what they thought was right in the case of the Farmers' Bank should be done in all cases. That is as far as I will go to-night in regard to this matter. I will take up some questions relating to it later on.

I am going to deal for a moment with the question of inspection; but before doing so, I hope that the hon. Minister in this respect will not be content to say in Committee that such a thing is not feasible, and state as a reason that the deposits are so enormous. I think that reason works the other way; it seems to me the larger the treasury you have, the more you should try to protect it. If the note issue is $116,000,000 and the deposits are $100,000,000, I say that the deposits should be protected in that proportion; and I hope that the hon. Minister will take the matter into serious consideration, and not brush it aside with the argument that it is not sound banking. Sound banking seems to be a matter that does not relate to any time; it is defined differently in different countries. From what the Minister says, this has never been tried in any country; and I do not think he should brush it aside with such an argument, because there has been no experiment here.

In regard to the audit which the hon. Minister has suggested in his Bill, I cannot see how it is going to produce the results he expects. We all know how the meetings of bank shareholders occur; we all know what takes place in them; we all know who attend and who hold the proxies; and it seems to me the only thing that can possibly happen would be that the auditor the general manager wants will be the auditor who will be appointed. In other words, the auditor will be the creature of the general manager; he will be paid by the bank; he will depend for his position on the favour and esteem of the general manager; he will depend for his position upon his obeying the behests of the general manager almost to the smallest item. I do not think in all sincerity that it is going to bring about the result that the hon. Minister said; and I think that a system of Government inspection could be easily organized with trained officers, competent men, well up in the banking practices of this country, at good salaries. We do not need to be mean in regard to this, because we have made lots of money, due to the prosperity of the country in the last fifteen years. I think the suggestion made by my friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean) is a splendid suggestion, that there should be a sub-committee or sub-department of the Finance Department which should have complete charge of the inspection of the banks of this country. The argument against it raised by the hon. minister is that it will raise a false security; that if you have a Government inspection of banks the Government will be responsible for the banks. There is a Government inspection in the United States; I am informed that they have a Government inspection in Germany, and I do not think the people of those countries hold their governments responsible for the failures of those banks at all. Let us see if in other things that impression has been created in the public mind. Let us go into the field of Ontario politics. Take insurance companies. My hon. friend knows that the Superintendent of Insurance under the Ontario Act has power to go into any insurance company, go through their books, examine witnesses under oath, ask for special statements and make a most thorough inspection of everything that is done by the insurance company, either at their head office or their branches; yet no person will contend that the people of Ontario think that the Government of Canada or the Government of Ontario is responsible for the insurance companies of this country. There is no false security in that respect. The same thing occurs in regard to loan companies and insurance companies under the Dominion Act. I think therefore the hon. minister's contention in that respect falls to the ground, and for my own part I will support very strongly a system of Government inspection as a sub-department of the Finance Department.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE (North Ontario): I do not think that the House can be better engaged than in the discussion of the Bill now before us. The legislation that we are considering affects every business and every community throughout the country. I think the time is past when we

in Canada should fall down and worship the banks and banking institutions of this country. I do not think that the record of failures of banks in Canada will justify the favourable comments and encomiums placed upon the banking system by the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Halifax. I have in my hand a pamphlet which was issued by Mr. H. C. McLeod, ex-manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia. Commenting upon the percentage of bank failures in Canada, he speaks as follows, at page 10 of this volume:

> From 1893 to 1909, with general prosperity, rapidly increasing bank deposits and advancing values, Canada shows failures of nearly one in five.

Further on he says:

> We would seem to require to ask the records of some of the notes of American Union, during the wildcat banking period of about sixty years ago, to find statistics with which our system can make favourable comparison. Whoever seeks the reason for this unfavourable result must reach the conclusion that the chief cause is want of supervision of the direction and the general management of Canadian banks.

Since Confederation there have been twenty-four bank failures. Since the last revision, in 1900, there have been six or seven failures. I submit that this displays a lamentable weakness in our banking system; there is something radically wrong, and that wrong should be remedied by this House. And for my part, I shall be glad to join with other hon. members and to lend such assistance as I can to this end. There was a recent disastrous failure in this country, namely that of the Farmers' Bank. This concern, unfortunately, had a branch in my constituency. This experience has made the revision of the Bank Act the livest issue in my constituency that is now under discussion. Hundreds of people lost a good deal of money, including township officials and municipalities, and, as I say, the people are roused to the necessity of a careful study and revision of the provisions of this Act. I believe the members of this House will be held responsible throughout this country for the form which this Act shall assume. The Minister of Finance, I think has displayed conspicious ability in the discharge of his duties heretofore; but no one, I believe, will envy him the task before him of evolving a Bill satisfactory to the people of Canada, and satisfactory at the same time to the Bankers' Association. I believe the predecessor of the present Minister of Finance was more timid in bringing down a Bill than is the present minister. I think the changes sugggested in this Bill go in the direction of rectifying the evils which have existed further than did the Bill presented by the former Minister of Finance; yet, in my humble opinion, the present Bill falls far short of what was expected by the people. When the former Minister of Finance was moving the third reading of the Bill to extend the bank charters for a year, on the 17th of May, 1911, I took occasion to make certain brief observations in connection with the matter. I refer to page 9335 of 'Hansard' from which I quote what I then said:

> I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the desirability of appointing a Royal Commission to enquire thoroughly into the conditions of banks in this country and other countries with a view of improving our present Banking Act. Recent events have disclosed many serious defects in it. The provisions regarding government inspection do not meet with the approval of many people. The provision in the Bill brought down would not meet the approval of many people outside the bank authorities.

I went on to discuss the advisability of appointing such a Royal Commission as has been proposed to-night by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) and approved by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). I am still of opinion that that is the most satisfactory way to deal with this question. The Banking and Commerce Committee is not an ideal body for the discussion of such questions and the investigation of the problems involved. We are told that banking operations are intricate and complicated; and I agree with that view. The members of this House are not expected to be familiar with the various conditions and complexities of banking or the amendments that should be made in the law. I believe a commission of experts should thoroughly investigate this question, and their report to this House would be the best available means to bring before us the information we need. The United States, a short time ago, spent something like $270,000 investigating the banking conditions with a view to improving their system. They have passed a resolution, by a majority of 237 to 8, instructing the Banking and Commerce Committee to investigate the banking conditions of the United States and report. Other countries also are spending large sums of money to investigate, with a view of putting this business on a proper footing. We, apparently, are satisfied with the old conditions and are making no effort, except by such as discussions here bring out, to improve our banking system. I say it does not require further argument to show that, if we have had twenty-four bank failures since Confederation, and one out of five from 1893 to 1909 and seven failures since the last revision, there is something radically wrong with our banking laws. Recent figures have disclosed the fact beyond question that

there is something radically wrong, and the people will insist upon this House providing additional safeguards that will prevent a repetition of such frauds and failures as have occurred recently in connection with banking affairs. If our banking institutions are doing a legitimate business, they have nothing to fear from an honest inquiry into their operations. Of course, we may expect the banking interests and the large money interests to oppose this investigation. They have always opposed such investigations. They will say that it will produce unfavourable conditions and possibly panic. That is always the cry of those who are fortified in their rights and privileges. That is the cry they raise—that conditions will be unsettled and business will be endangered. I think the proper way to approach this question is not through the Banking and Commerce Committee, but by a Royal Commission that will investigate the banking conditions not only of this country but of the United States and other countries, and will suggest for incorporation in our Bank Act such wise provisions of foreign legislation as can be adapted to our system. If, however, there is not to be a Royal Commission appointed to investigate our system and improve our banking laws, then the Banking and Commerce Committee must go thoroughly into this discussion, so far as time will permit. And I submit—and I trust it is the idea of the powers that be in this House—that the Banking and Commerce Committee should have every opportunity to call the witnesses who desire to give testimony as to the operations of the banking law. Everyone knows what will happen. The Bankers' Association will have its representatives; it will be represented by paid counsel by the presidents, managers and directors of banks; and those of us who are not familiar with the intricacies of banking will be handicapped. We should have counsel there, employed by the people. And men should be summoned from any provinces that desire to assist the committee in their deliberation. I think representative farmers should be summoned who desire to testify—the President of the Grain Growers Association of the West, the President of the Dominion Grange; also the editors of the Grain Growers' Guide and the editor of the Weekly Sun. Also, I think the committee should endeavour to get some inspectors of the United States system to give us their experience in regard to inspection in the United States.

Then we have to note that nobody closely indentified with the banks has raised any objection to the provisions of this bank Bill. I have heard no adverse criticism by anybody of authority in the Bankers' Association. The Saturday Night, in discussing the Bill, stated that it was customary for the previous Finance Minister to submit any proposed Bank Bill to the Bankers' Association for their approval before it was brought down to the House. I do not know whether or not that has been done in the present case——

Mr. WHITE: The Bill was presented to the House in the first instance, without previous submission to the Bankers' Association.

Mr. SHARPE: I am glad to receive the assurance of the minister that the Bankers' Association has not had an opportunity of perusing the Bill before it was submitted to the House, for I think it is due to the members of this House to have an opportunity of discussing the Bill before any interests affected by it should pass upon the Bill. However, I am giving as my authority Saturday Night, a very reputable paper.

Mr. GRAHAM: I think Saturday Night is wrong in that respect. All these gentlemen who are so vitally interested send in all the opinions they have when a matter of this kind is coming up for discussion, but in every case I think it is presented to the House first.

Mr. SHARPE: At any rate, any Bill presented to this House by previous Finance Ministers, as well as the present Bill, has never met with any adverse criticism from the Bankers' Association or anybody identified with banking interests. I assume, since the Bill has not been adversely criticised, that it is in a condition acceptable to them, and I assume that they expect that certain concessions will be made, and that we may expect those interested, even in the Banking and Commerce Committee of this House, will try to retain all the privileges they possess without having the door opened to the public for the improvement of present conditions.

As hon. gentlemen are aware, this Bill is not a political measure, and I was glad the Finance Minister invited suggestions from members of the House. I think it is the duty of hon. gentlemen to give their opinion freely, and I do not think the people of the country would object if the discussion on the second reading of this Bill occupied a period of a week or ten days. I agree with the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross), in his statement that there is not a more important measure before this House than the present Bank Bill, and it should not be railroaded through as quickly as possible, as hon. gentlemen should have every opportunity of discussing it and expressing their opinions in regard thereto.

Representing a rural constituency, I have conferred with a good many people

in the rural districts, and, in offering my first suggestion, I say that the Finance Minister, in not making provision for a system of government inspection, has not caught the spirit of the people. To use a colloquial expression, he has not had his ear to the ground, or, if he has, it has been the wrong one, because I believe in view of the disastrous failures which have occurred during the past few years in connection with our banks, and the serious losses suffered by the people of this country—admittedly through defects in the Bank Act, which required drastic treatment—that the overwhelming sentiment of this country is in favour of some system of government inspection in connection with these institutions. I think the hon. Minister of Finance instead of diagnosing the case as one requiring a surgical operation, prefers the milder treatment of administering homeopathic doses to the patient. The provisions for inspection are entirely absent, and there is merely a provision for a shareholders' audit, which is entirely inadequate to meet the public demand. The only redeeming feature I can see—if there is a redeeming feature, and I doubt it—in connection with the unfortunate failure of the Farmers' Bank is the fact that it has been the means of concentrating the attention of the House upon the defects in the Act. I have suspicions that the ex-Finance Minister did not go on with his revision at the time when the failure occurred because that was at the time when public indignation had reached the crest of the wave and public opinion would have forced this House to have made some changes more radical than have been made in the Bill proposed to this House by the ex-Minister of Finance. Now that the tide has ebbed somewhat, and public feeling has subsided, we are going to allow the Bill to go through with very slight changes, with the result that the same old conditions will exist; we will have a few more failures, and when we are considering the next Bill ten years hence we will be lamenting the fact that we never had government inspection.

Mr. PARDEE: And this Bill is no better that the last one in that respect.

Mr. SHARPE. The essential omission in this Bill is the lack of some kind of external inspection. Some arguments against government inspection are advanced by those interested in not having any such a system. They say the people would rely upon government inspection as a guarantee. But they already look to the Government that grants the charter and certificates and receive annual returns, and that can demand special returns to protect them from fraud. If the people are now relying upon these things, they will not rely any more on the government if we have a system of external government inspection. The government inspection supervises insurance companies, foodstuffs, and weigh scales; why do they not inspect these banks, holding a thousand millions of dollars as deposits? Other countries, such as the United States, have a complete system of government inspection which works satisfactorily, and there is no objection to that system on account of the people relying on that inspection and holding the Government responsible for failure. They also say it is impossible to inspect thoroughly owing to the great number of branches as a great staff of inspectors would be required. It is a fact that the branches require no other inspection than the inspection of the head office. The great frauds—the Ontario Bank, Sovereign and Farmers' Bank—occurred at the head office.

Mr. EDWARDS: The head office believes in the inspection of the branches.

Mr. SHARPE: Yes, and not of the head office. If the rule is applicable to the branches, and they should be inspected, then surely they cannot object if the Government institutes a system of inspection with regard to head offices. At page 6 Mr. McLeod, in his pamphlet, says:

> If there be any Canadian bank of which a fairly clear insight cannot be obtained by intelligent auditors within a week, by examination at the head office alone, that bank's system is out of date, and a chartered accountant's assistance might not be amiss for the purpose of improving it.

Mr. PARDEE: What is the hon. member reading from?

Mr. SHARPE: A pamphlet written by Mr. McLeod, ex-manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, an experienced and successful banker of many years' standing. This statement is endorsed by the Minister of Finance, and I think he thus gave us the best argument that could possibly be made for a system of government inspection of head offices. Mr. McLeod further says:

> In our investigation of the causes of failure of banks operating branches, we have not found one instance in which failure was due to bad management at the branches.

This is because they are checked up at the head office. What we want is somebody to look after the head office. Mr. McLeod says:

> The general management is always at fault, and the directors are frequently involved.

That is the expressed opinion, not of a member of this House, but of a banker, the manager of a bank for many years.

The general management is always at fault, and the directors are frequently involved. There is almost no other history of the cause of bank disasters in Canada.

Think of that.

There is almost no other history of the cause of bank disasters in Canada, and the same appears to be true fo other countries having similar systems of banking. We have no record of fraudulent failure in which the vicious conditions existing could not have been readily detected by an expert at the head office of the bank.

Could any argument be stronger than that for a checking up at the head office by a Government inspector. It is said that it is impossible to thoroughly inspect banks on account of the number of branches, but as Mr. McLeod points out in his pamphlet, and as we know from the history of the failures and frauds and losses occasioned by mismanagement and maladministration, it is at the head office that the trouble occurs. What was the experience of the Ontario bank when Mr. McGill speculated in New York? Would his speculations have been possible under a system of Government inspection. The branches were not blamed in that case; it was McGill's speculations and maladministration that resulted in the failure of the Ontario Bank. What is the history of the suspension of the Sovereign Bank but the lending of money by Mr. Stewart to his relatives on foreign securities such as the Alaska Railway and the Milwaukee and Chicago Railway? That would have been detected at once by a Government inspector at the head office. In the case of the unfortunate Farmers' Bank we had Mr. Travers speculating with hundreds of thousands of dollars in a hole in the ground, the Keeley mine. Would not that have been detected at once by a Government inspector at the head office? I venture to express the opinion that those loans and speculations would never have been made in any of those cases, and the defalcations which resulted would never have occurred if there had been a consciousness in the minds of the managers that they might be called upon at any time by a Government inspector. The very consciousness of the possibility of a Government inspector walking into the head office would have prevented those loans, and an inspection would have disclosed at once the frauds that were being perpetrated. What are the arguments in favour of government inspection? Government inspection may do some good, and it cannot possibly do wrong. If an institution is doing legitimate business there is no reason why its operations should not be open to inspection by a government official. If government inspection increases the public confidence in banks so much the better for the banks, for people would utilize more than they do, and the banks would thereby benefit. A system of government inspection would disclose any frauds at the head office, and I repeat that the mere knowledge that a government inspector would appear at the head office would be the very strongest factor in keeping that office in perfect order.

If time permitted I could read extracts from newspapers and from the speeches of representative men from the Atlantic to the Pacific, favouring government inspection. I am going to read some to the House. If this Bill had been submitted at the time originally proposed, the sentiment of the country would have forced the members of this House to compel the Government to adopt some system of government inspection. Unfortunately however, public interest seems to have subsidied and consequently there is no provision in the Bill for government inspection. Instead, there is simply one for a system of audit which I do not think is at all adequate to the necessities of the case. I read the following extracts because I am impressed with a sense of my duty to the constituency that I represent, a constituency that has suffered severely through recent bank losses. I believe that a five cent piece would not have been lost if the warnings given and the arguments advanced years ago had been acted upon. The Toronto Saturday Night, a very representative paper, dealing with this question on January 7, 1910, had the following:

Under proficient and proper government supervision practically every bank failure that Canada has experienced in twenty years could have been avoided, for in no instance in that period would the head office of the bank in difficulties have failed to indicate to an expert the breakers ahead.

Here is what the Toronto World of January, 1911, said:

Enough has come out of the bank failures of recent years and especially out of the Farmers' to justify the demand for a governments inspection of banks . A public book inspector would have discovered irregularities in the Farmers' Bank at the end of the first three months.

The Toronto News in its issue of January 9, 1911, said:

The News believes, and the ordinary layman believes that the time has come for the inclusion in the Bank Act of a clause providing for the regular overhauling of every chartered bank in the country by highly paid government experts. Such outside supervision would be no terror to well-conducted institutions and it would prevent at least some from being run into the gutter.

Hon. members will have noticed in reading the press to-day, when the Bank Act is being considered, that there is not very much urging in favour of bank inspection.

For some unaccountable reason the newspapers are quiet on the subject when they should be speaking out in the loudest tones. I leave hon. members to draw their own conclusions as to the reason, but it is curious that at the time of the Farmers' Bank failure the newspapers urged with irresistible force this subject of inspection upon the attention of hon. members of this House, and were wild in their demands for government inspection. To-day they are as silent as the tomb; not a voice is raised that I have heard in favour of government inspection. I have here extracts from the Evening Journal of Ottawa and the Toronto Telegram, but I shall not take up the time of the House in reading them. They are along the same lines. Here is what the Toronto Star said, however:

The lesson of the Farmers' Bank failure, as of other recent bank failures, is the necessity for government inspection.

The Montreal Witness said:

The Witness was the pioneer in demanding either government inspection or independent audit of banks.

Now I want to read Col. Denison's opinion on the subject. He is not a bank expert like many members of this House; he is a businessman of the world, and he has good judgment. I rely on Col. Denison's judgment because he investigated a great many bank failures and tried a number of the parties charged with defalcations and maladministration. On January 17, 1911, Mr. Travers was brought before Col. Denison to be sentenced for his criminal conduct in connection with the Farmers' Bank failure, and he said:

One thing that can be said for you is that you were severely tempted to do wrong in attempting to retrieve the fortunes of your bank, and that the system of bank inspection that is in effect in Canada would seem to make it easier for you. If there had been a proper system of government inspection of banks I don't think things would have gone so far as they did.

The fact that there is no government inspection makes the temptation to do as you have done greater and since this is so, the only way to stop it is to impose a severe penalty. This is the third bank case of a similar nature that has come before me.

I specially invite the attention of the House to this observation:

And I have no doubt that a system of outside inspection in each of them would have made almost impossible the things that were done.

That is Col. Denison's opinion after having tried at least three cases of defalcations in connection with banks. The Toronto News of January 14, 1911, had the following:

In any event, Parliament should not rise until it has armed the Administration with full authority to inspect all chartered banks annually, and prevent their systematic looting over long periods.

I have a stronger authority for government inspection than I have yet read. Some of the banks, when the storm was brewing, hastened to get, so to speak, under cover and welcomed government inspection. I have have here the annual report of the Bank of Toronto contained in the Mail and Empire of January 11, 1912. Mr. Coulson was president of the bank and, in the annual address published in that paper, he says:

It has been suggested that all banks should undergo an outside audit or inspection. We have no objection to such an external inspection, if made by competent authority, and should the Government decide to incorporate provisions to that effect in the Bank Act, we will be ready to agree to whatever inspection the country, through its representatives, desires.

Then, the president of the Bank of Toronto welcomed government inspection. But we have a stronger case even than that. At the annual meeting of the Traders' Bank—the bank that was merged with the Royal Bank a short time ago—we had their president, Mr. C. D. Warren, practically favouring government inspection. The Hon. J. R. Stratton, vice-president, expressed his entire agreement with those views. In addition, we had Mr. E. F. B Johnston, K.C., at the annual meeting in Toronto, moving the following resolution, seconded by Mr. J. S. Williamson:

Resolved, that the shareholders and directors of the Traders Bank of Canada place on record their hearty approval of any legislation of the Dominion Parliament whereby an independent examinaton and audit, under the direction of the Government, of all Canadian banks shall be made from time to time. Resolved, also, that whilst the system of auditing should be determined by the Government, it is hoped that, in the public interest, the method to be devised will be thorough and efficient, and of a practical character, as the result of a defective system would create injustice and tend to injure those who might be induced to rely on reports having the sanction of a government or other official auditor.

Here are two representative banks in the country passing resolutions favouring government inspection. The country is ripe for government inspection and I trust that the Minister of Finance will remodel the provisions in connection with the audit and that he will, instead of providing for a shareholders' audit, provide for a system of government inspection. But I have the authority of the Minister of Finance himself. An address which he delivered before the Dominion Chartered Accountants is reported in Saturday Night and he made use of such language as to justify Saturday Night in concluding that he was favourable to a system of external inspection.

Mr. WHITE: I desire to correct that misapprehension. I was addressing the Accountants' Association and I stated that I was in favour of an external audit such as I have provided for in this Bill, but I did not say that I was in favour of external inspection.

Mr. SHARPE: I accept the word of the Minister of Finance without any reservation whatever, but I say that the language the minister used, according to the Saturday Night, justified that journal in believing that he was in favour of an external audit and I will read what the Saturday Night said in support of what I say:

There is no one in political life, who would be less calculated to speak out of his turn than Hon. W. T. White, Minister of Finance. His short tenure of the post and the circumstances of his election, not to mention the dead weight of the position itself, are all against any slip of the tongue.

When, therefore, the Hon. Minister of Finance rose to address the Dominion Association of Chartered Accountants on the occasion of their annual banquet at the King Edward Hotel, Toronto, and before this representative gathering of skilled experts made the observation that the wrecks of the Ontario Bank and the Farmers' Bank might in both cases have been averted by a proper system of auditing, the opinion is one of importance and the probability is that bankers throughout the country will immediately sit up and take notice of the same. The effect of the utterance of the hon. Minister of Finance is that while Mr. White meant all he said, he may have meant a great deal more, as a little analysis of the position would tend to show. Mr. White is quoted as having included the following in his address on that occasion:

I feel satisfied that had the directors of the Ontario Bank employed a proper system of auditing, it would have been the means of preventing the institution from closing its doors. This might likewise be applied to the case of the Farmers' Bank, which might have been averted, had its affairs been under the observation of a first class auditor.

Then the Saturday Night, briefly commenting upon this observation, says:

Both banks employed officials to do just this work. A similar system is being followed by most of the chartered banks in this country. A few also utilize the services of a special auditor who is a nominee of shareholders, but to all intents and purposes he is on a par with the other inspectors, as he is paid by the bank, and not by the shareholders. . . The observation of the Minister of Finance would seem to contain an implied message to bankers throughout Canada, to the following effect: a proper system of audit would make it impossible for the general manager or any other official to divert the funds of the bank to any improper use and would thus effectually safeguard the investment of shareholders and the rights of prior creditors. It has been left for the banks to have their own audit made in the past, notwithstanding which a number of disastrous failures have resulted. There appears, therefore to be something deficient in the system under which these audits have been effected, and consequently something new must be devised and applied which will be adequate to cover the conditions under which the banks operate.

Unless the above surmise takes unwarranted liberties, it would appear that Hon. W. T. White is in favour of an external examination of Canadian chartered banks. Such an able banker as H. C. McLeod, former general manager of the Bank of Nova Scotia, took this view so emphatically that he issued a most important forty-page pamphlet on the subject. The first edition was printed in 1909 and it resulted in a conference of leading bankers of Canada on the subject. It was quite plain, however, that the bankers were on the whole utterly out of sympathy with the application of external inspection to Canadian banks. Consequently, although they read the pamphlet, it was promptly pigeonholed. It would not be at all surprising if the Minister of Finance would, under the head of 'Revision of the Bank Act,' introduce legislation which would, in some form or other, insure that the books and papers of Canadian banks should be inspected and audited by others than the paid employees of the banks themselves. Such a policy would meet with the almost unanimous approval of financiers and business men throughout the country and it would incidentally stamp Hon. W. T. White as being a minister of finance well worth electing to the position.

Mr. EMMERSON: May I ask the hon. gentleman if, in the extract from the minister's address, the words 'external examination' or 'external audit' are used?

Mr. SHARPE. No, but what the article assumes is that the Minister of Finance says that a proper system of auditing would have prevented the recent failures. They had a system of audit that was not proper or effective and as the present system—practically what is provided in this Act, namely, a shareholder's audit —is not sufficient to prevent failures, they assume that an external inspection was what the minister aimed at on that occasion. The proposed audit in the Bill is no inspection at all. It provides merely that an accountant or auditor shall be appointed by the shareholders at the annual meeting. It is for the shareholders' protection. What about the depositors? The depositors in all our banking institutions are the special wards of the Government. They have no right to participate in the election of the officials of the bank, they have no voice in the management of the institution, it is the duty of Parliament to so safeguard the depositors that they cannot possibly be losers and the best system of protecting the depositors is by providing for a system of government inspection. The appointment of auditors by shareholders does not meet the necessities of the case at all. The hon. member for Westmorland, on the first reading of the Bill, touched a

weak spot when he said that the directors control the annual meeting by proxies from shareholders and consequently it is in substance a directors' audit and not a shareholders'—a shareholders' in theory but a directors' in fact. I had occasion to read a few of the annual reports and I find that the Northern Crown Bank published its annual report in the Mail and Empire on December 24, 1912. There are twenty-three names of shareholders given as being present at the annual meeting, and twelve directors were elected, so that consequently the twelve directors would control. The annual report of the Merchants bank was published in the Toronto Globe, on December 31, 1912, and twenty-two names of shareholders are given as being present and twelve directors were elected; the annual report of the Royal Bank was published in the Toronto World of January 11, 1913, and there were twenty-two shareholders present and sixteen directors elected. Consequently, as the hon. member for Westmorland truly said, in substance this appointment of an auditor would be not by the shareholders but by the directors who control the situation. I know that the people will not be satisfied with any audit short of an independent government audit. I think it was the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) who stated that the business of a bank is the business of the shareholders, and that the public have no right to enforce their views in regard to government inspection of banks.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I did not say that. I said that one objection made by bank managers to external inspection was that it was a matter for the shareholders. I took the very ground which my hon. friend appears to be taking.

Mr. SHARPE: That ground is taken by the banking institutions.

Mr. MACLEAN: And I was combatting that.

Mr. SHARPE: I was under the wrong impression that the hon. gentleman had made that statement. My answer to that argument is that the banks are quasi-public institutions created by the state, enjoying special and peculiar privileges and rights from the state, and as such they should be subject to inspection by the state. In olden days, one of the prerogatives of the Crown was the creation and the circulation of money, and we having conferred this prerogative of the Crown on banking associations, they certainly should be amenable to public inspection and public control. The very fact that the banks invite deposits from the public, is sufficient reason to make them amenable to the control of this Parliament representing the people of this country. We have a system of inspection of insurance companies and other institutions of the kind, and why not inspect banking institutions which it is still more important should be inspected. Then again, I never have been able to understand why bank charters are extended for a definite period of ten years. Why should banks any more than railway companies receive carte blanche to do business for ten years without being in the interim amenable to this Parliament. It seems to me that it is a legal fiction for us to assume that we can shackle future parliaments and prevent them from amending in any way the Bank Act. No doubt the Bankers' Association would desire immunity from criticism for ten years, but, if an hon. member of this House desires next session or the session afterwards to introduce some amendment to the Bank Act which is found to be in the public interest, should this Parliament be prevented from legislating because of the fact that we assume to say the charters of the banks shall run for ten years. That idea is a constitutional fiction; I do not believe that this Parliament can restrict future parliaments. In the event of this Bill becoming law now, and there should be discovered defects in it, such, for instance, as the inadequacy of the shareholders' audit, is the Parliament of Canada to be prevented for ten years from making the necessary amendments? I have to be enlightened, when the Bill gets into the Committee, as to why we should name a definite period for the extension of these charters, because I consider that I have never been able to understand it. For example, Sir William Meredith, Chief Justice of Ontario, has been investigating the failure of the Farmers' Bank, and if he discovers abuses that should be corrected and makes suggestions as to a remedy, are we to be prohibited from incorporating his suggestions into the Bank Act next year? I repeat that I do not believe it is within our constitutional right to pass a Bank Act for a period of ten years and profess to tie the hands of Parliament during that time from interfering with it. I presume that the provision in regard to ranch cattle and grain is inserted in this Bill for the benefit of the western farmer. But, why should the eastern farmer be discriminated against; why should not this provision be made to include the live stock in the barns of the eastern farmers? I represent a county which is one of the best in this Dominion for the raising of horses, cattle, sheep and hogs. The farmers of that county raise grain, not to sell, but for feed purposes; the capital of the farmers of my constituency is invested in live stock, and representing these farmers I protest

against the discrimination that this Bill levels against them. It is clearly set out in the Bill that the provision is intended to apply to ranch cattle and to grain, so that there is an unfair discrimination made against the cattle raising industry of Ontario. I say, Sir, that the eastern farmer is entitled to as much consideration as the western farmer, even though he may not be so aggressive in his demands. If the advantage be extended to the western farmer to borrow on his ranch cattle, then a similar advantage must be given to the eastern farmer to borrow on his horses, cattle, hogs and sheep. Then again, there should be provision made in the Bill for some form of notice of the pledge held by the bank which advances these loans. Under this provision, in the Bill as it is at present, a dishonest man may go to his neighbour and borrow all the money he can on his stock and grain; then he can go to the bank and give them a secret pledge and borrow from the bank and then light out with the result that the bank will gobble up everything and the other creditors can go hunting for their money. There is no protection in this Bill for the private lender or the local merchant; under its provisions the bank can step in and take everything. If this provision is allowed to remain in the Act, there should be some requirement for notification on the part of the bank by filing a copy of the pledge in the registry office of the county town.

Mr. EMMERSON: That is required in all other business transactions.

Mr. SHARPE: It is required with respect to every other such transaction, and I do not see why the banks should be exempted from doing what other people are compelled to do. In my opinion, if there is no notice to be given to the public of these loans, then this provision in the Bill will benefit the banks and injure the general public to a degree which we cannot at present estimate. The private lender will suffer and the local merchant will suffer. In connection with this provision some better pledge should be given to the people. I have some other materials that I wish to refer to in connection with this Bill; but I have delayed the House too long, and I do not purpose occupying much further time. I had some words to say in regard to some features of other banking systems that should be incorporated in this system. I agree with a great deal of what has been said by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) in regard to the national system of banking acting in co-operation with private banks or private individuals. In the first place, I desire to emphasize beyond anything else that we should have some system of Government inspection or external inspection of banks. We should also have a national bank along the line suggested by the hon. member for South York, which would have control of the note issue under Government supervision, which would do the Government business, the same as the European banks do, free of charge, and would hand over a part of their enormous profits to the people. Such a bank would be a great regulator of rates of interest and of discounts, and a great profit earner for the people, as has been proved in European countries. If there is no national bank, then I say that the Government should control the issue of the notes in the same way that the United States Government does, and hand them out to the banks on their depositing gold or Dominion of Canada bonds bearing a low rate of interest. Thus the Government would secure more direct control, would have profits on notes issued, and also a great profit on lost notes, which now goes to the bank. Failing a Government bank or Government issue of notes to the bank, then the banks should pay reasonable taxes to the Government for the privilege of issuing notes, for instance, as is done by the Bank of Belgium, the Bank of Norway, and the banks of several other European countries. I say that other countries receive enormous benefits from banks for the exclusive privileges and rights conferred by the state on these banks. For instance, the Bank of France pays stamp duties and interest on its currency amounting to several millions of francs each year; it also loans to the Government free of interest fifty millions of francs; it also loans thousands of millions of francs to the Government at one per cent and two per cent.

An hon. MEMBER: That was one of the conditions of the charter.

Mr. SHARPE: Yes. It does all Government business free of charge, and it returns to the Government three-fourths of its earnings over five per cent. The discount rate is alike to all. Why should Canada stand alone in all the world in not collecting reasonable taxes from the banks, or controlling the note issue, or having more direct voice in the banking operations of the country?

There are a few objectionable features in our banking system, which I think should be eliminated on this revision if possible. I have repeatedly said in my remarks that there should be Government inspection, and I say that there should be provision in the Bank Act compelling the banks to accurately value their assets, especially real estate. They conceal their assets by undervaluing their very valuable proper-

ties in the cities. There should be some tax on currency issue; there should be some tax on money shipped out of Canada. At a time of stringency as at present, when the grain is being moved from the West and some farmers both in the East and in the West can scarcely command any money, I understand that the banks are loaning millions of dollars on the New York Exchange. There should be some limitation of the banks' power to loan to officials of the bank; there should be some limitation of the banks' power to loan to mining companies in which officials are interested. Under the old Bank Act, the manager of the bank could lend money on the security of a hole in the ground, the same as Travers did in the case of the Keeley mine. That can be done at the present time just the same as before. It should be made criminal for a bank to purchase its own stock, and the directors of a bank should not be allowed to be directors of any trust company. I will have more to say in connection with the trust companies and the banks which are closely allied to the trust companies, when the Bank Act comes before the Banking and Commerce Committee. Mr. H. C. McLeod says that a bad feature of our present banking system is the system of interlocking directors who hold seats on the banks and on the trust companies, in order to speculate to the detriment of the general public. I submit there should be no mergers of our present banks without the consent of Parliament; that should be provided by special bills. No such responsibility should rest on the shoulders of any individual or group of individuals outside of this House. I have absolute confidence in the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board; but I say it is too great a responsibility to rest upon the shoulders of any group of men to be able to consent to the amalgamation or merger of any two banks; it should be by private Bill brought before the House. In connection with the capitalization, I agree with the hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean), when they said the success of the bank does not depend on its capitalization; it depends on the security and integrity of the management and the limited scope of its operations. Mr. McLeod says the same thing on page 4:

> With capable management a bank with $200,000 capital is not more liable to disaster that a bank of $2,000,000 capital: the one must be content with a small circle of operation; the other must avoid the temptation to reach out with the dash and daring that in too many instances, for want of restraint, has resulted in menace and wreck.

What I respectfully suggest would be this that we should have incorporated some features of the United States system in small banks. Allow the banks that are operating with branches in more than two provinces to have $500,000 capitalization; allow the provincial banks with branches confined to one province a reduced capitalization of $250,000; and allow a bank that will have no branches to be operated in cities and counties a capitalization of $100,000. I believe this is one of the great defects of the banking system of Canada. The present banking system is like a mighty octopus with its tentacles in the shape of branches stretching out throughout the whole Dominion, and gathering into its mighty maw the earnings of the rural districts and taking them to Montreal or Toronto for speculation. We want local banks in Canada with smaller capitalization; I say that is what the West is calling out to-day for, and the board of directors should be elected in the county where the banks are operating; that will help to build up those local towns. Oshawa was built up by reason of the head office of the Western Bank being situated in that town. Weyburn to-day is being boomed because the head office of a bank is in Weyburn. The smaller places in this way would have means at their disposal to carry on their local productions and local industries. I submit that by the present system we have created an aristocracy of wealth, the greatest combine in Canada, having a predominating influence upon our economic, industrial, financial and political life. I agree with the remarks of the member for South York that in the present stage of the history of this country, there must be some system of restraining and controlling this mighty commercial combine, and the best means of controlling that and making it operate in the interests of the people is in my opinion a system of government inspection and a change in the capitalization of the banks. I say it is a combine; prices have risen in all walks of life, all commodities have increased in price, rents, cost of materials; we must pay higher interest on our loans, but the Bankers' Association never raise their rates of interest on deposits. Consequently I say, if we had a system of local banks it would help to build up the communities and would be to the greatest advantage of the people of this country. I have a number of amendments to suggest, and these I shall propose in the Banking and Commerce Committee when the proper time comes. I firmly believe that the Bill will not be satisfactory to the people, in my section at least, without some adequate provisiion for outside government inspection; and I would strongly urge the Finance Minister to consider the advisability of remodelling the Bill in this respect.

Mr. J. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville): Translation.) Mr. Speaker, at this late hour, I do not propose discussing at any length this question to which I have given a great deal of attention of late years. I even introduced a Bill in that connection, and though it did not cover the whole ground—which is not to be wondered at, considering the importance of the question—it had nevertheless the good effect of causing hon. gentlemen to look into the matter and impressing them with the necessity of radically amending the Banking Act.

The Bill referred to provided for a system of government inspection of our banks. Besides, it required that shareholders should be kept informed of the bank's dealings, inasmuch as directors and officers of the bank were directed to supply full particulars in regard to the business of the year preceding, an annual meeting of the shareholders being, of course, convened in due time. My contention was that shareholders would thereby be in a better position to appoint thoroughly competent, honest and trustworthy directors.

The important point is to protect depositors, and I considered that such protection would be ensured by means of a thorough and painstaking government inspection, such inspection following on the fuller acquaintance with the bank's transactions previously obtained by the shareholders. I believed, and I still believe, that those unfortunate depositors who are left unprotected under the present Act, would thus have their interests efficiently safeguarded.

I shall be very brief, as I understand from the statement made by the hon. Minister of Finance this afternoon, that this Bill will be referred back to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, where we will be given an opportunity of moving amendments and of making whatever suggestions which we consider most beneficial. But, before proceeding any further, I wish to draw the attention of the Finance Minister to the fact that the Bill as printed in French is not a correct translation of the English copy. In the first place, I should point out that the Bill as printed in French does not give in italics the proposed amendments, while in the English copy every little change is shown. Accordingly, whoever takes up the French version of this Bill for purposes of study, has to compare it with the wording of the present Act, which, considering the length and intricacy of the Bill, entails considerable work, a difficult task and one almost out of the question.

I beg to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance, who possibly does not understand me when I am speaking French, to the facts I have just stated. I hope that some hon. gentleman will make him acquainted with the substance of my remarks, viz: that the French copy of the Act is not the verbatim rendering of the English. For instance, section 43, paragraph (a) of the English version reads:

Or by his attorney appointed in writing.

while in the French copy the corresponding statement is wanting. Then section 47, paragraph 2, of the English Act contains these words:

And shall give his post office address and description.

which are not to be found in the French copy.

The probable explantion is that the Bill was first prepared in English, then translated into French, and that later on the English copy was made to include these additions, which were not inserted in the French copy.

I claim that such an oversight should be corrected previous to referring the Bill to the Committee on Banking.

I trust the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Pelletier) will kindly draw the attention of the Finance Minister to this statement of mine, and that before submitting the Bill to the Committee on Banking, the French copy of the Bill will be reprinted, the variations shown in italics, and that the portions omitted will be inserted in their proper places.

Mr. PELLETIER: (Translation.) Has the hon. member discovered serious discrepancies?

Mr. DEMERS: (Translation.) It is rather a difficult matter to make a definite statement in connection with so lengthy a piece of legislation. But from the facts I have just pointed out, in reference to sections 43 and 47, I have reason to believe that such discrepancies exist.

Mr. PELLETIER: (Translation.) In the English copy changes are shown in italics; does the hon. member say that this has not been done for the French version?

Mr. DEMERS: (Translation.) Just so. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). I agree entirely with his views, though I cannot approve of the form in which he has presented them to the House. I regret exceedingly that the hon. member should have attempted to make political capital out of this question, for this is not a question as between Liberal and Tory; it is a question which calls for the co-operation of all men of good will towards the perfecting of legislation which is of the utmost importance to the public welfare. I was sorry to hear the hon. member cast aspersions on the former Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding), whose fair name and public-mindedness are fortunately unimpeachable.

I am the more aggrieved at these statements coming from the hon. gentleman that I am in perfect sympathy with the suggestions he made. I am in favour of a system of government inspection for our banks, and without any undue boasting, I think I can claim that I have done my share towards bringing about a consideration of that question, and that I have been one of the first to make such a proposal in this House. Of course, in that part of the province of Quebec which I have the honour to represent, the failure of a certain bank caused much suffering, and that sad experience of ours had something to do with my efforts to find some means of preventing such disasters which under the present law are difficult to avoid. But whatever my reasons for doing so, I have made a special study of this question.

One of the means I suggested, and possibly the most effective, was a system of government inspection, and, useless to say, I rejoice that by far the greater number of hon. gentlemen who have addressed the House on that question to-day, on either side, have spoken strongly in favour of such a system.

Mr. PELLETIER: (Translation.) If my hon. friend will allow me, I wish to give him satisfaction at once in connection with the complaint he has just made, and asked me to submit to the hon. Finance Minister, to whom I have communicated the substance of his remarks. The Bill was first drawn in English, and my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance is quite put out by the statement of my hon. friend. Of course, each one should bear his own responsibility. That translation is the work of the officers of the House of Commons, and whatever omissions the hon. member has found out and complained about, and rightly so, should be brought home to them. I propose laying the matter before the Speaker, and I have no doubt he will see to it at once.

Mr. DEMERS: (Translation.) I am altogether satisfied with the explanation forthcoming from the hon. Postmaster General. I was saying how pleased I was to find that so many members of this House were advocating to-day a system of government inspection of banks. But I am very sorry indeed that the Minister of Finance should not have inserted a clause to that effect in the first draft of the Bill. According to that hon. minister's contention, the carrying out of such a proposal is an absolute impossibility, owing to the fact that there are in Canada, he says, 2,800 such branch offices. If, in order to give satisfactory results, it were necessary that the said inspection should include a separate investigation of the business of the various branches, that would offer, I admit, some serious difficulty. But I contend that with a system providing for practically day-to-day reports from the branch offices to the head office, it would be sufficient to have inspection at the headquarters. And, Sir, I insist particularly on this: the existence of a system of government inspection would exert a considerable moral influence. Realizing that an outside inspector may come in at any time, bank managers would surely be more careful, in the same manner as customs officers on board of trains. I doubt very much that any of them effects during the year seizures for an amount equal to his salary, but then how much smuggling is prevented merely by the presence of such an officer!

The hon. member for North Ontario was right in saying that the people of this country expected to find in this revision of the banking Act a clause providing for a Government controlled system of inspection, instead of inspectors or auditors appointed by the directors themselves, as it is well known that shareholders are in most cases represented at the general meetings by those very directors. Bank charters are granted by the Government, issued by the Government under the authority of Parliament; it is in order therefore that the Government should take in hand their supervision and make sure that there is nothing wrong with the management of those institutions which are entrusted with the savings of the people.

The Government cannot afford to remain indifferent in regard to this question; sooner or later, they must follow in the footsteps of the governments of foreign countries, such as the United States and Germany, where, thank God, a similar system of inspection has been giving general satisfaction.

Moreover, the mere reading of the law as it now stands clearly shows that the legislator realized that it was necessary for the Government to have supervision over the financial status of our banks, as evidenced in the wording of sections 112, 113, 114 and others. Unfortunately, however, previous experience has shown that such means are insufficient. Therefore, it is incumbent on our present law-makers to find other means towards attaining that necessary end.

In conclusion, I insist once more on the desirability of providing a system of government inspection, and I trust that when the Bill is submitted to the Committee on Banking, amendments will be introduced towards providing for such a system, and that the hon. Finance Minister will think it proper to insert them in the Act. I shall not proceed any further for the time being, reserving my right to address the committee in connection with it later on.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N. B): Although I have no desire to occupy the

attention of the House at any great length at this late hour I do not expect to be here when this Bill is reached next week, and it is of so much importance to the country at large that the opportunity of voicing an opinion in the matter should not be allowed to pass by any member of the House who gives the matter serious consideration. The Bill now under consideration is fraught with greater and more important consequences for the people of Canada than any Bill introduced in the House during this session. I am not here to condemn the banks generally, because I believe the banks of Canada do a good work for the country as a whole, but I do think the system that has grown up during the last forty or fifty years should be carefully discussed before we extend to these banks the right to carry on this system for another ten years.

A statement made this evening by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) impressed me very much. Evidently the hon. gentleman has given the matter a great deal of consideration. I must confess that I have not gone into the matter to such extent as he has. I have only a cursory knowledge of the system being carried on in the continent of Europe and the British Isles; possibly I know more about the banking system in the United States than in any of the continental countries. I think the proposition which the hon. gentleman made to-night is one which the Government should consider very carefully; that is that there should be a Royal Commission, or a commission of some kind appointed to investigate the banking systems of the world, and be able to report to this House before the Bill becomes law. Of course it would be necessary to renew the present charters for a couple of years in order to give the commission time to conduct the investigation and make a report, but the country and the banks could well afford to wait for two years, continuing the present conditions, especially in view of the fact that, as I view the Bill, it does not change the conditions to any very great extent. And if the Commission find that we have the best system in the world, then the only thing we have to do is to accept it. I do think that from the general standpoint of Canada's interests our system possesses very many advantages over that of any system in the world. Some hon. members have explained this afternoon the system at present being followed in France; the enormous amount of money they are lending to the French government free, and the amount of money they are lending to the French government of one and one-half per cent interest. With all due respect to the hon. gentleman who advanced these ideas, I do believe that would not be possible in Canada, because money is worth more here than in France. Men who have money can invest it in the ordinary business affairs of the country and get from it a greater percentage of profit, and therefore, we have got to face the conditions as they are. We cannot expect, however, to keep the money in the banks at a rate of interest which bears any reasonable proportion to the interest they would receive in the ordinary business affairs of the country. It will be a splendid thing for the members of this House to get the information before them as to what is actually going on in France, Holland, Belgium and other European countries before being called on to give to the banks of this country a renewal of their privileges for another ten years. We have, of course, a right to amend the Act, but we do not want to forget that if we pass this Bank Act for ten years, then one year from its passage certain people will invest money in banks and obtain certain vested rights. While this Parliament has a legal right to pass amendments and vary the law, I do not think it has a moral right to make such amendments as will affect those rights until the expiration of the 10 years for which the charters are extended. It therefore seems to me that we should have this information before the charters are renewed.

It has been stated by hon. gentlemen speaking in this discussion that the banks are giving to the people of Canada all the accommodation which the business affairs of the country require. That, Sir, I deny. I have no doubt that in the city of Toronto, represented by my hon. friend, the president of the Dominion Bank, who has spoken here this evening, and in the city of Halifax, represented by the hon. gentleman who sits at my left (Mr. Maclean), they may be able to get all the money they require for the ordinary business affairs of the community, but that is not so in the country districts of some portions of Canada. The people of the Maritime provinces are not able to get the money they require to carry on their business affairs. If a manufacturing concern can show the proper amount of assets, and a sufficiently well-established business, they can get the accommodation they require, but the fault I find with the banking system of Canada today is the fact that there must be an idea in the minds of those controlling the banking trust that the banks exist for the purpose of helping out the manufacturers of the country, and have nothing whatever to do with the farmer, the mechanic, the artisan, and the men who are really contributing two-thirds of the money upon which they are doing business. Another fault I have to find is that they will lend money at certain times in the year, and when money is required for moving the crop in the West they will close up

like a rat trap. A man may have borrowed a few hundred from the bank, and if he is not prepared to meet it at its maturity he is simply told by the local branch manager: my instructions from head office are that you must pay that note—and he has got to pay it. He must go to his friends and have them endorse a paper for the purpose of meeting this small amount. Within the last two months I have had an instance where from one of the greatest financial institutions in Canada a gentleman obtained the loan of the paltry sum of $300, endorsed by a man worth thousands of dollars and backed by collateral securities consisting of municipal bonds to the amount of $1,000 at 4 per cent. When this became due the bank refused to renew it, and the man had to negotiate the amount elsewhere. I can relate another instance occurring in my own town where a man spent $10,000 to erect a mill. He did not have to borrow this amount, as it was his own money, but he wanted three or four thousand dollars to carry him along in his lumber business until he got his product on the market in May. He went to the bank and offered undoubted security —indorsements and mortgages, but he was compelled to go to his friends, who had to raise money from private sources to obtain the beggarly sum of three or four thousand dollars. The reason given by the bank was to the effect that the head office had instructed them not to loan any further amounts—they needed it to carry the crops in the West. Indeed, the farmer and lumberman in the Maritime Provinces and throughout the agricultural portions of the country are the men who are furnishing the capital. I have not the figures and have no way of getting them, but I think I am safe in making the statement that 75 per cent of all interest bearing deposits in the banks of Canada to-day—about half a million dollars—is the money of the farmers and mechanics of this country who have all got money in the banks in amounts ranging from $25 up to $100, $1,000 and $4,000. The banking system is not doing its duty when it does not furnish back to the people reasonable facilities for carrying on their business. I will admit their business would not be as profitable as the big manufacturing industries of the large cities, but they are just as important to the people of this country as are the big commercial institutions.

Now Sir, that brings us to the consideration of what is going on in the banking world of Canada. I believe that the banks of Canada are honestly working for their shareholders. Their object is to pay dividends, and I do not think they are carrying out their present procedure from any ill-feeling towards the farmer or towards the small depositor. I think it is simply because they believe that they can do better business and make more money for their shareholders by carrying on their business in the big centres. That is why I believe they are adopting the policies that are in operation at present. One of the great difficulties in my mind lies in the absorption of the smaller banks by the greater ones, and that, of course, brings into the question the policy of bank agencies in Canada. Personally, I am a firm believer in the system of banking agencies. As I said before, I have not a very intimate knowledge of the banking system throughout the world, but I have not read of any system that is so well adapted to our needs as the system of banking agencies. By that means we are able to gather in small deposits throughout the country—it may be only $25 or $100 or $1,000—and to transfer them from one part of the country to another where the money is most required. The difficulty I am inclined to think, lies in transferring the money from the country districts to the city centres, but it is a system which, if carried out properly, would not permit of any inequality, and would give splendid results. We found in the Maritime provinces when we had our local banks that it was a much easier matter to have our local needs supplied than it is by the larger banks. The answer will be that the local banks were sometimes insecure, that it was necessary for the security of the country at large that the local banks should be merged. That might be under existing circumstances, which I am sorry to say the Minister of Finance intends to perpetuate in this Bill, but I think that some system should be devised which would encourage the creation and maintenance of local banks. I am not sure that I would go as far as the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). He seems to think that there ought to be a system by which banks with only $100,000 of capital and with one office should be encouraged. That might be all right in some places, although I think that a capital of half a million dollars with $250,000 paid up, is probably small enough. The great difficulty would be that if you had a bank with a capital below that amount the public would not have sufficient faith in it to invest their savings, and without the savings of the public, practically no bank could make money in Canada to-day.

It has been explained thoroughly this afternoon that the banks are really doing business, not upon their own capital, but on the savings of the people, and the bank which is not able to obtain the savings of the people will not, I am afraid, make its business a success. Now I believe that the difficulty in regard to small banks has been that the big banks, perhaps silently, but

deliberately, have frozen them out, putting them in a position where they could not get the savings of the people, and practically compelling them to merge with the larger banks. I believe that no bank should be allowed to merge with another without the consent of this Parliament, embodied in a Bill and duly enacted. I do not believe that a bank should be allowed to merge with another simply with the consent of the Minister of Finance or of the Treasury Board.

Mr. CURRIE: What would the hon. member do in the case say of the Ontario Bank?

Mr. CARVELL: It became bankrupt, did it not?

Mr. CURRIE: It had to be taken over in one day to avoid great losses.

Mr. CARVELL: I would simply allow the mater to stand until Parliament had met. I do not think the matter would be so urgent as not to permit of that. If some of the ideas that have been so ably advanced by the hon. member for Middlesex (Mr. Ross) this afternoon were carried out, I do not believe that any bank would get into such a position that it could not wait a few days or a few months until Parliament met and passed an act. Look at what is going on in the Maritime provinces. The Bank of Nova Scotia and the Bank of New Brunswick are amalgamating because the big stockholders say it will be to their advantage, that they can make more money by amalgamation, and the people of New Brunswick have not a word to say about it. The Bank of New Brunswick to my mind has been a great factor in the interests of the people of the province.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is its capital?

Mr. CARVELL: Over a million dollars, I think. It was in splendid financial shape; it had deposits amounting to $5,000,000 or $6,000,000; it had a magnificent business and a truly local business; and I think it is a misfortune that it has ceased to exist, as it practically has, by amalgamating with the Bank of Nova Scotia. The Bank of Nova Scotia may also be said to have ceased to exist as a Maritime institution, because its head office is now in Toronto. It would have been very much better for both of these institutions and for the people of those provinces, if the two corporations had been compelled to come to Parliament and show reasons that would justify them in being merged into one institution.

I was very much impressed this afternoon with the proposition put forward by my hon. friend from Middlesex, that this Parliament should make some provision for the protection of depositors. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance settles the matter by one wave of his hand. He says such a thing was never done before, that it is not practicable, and he thinks that is the end of it. Well, a good many things have happened in Canada recently that never happened before, and I do not see any reason why we should not at least consider this matter, even if we do not adopt it. If the Minister of Finance would consider it a little more carefully, I think he would change his opinion. I was not in Parliament when the Act was passed providing for the protection of the note issue by the putting up of five per cent, but I have no doubt that all the banking institutions of Canada and all the banking magnates said that that had never been done before, and that therefore they should not be compelled to give that protection. But they were compelled to do so, and now they say it is all right. I am old enough to remember when a bank note in Canada was practically not good except in the immediate vicinity of the bank which issued it. Now, a bank note issued in Nova Scotia is as good in Vancouver Island as it is in Halifax, simply because the people have absolute faith in the banks. They do not know why, but they know that in some way or other that note is protected, and that they are perfectly safe in taking it. It passes current everywhere, and it is good for 100 cents on the dollar. I do not contend that it would be profitable perhaps to devise a scheme by which deposits would be as fully protected as the note issue is, but when we consider that to-day the banks of Canada have over $1,000,000,000 of the people's money, and that even two per cent of that amount or $20,000,000 would for all practical purposes absolutely protect the depositors of this country, it seems a proposition which ought to be considered very carefully. It would only mean that at the end of every year or at the beginning of every year the banks would put up with the Government two per cent or three per cent of their deposits, and in my opinion two per cent would be ample. They should go to the Government and the Government should pay interest on them. I would be willing that they should pay them 3½ per cent because the Government cannot borrow money for less than 3½ per cent; although possibly, as the Government now pays 3 per cent on deposits with them, and as the banks only pay 3 per cent, it might be fair that they should only pay them 3 per cent. That would mean that all that the banks would lose would be the right to make profits on that paltry sum of money and it would be a paltry sum of money when you consider all the business done and the immense

amount of money received from the public. The banks obtain this thousand million of dollars at 3 per cent. and they let it out to the people of the country at anywhere from 5 to 8 per cent and I am told that they let it out at the rate of 9 and 10 per cent in the West. Well, 9 and 10 per cent is too great, but I am not going to find fault with the banks for trying to make money when they can because the conditions are not the same in Canada as they are in Europe. If a bank charges 6 per cent I have no fault to find with it and I dare say that 7 per cent is not unreasonable on small loans. I do not find fault with the banks for trying to make money, I think it is only right that they should try to get as good a return as possible for their shareholders without, of course, doing an injustice to borrowers or crippling the industries of the country.

My hon. friend would ask: What right have you to take money out of one bank and use it as a guarantee for the depositors in another bank? The answer is this: The people of Canada are giving the banks the right to issue dollar for dollar with their paid-up capital without paying them one cent. The paid-up capital of a bank is perhaps $250,000, the bank at once issues $250,000 in notes and, instead of having a quarter of a million of capital, it has half a million of capital. Then, we are making them the repository for the savings of the people. It is true that a man can go to the Government, or Post Office Savings Bank and deposit his money, but the conditions are such that people do not like to go to the Post Office Savings Bank. If a man wants to withdraw $1,000, $500, or $100 from the Post Office Savings Bank he is obliged to wait a month. I do not know whether the banks had anything to do with getting the law as it is relating to the Government Savings Bank but certainly the law is very much in favour of the banks.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do you not believe in the Government Savings Banks?

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly I do, but unfortunately, as a result of the way they are managed, the banks are getting the money and not the Government.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Do not the barriers that you put in the way of the withdrawal of savings from the Government Savings Bank constitute an important feature of the system?

Mr. CARVELL: I do not think so. I think you should make the Government Savings Banks as elastic as possible to induce people to put their money into them. Client after client comes to me and says that he does not want to put his money into the Post Office Savings Bank because he has too much trouble in getting it out; therefore, he goes to the chartered bank. Personally I have advised clients of my own to put their money into the chartered banks.

Mr. LEMIEUX: But you have big clients.

Mr. CARVELL: No, they are not all big clients. We have three chartered banks in our town and I have never had any hesitation in advising my clients to put their money into those banks on account of the conditions to-day. I repeat the statement, that the chartered banks are the repository for the savings of the people and they will continue to be so. In this Bill we are even going so far as to provide that no corporation may use the word 'banks' except a chartered bank. A private banking company may not use the name at all. We are even giving the banks a greater monopoly than they have at the present time. If the banks have the right to issue dollar for dollar of currency with their paid-up capital, and they have that right, if they are the only banks practically which can receive the savings of the people, if they receive them at three per cent and are allowed to let them out at six, seven and eight per cent, I do not think it would be a hardship upon the shareholders if they were compelled to put one or two per cent of their savings with the Government as a security for depositors in every other bank.

Mr. EMMERSON: Especially where they are earning from eighteen to twenty-three per cent.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. CURRIE: Are you not taking that much money out of circulation?

Mr. CARVELL: Possibly you are. I am not going to argue that at all. You are putting that into the hands of the Government and my hon. friend would perhaps say: Well, the Government have the $20,000,000 or $30,000,000 and if they did not get money in this way they would have to go to Europe and borrow it. I admit that possibly we might have a little more money brought into the country from Europe, but the amount is so infinitesimal compared with the enormous wealth of Canada, the interest of the people is so great and the advantages to both the banks and their depositors are so important, that I do not think it is worth considering.

If you had had a system like that coupled with bank inspection, I do not think the Minister of Finance would have listened to the castigation which he received this evening from his friend and supporter the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) or would have been made to feel

that there is something wrong in the system of audit which he is proposing here. It does not meet the needs or aspirations of the people, it is not giving to the people that protection which they claim they have the right to expect from the Government. My hon. friend provides that the banks shall appoint an auditor. The auditor, it is true, shall be elected by the shareholders, but my hon. friend provides that if a man is eligible to be elected as an auditor his name must be proposed at least ten days before the annual meeting and every big shareholder and all the directors know that such a man is proposed as auditor. If the directors, who are usually the majority of the stockholders, do not want that man to be auditor, you can depend upon it that he will not be auditor. My hon. friend is not innocent; he knows how these things are carried on. There is not a man in this House who is innocent; we all know how these things are carried on. We know that a dozen or half a dozen of the leading stockholders are the directors and they always have their own way about the election of directors and officers. If they could not have their own way they would not be directors and officers. The fact that they are able to have their own way results in their being directors. If they want Brown as auditor they will have Brown as auditor and the minority stockholders can go whistle and hang. The measure provides that this man's salary shall be paid by the shareholders. The shareholders are the directors and if the shareholders choose to vote one dollar for a salary they will not get very much of an audit. The whole thing goes to show that this is a scheme put up in the interest of the banks to meet the growing demand that has taken place in this country for the past three or four years for an independent, outside audit or inspection of the bank. I do not charge my hon. friend with doing anything improper. I am afraid that my hon. friend has lived in the financial atmosphere of Toronto so long that he is saturated with it; therefore, I do not charge him with anything wrong. He is permeated with this idea but of course my hon. friend is not answering to the sentiment of the people in making the provision that he is making for inspection. If my hon. friend had kept his deaf ear, not even his good ear, to the ground this evening he would have heard the significant murmurings behind him in several places while the hon. member for North Ontario was speaking, and he would have been aware that at least, so far as the Conservative party are concerned, they are not in sympathy with this proposal. I believe that when this Bill gets to Committee the Minister of Finance will consider carefully a proposition that there should be a real inspection of the banks, not an inspection and audit by a man under the control of the directors and general manager who is simply a jack-in-the-box to do what he is told, but a real inspection by an auditor appointed by the Government who will, if necessary, go to the head office and to the branches as well. In most cases an audit of the head office would be sufficient, but I know of some banking transactions, which had the audit gone beyond the head office would have been of great advantage to all concerned. I have in mind a bank in the Martime provinces which was afterwards amalgamated with the Bank of Montreal, and had there been an efficient system of outside inspection, and had the inspector investigated the conditions at the branch in my own town and in the town which was lately the residence of my hon. friend from Halifax (Mr. Maclean), and had that inspector made an honest report on only two accounts in these branches, there would have been a different story to tell. Fortunately, the bank was taken over by the Bank of Montreal, and nobody lost any money.

Mr. CURRIE: Has government inspection in the United States prevented defalcation and ruin to the shareholders of the National Banks?

Mr. CARVELL: I am unable to answer that question.

Mr. CURRIE: They have had years of experience of government inspection in the United States, and I understand relatively more banks have failed there than in Canada.

Mr. CARVELL: That may or may not be correct, but I have cited from my own experience cases in which the inspection of two or three accounts by an independent inspector would have made a great difference to the shareholders of a small bank. I do not think that an inspection of the Bank of Montreal or of the Bank of Commerce, for example, would be necessary, but if such a law be passed, it must apply to the big banks as well as to the little banks, because the law cannot distinguish between them. I have sufficient faith in these great financial institutions to believe that it would be impossible, by any defalcation or bad management at any one point to bring ruin to the whole. I have heard it stated that the Bank of Montreal lost six or seven million dollars in Mexico, but even if that were true, and I do not say it is, the Bank of Montreal is such an enormous institution that it could lose that large sum without affecting its general standing.

Mr. EMMERSON: I do not think the statement is true.

Mr. CARVELL: I do not know whether it is true or not, I merely mentioned it as a rumour.

Mr. CURRIE: I think it is only street gossip and I do not think it is fair to any bank to make such a statement.

Mr. CARVELL: I guarded myself by saying it was merely as a rumour, but even if it were true my point is that it would not to any great extent affect the standing of the Bank of Montreal.

Mr. CURRIE: The statement reflects on the management.

Mr. CARVELL: It would not bring about any serious consequences to the Bank of Montreal, but if a smaller bank lost one quarter of that amount, of course it might ruin the institution. I believe that had there been an actual inspection of the Ontario Bank, the Farmers' Bank, or the St. Stephens Bank, their deplorable failure would not have occurred. Any person who knew anything about auditing books could have gone to the St. Stephens Bank two years before it failed, and in one day he could put his finger on the sore spot and prevent the people incurring the great loss they did.

Mr. EMMERSON: The possibility of an inspection might be sufficient.

Mr. CARVELL: Yes, even the possibility of inspection would have prevented some of those occurrences. I believe that we should have government inspection, which should not be a perfunctory matter, but under which the Minister of Finance, on a well-founded complaint, could direct his inspector to go to the head office or to any other office, and look into the condition of affairs. If this protection be given to the depositors, then you will have all the banks subject to the fatherly care of the Canadian Bankers' Association. The only care the Farmers' Bank and the Ontario Bank got from the Bankers' Association is, that they were taken possession of by an officer of the Association under the law and closed up as quickly as possible. But, if the Bankers' Association had their money up, to meet any loss which might occur by the failure of these banks, the Farmers' Bank would not have put thousands of dollars into a hole in the ground in Cobalt, nor could the manager of the Ontario Bank speculate in the New York stock market without the Bankers' Association knowing it. If we had protection of the depositors and government inspection, it would be the greatest boon to the small banks that could be devised. These small banks have the interests of the local community more at heart than any big bank could possibly have; they would take a personal local pride in building up their own district, and the farmers and artisans who require money in a small way to carry on their business would be able to get that accommodation from the small banks doing a local business, which they could not get from the large financial institutions. With the suggestions I have ventured to make carried out, I believe the banking system of Canada would be put upon a perfectly sound basis.

Mr. NESBITT moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. EMMERSON: I should like to ask the Minister of Finance if he can furnish to the House data that would show the percentage of losses of notes of any of the banks which have been wound up, that is to say, if there is any data that shows in any way the percentage of earnings the banks have by reason of the destruction and loss of bank notes.

Mr. WHITE: I am not sure that that can be done, but I shall endeavour if possible to get it for my hon. friend. I have never seen such data myself.

Mr. EMMERSON: I did not know but that there was some information obtainable, and if so it would be very valuable.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Rogers, House adjourned at 12.10 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, January 22, 1913.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO presented the second report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts, and moved its adoption. He said: This report recommends that such parts of the Auditor General's report for the last ten years as relate to payments to the Canadian Dredging and Construction Company, and the Owen Sound Dredging Company, in connection with dredging at Tiffin, Victoria Harbour and Midland, be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

Mr. MACDONALD: Will the hon. member allow that motion to stand until those who do not belong to the committee have an opportunity of looking into the matter?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: At a meeting of the committee this morning, it was decided

that the report should go through to-day, so that we might proceed with the matter to-morrow.

Mr. MACDONALD: The proposition to deal with accounts running back for a period of ten years is a very unusual one, as far as the practice of the House is concerned, and the motion is of a special character, the effect of which I think the House should consider. I do not happen to be a member of the committee, but as a member of the House I would like to have an opportunity of looking into the matter myself.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO: I may say that the committee met this morning and one witness was examined. We adjourned until to-morrow, when we will have another witness present, and it was for the purpose of having a prompt and efficient examination of this witness that this resolution was unanimously passed by the committee.

Mr. MACDONALD: It is not very late in the session, and the members of the committee have ample opportunity of holding further meetings. I only ask that the matter be allowed to stand in order that all hon. gentlemen may know the full effect of the recommendation.

Mr. BORDEN: The rule of the House as interpreted by the Speakers in the past is, if objection is taken to a matter of this kind, that it be allowed to stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 85, respecting the Board of Management of the Church and Manse Building Fund of the Presbyterian Church in Canada, for Manitoba and the Northwest, and to change its name to The Church and Manse Board.—Mr. Sharpe (Lisgar).

Bill No. 86, to incorporate the British North-Western Mortgage Company. — Mr. Aikins.

Bill No. 87, respecting the Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company.—Mr. Stevens.

Bill No. 88, to incorporate the Canadian Accountants' Association. — Sir Rodolphe Forget.

Bill No. 89, to incorporate the Canadian Medical Protective Association. — Mr. Chabot.

Bill No. 90, respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Bennett (Simcoe).

Bill No. 91, respecting the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Green.

Bill No. 92, to incorporate the Metropolitan Mortgage Corporation.— Mr. Meighen.

Bill No. 93, to incorporate the Quebec Rapid Transit Railway Company. — Mr. Gauthier (Gaspé).

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. A. M. AIKINS (Brandon) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 98, respecting the Dominion Lands Act. He said: As the Dominion Lands Act now stands, it approves the principle of a sale and complete alienation from the Crown—in other words, from the people—of water powers in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, and the lands connected therewith, and of the alienation and sale of coal lands, coal oil lands, gas lands, mineral lands and quarry lands. I am aware that the practice of the department recently has been not to absolutely dispose of these great natural resources, but to lease them under certain regulations. The purpose of the Bill, therefore, is to strike out the power of sale, and allow the leasing under proper regulations. In respect of water powers, the regulations may be made by Order in Council and approved by Parliament, but they relate to such important matters that it seems to me that they should be brought more directly under the consideration of Parliament, and the Bill proposes that these regulations relating to water powers should be first approved of by Parliament before they go into operation; should be amendable by Parliament, if Parliament so desires, and that any Order in Council amending them should not go into operation until approved by Parliament. A further provision of the Bill as introduced is to prevent what the Act now authorizes—the homesteading of such lands as I have referred to, which, when the conditions have been complied with, entitles the homesteader or the person who has the pre-emption, or has a right to purchase the homestead, to a patent, so that the surface rights become separated from the sub-surface rights which will be detrimental and injurious to the proper working of mines and the like, below the surface. In view of the proposed alterations it becomes necessary to make a provision for the utilization of the surface rights, and the Bill therefore provides for the right to give licenses for grazing and for hay cutting on the land.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. EMMERSON: Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence for a few moments to bring to the notice of the House a question of privilege, with reference to the report which appeared in the press of the discussion which occurred here on Monday afternoon in relation to the acquisition of branch lines by the Intercolonial railway. In the Ottawa Free Press of January 21, I find the following:

If Hon. Frank Cochrane had his way 'Hansard' would shrink in size and Parliament become the scene of brief and business-like proceedings. The Minister of Railways has always been laconic himself. Yesterday afternoon he sought to impose his brevity upon one of the hardy annuals of the House by a characteristically pointed interjection at the opening of what is recognized by tradition to be a regular all-day debate on the advisability of the Government taking over the branch lines of the Intercolonial. Mr. Cochrane was not successful. Hon. Mr. Emmerson, who is head and front of the agitation for action in this respect, declined to allow Parliament to escape his trenchant analysis of the situation and proceeded to debate his resolution.

It goes on further to state——

The member for Westmorland, who invariably goes into the whole question with considerable detail and elaboration, had hardly started his speech when the Minister of Railways rose. In order to save his hon. friend going further, Mr. Cochrane explained he was prepared to state his position at once.

I do not complain of the language that is used, but I want to call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the facts of the case. Early in December last I placed on the Order Paper this inquiry:

1. Has the Government reached any decision as to the action they propose taking, if any, with a view to the acquisition of the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial railway, and the operating of the same as a part of the Government system of railway? If so, what is the nature of the decision reached and when will their intentions relating thereto be given effet?
2. What is the estimated maximum amount involved in the purchase of all the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial railway, as feeders operated at present by isolated private railway companies?

On Monday afternoon that question stood as No. 1 on the Order Paper. When it was called by you, Sir, the Minister of Railways was not in his seat, and somebody on the Government benches said: 'stand,' and it did stand. But later on, when my hon. friend the Minister of Railways had returned to the House, and before the questions were passed, I called his attention to No. 1 which had not been answered because of his absence. He then stated that the question, being one addressed to the Government had been handed to the Secretary of State, and that that hon. member of the Government would reply. The Secretary of State, who was in his seat, rose and said that the answer to the question had not reached him, and that therefore he was not in a position to answer.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is stretching the question of privilege to a very unusual degree.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Mr. EMMERSON: I trust, Mr. Speaker, that I have your indulgence and the indulgence of the House in making my explanation. I am not making any comments; I am merely reciting the facts to show that an injustice has been done to me as a member of this House, not only by this newspaper, but by the press throughout the country, because of a misapprehension of the facts.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. SPEAKER: While that may be allowed, I would point out, if I correctly interpret what a proper question of privilege is, that the hon. member is entitled to read the item and assert his privilege as a member of Parliament without going into a long history of the matter.

Mr. EMMERSON: I have read the article complained of, which does me an injustice and is not in accordance with the facts. I am calling your attention to what did occur. This appears on 'Hansard,' page 1798. I read the resolution which stood in my name, and moved it. I proposed to make some comments with respect to that resolution, and to explain it as best I could, and I made use of these words:

In attempting to discuss the question I am somewhat hampered by the fact that the Department of Railways and Canals have not answered the following question which stands on the Order Paper:

I read to the House the question which I have just repeated in your hearing. Mr. Cochrane then rose and said:

I could give the hon. gentleman the answer.

My reply to that was:

I should be very glad to have it.

I took my seat and my hon. friend then said:

The answer to the first part is that it is still under consideration. The answer to the second is that it is not in the public interest that we should give any estimate of what they are worth.

I then proceeded:

I thank my hon. friend for the information. Apparently the Government have not reached a conclusion with respect to the matter.

These were the facts, and they are not in accord with the conclusions drawn not only by this newspaper but apparently by all newspapers throughout the country. The answer of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways was not an answer to my resolution, nor did it in any way meet it. He simply stated that the question was under consideration by the Government, and I thanked him for that information. I feel it is due to myself, in the first place that

the facts should be clearly understood, and I am sure it is due to the country that no misapprehension should go abroad with respect to the discussion of a matter of this character in which the public at large is interested.

Mr. COCHRANE: The hon. gentleman is in error in one or two things. He is in error in saying that I was not in my seat when the questions were called. I was here, but, as this question was one for the Government, the Secretary of State said that he had to hear from the different departments, not from one department, and, therefore, he was not able to answer it, and someone did say 'stand.' The Secretary of State was waiting for the other departments to answer.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—BRANCH LINES.

*Mr. EMMERSON:

1. Has the Government reached any decision as to the action they propose taking, if any, with a view to the acquisition of the branch lines connecting with the Intercolonial railway, and the operating of the same as a part of the Government system of railways? If so, what is the nature of the decision reached and when will their intentions relating thereto be given effect?

2. What is the estimated maximum amount involved in the purchase of all the branch lines of railway now connecting with the Intercolonial railway, as feeders operated at present by isolated private railway companies?

Mr. CODERRE:

1. The whole question of branch lines is receiving the attention of the Government.

2. It is not considered in the public interest to give this information at present.

BUCKHORN BRIDGE CONTRACT.

Mr. BURNHAM:

1. Was there any understanding, agreement or intention on the part of the late Government, or the Department of Railways and Canals, to cancel a certain liability of the county of Peterborough under contract made July 2, 1907, between the said county and the late Government for the sum of $3,000, and the cost of maintenance of the Buckhorn bridge in said county?

2. Was the following letter to Mr. J. R. Stratton respecting the same signed by the late Minister of Railways and Canals?

Ottawa, April 12, 1911.

Dear Stratton,—I have your letter of the 10th instant. We are preparing an Order in Council at the present time in connection with the $3,000 promised by the county of Peterborough to the Government in connection with the construction of a bridge over the dam at Buckhorn, as I believe upon investigation that this is the proper arrangement to make. As you know I cannot say positively that it will go through until council has decided.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) George P. Graham.

Hon. J. R. Stratton, M.P.,
House of Commons.

3. If so, did the said letter mean that the said cancellation of the above mentioned liabilities would have been made had the late Government remained in power, and on what grounds would the same have been carried out?

4. Was it the intention of the late Minister of Railways and Canals to recommend the said cancellation to the Cabinet Council of the late Government?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. Not in so far as the Department of Railways has any knowledge.

2, 3 and 4. The department has no information.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—MONCTON-EDMUNDSTON SECTION.

Mr. EMMERSON:

1. By whom is that portion of the National Transcontinental railway between Moncton and Edmundston, New Brunswick, being operated, and when did such operations commence?

2. What has been the total cost of the said operation from the commencement thereof to the 1st of January, 1913?

3. What have been the total passenger earnings during the same period, and what amount has been earned and paid during said period for the freight traffic on said railway?

4. What number of officials are employed in connection with the operation of said railway, what are the names of the offices held by them respectively, what are the names of such officials, and what salary or wage is paid to each respectively?

5. How many employees generally are engaged in connection with such operation, and what are the names of all such officials and employees, what is the particular employment or duties of each respectively, and what salary or wage is paid in each particular case, respectively?

6. At what points are the said officials or employees, respectively, stationed or placed?

7. Are the station houses and other buildings in connection with that portion of the National Transcontinental railway thus being operated, fully completed and taken off the hands of the contractors, and are such station houses and other buildings now in occupation in connection with the operation of such railway?

Mr. COCHRANE:

1. By the commissioners of the Transcontinental railway. Date of commencement, November 20, 1912.

2. Total cost of operation, $6,931.01.

3. Passenger earnings, $1,233.30; freight earnings, $2,049.83; freight paid, $1,590.49; amount due for freight, $459.34.

4. W. B. Cronk, general superintendent, Ottawa, $300 per month; E. P. Cronk, superintendent, Edmundston, $175 per month.

5 and 6. Attached list of employees filed with the Clerk of the House.

7. No, but a number of such station houses and buildings are in occupation in connection with the operation of the railway.

LETTER CARRIER SERVICE.

Mr. VERVILLE:

What are the names of the different cities, towns and villages in Canada that have a letter carrier service, and their population respectively?

Mr. PELLETIER: Montreal, 470,480; Toronto, 376,538; Quebec, 78,710; Ottawa, 87,062; Hamilton, 81,969; St. John, 42,511; Halifax, 46,619; London, 46,300; Winnipeg, 136,035; Kingston, 18,874; Victoria, 31,660; Vancouver, 100,401; Brantford, 23,132; Edmonton, 24,900; Calgary, 43,704; Stratford, 12,946; Berlin, 15,196; St. Hyacinthe, 9,797; Three Rivers, 15,691; Peterboro, 18,360; Sherbrooke, 16,405; Guelph, 15,175; Charlottetown, 11,203; Brandon, 13,839; Windsor, 17,829; St. Catharines, 12,484; Sarnia, 9,947; Fort William, 16,499; Port Arthur, 11,220; Moncton, 11,345; St. Thomas, 14,054; Chatham, 10,770; Regina, 30,213; New Westminster, 13,199; Hull, 18,222; Owen Sound, 12,558; Sydney, 17,723; Saskatoon, 12,004; Moosejaw, 13,823; Lethbridge, 11,137; Niagara Falls, 9,248; Brockville, 9,374; Sault Ste. Marie, 10,984; Galt, 10,299.

The two cases of St. Hyacinthe and Hull are the only ones in the above list which do not come within the rules followed for the establishment of a letter carrier service, their population and postal revenue not being sufficient. The Hull service was started on the 11th May, 1910, and the St. Hyacinthe service was started on 29th August, 1907.

IMMIGRATION REPORT OF MR. ASSELIN

Mr. PAQUET :

1. Has the Honourable Minister of the Interior received the report of Mr. Olivar Asselin, on the Belgium and French immigration?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Honourable the Minister to lay this document immediately on the table of the House?

Mr. ROCHE :

1. Yes.

2. Yes, it has been already laid on the table.

COMMISSIONS FOR FARM LABOURERS AND DOMESTIC SERVANTS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND :

1. How many farm labourers and domestic servants have been placed by each employment agent in Canada for whom a commission has been paid by the Government, during the year 1911 and 1912?

2. What is the total amount of commission paid to each of such agents in each of the years mentioned and the counties and provinces in which they are located?

For answer by Mr. Roche, see statement filed with Clerk of the House.

SUNNYBRAE-GUYSBOROUGH BRANCH.

Mr. SINCLAIR :

1. Referring to the following question and answer, as reported on page 5729 of 'Hansard,' on March 20, 1912, namely:

Mr. Sinclair:

Will provision be made in the Supplementary Estimates for a branch line from Sunnybrae to Guysborough?

Mr. Cochrane:

There is provision made for a survey. I have told the honourable member twice that we intend to investigate this matter during the coming summer.'

2. If no survey of this proposed branch was made during the past season, why was it not made?

Mr. COCHRANE : The Minister of Railways and Canals investigated this matter of the branch line from Sunny Brae to Guysborough, and after discussing it fully with the engineers it was ascertained that the preliminary surveys were sufficiently complete to determine the feasibility of the line and that no further surveys would be required until it was decided by the Government that the line should be constructed. This matter is still under consideration.

ALLEGATIONS OF POLITICAL FAVOURITISM.

*Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. Has the attention of the Prime Minister been called to the following paragraph published in the Ottawa Citizen of the 18th instant:—

Political favouritism with federal grant—Quebec delegation makes charges regarding Government help.

The manner in which the Gouin Government administered the Federal grant in aid of agriculture does not appeal to prominent Conservatives in Quebec, and the allegations of political favouritism made during the session of the legislature in regard to the subject were brought to the attention of the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues yesterday afternoon, by a delegation including Honourable J. M. Tellier, C. Ernest Gault, M.L.A., Philomon Cousineau, M.L.A., E. Patenaude, M.L.A., L. T. Maréchal, K.C., and C. P. Beaubien, K.C.

It is charged that in spending the money, Liberal localities or Liberal farmers were singled out for favour to the exclusion of Conservatives.

It is desired that such steps be taken as will prevent the application of the funds in any way suggestive of partisanship, and this will be done. Matters of party organization in the province were also discussed.

2. What truth is there in the above statement?

Mr. BORDEN :

1. No, except by the question of the hon. gentleman.

2. I must leave the hon. gentleman to make his own inferences.

CANADIAN FLOTATIONS IN FRANCE.

*Mr. LEMIEUX :

1. Is the Government aware that the keeper of seals in France has appointed Messrs. Guichardon, examining magistrate, and Benezech, commissioner of judicial delegation, to investigate certain Canadian subscriptions and issues launched within a few months past on the French market?

2. If so, what is the nature of the information received?

Mr. BORDEN : In answer to the first and second questions, I may say that the Government has no information on the subject.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—REGINA MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina):

1. Has the Government, or any member therefore, received any representations or petitions praying for the establishment of a mail service on the Grand Trunk Pacific running south of Regina?

2. If so, have any steps been taken to establish such mail service?

Mr. PELLETIER :

1. No.

2. Authority has, however, been granted for the establishment of a tri-weekly service from Regina to Griffin, 79.4 miles, but same cannot be put into operation until a regular train service is operated.

DISMISSALS.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Have Adélard Bourdon, Ovila Champagne, J. E. Champagne, Olympe Desrosiers, Arthur Delorme, Emmanuel Jetté, Lanorale Marion, J. E. Fafard, Henri Hervieux, Henri Marion, been dismissed?

2. If so, at whose request?

3. Has an inquiry been held in each of these cases?

4. By whom have they been replaced respectively?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Of the persons mentioned, J. E. Fafard was the only one dismissed.

2. J. E. Fafard was dismissed by request of sitting member for the county of Berthier.

3. No.

4. Answered by No. 1.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. Has Mr. James A. McGee, lightkeeper at Ash and Bloody Island, on the river Richelieu, been dismissed from his services? If so, when and why?

2. Were any complaints made against him? If so, when, by whom, and what is the nature of these complaints?

3. What was his salary?

4. Has he been replaced? If so, by whom, and what is his salary?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Yes. December 10th, 1912. For the purpose of reinstating Mr. Geo. L. Robinson, who was dismissed in 1902, without any investigation being held, and without sufficient reason.

2. Complaint was made to the effect that Mr. Robinson had been most unfairly dealt with, and that in the interests of justice he should be reappointed to this position from which he had been wrongfully dismissed.

3. $320 per annum.

4. Yes. Geo. L. Robinson. $320 per annum.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina):

1. When was A. C. Sipes appointed a homestead inspector at the Regina land office?

2. Is he still in the employ of the Government?

3. If he is not still employed by the Government, why was he dismissed, and what was the date of his dismissal?

4. How much money did he draw during the period of his service?

5. How many homestead inspections did he make during his employment?

Mr. ROCHE:

1. April 4th, 1912.

2. No.

3. Neglect of duties. August 31st, 1912

4. $490.

5. None reported.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina):

1. Was J. W. Silverthorn dismissed from the position of fishery inspector at East Mountain lake, province of Saskatchewan?

2. If so, what was the reason and on whose recommendation?

3. Who has been appointed in his place and what is his salary?

Mr. HAZEN:

1. Not yet; but he has been informed that his services will not be required after March 31st next.

2. Because Mr. Silverthorn is now an old man and physically unable to efficiently carry out the duties involved, that of the chief inspector of fisheries for the district and of the department.

3. His district forms part of that now under the supervision of Gavin S. Hunter, $800 per annum.

DISMISSALS OF POSTMASTERS IN VAUDREUIL COUNTY.

On the calling of the order for notices of motion for the production of papers:

Mr. PELLETIER: With reference to motions Nos. 1 to 8, I may say that these motions have been postponed twice until I should have the opportunity of seeing my

hon. friend from Vaudreuil (Mr. Boyer). I saw him yesterday and suggested to him that all of these motions might be dropped with the exception of one that covers the whole subject so as not to dulpicate the returns. I told him that I would bring down all the papers in connection with these questions under motion No. 8, which covers the whole county. I am prepared to bring the papers down in this way or to await the hon. member's convenience. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that you call No. 8, which might be adopted, and then, the hon. member would drop the other motions.

Mr. BOYER:

For a return showing all postmasters who have been dismissed in the county of Vaudreuil, the dates of their appointment, the cause of their dismissal and by whom their dismissal was requested.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. OLIVER: Mr. Speaker, if I might have your indulgence, I desire to bring up a question of privilege. I have been honoured recently by a personal reference on the part of the Premier of Manitoba, Sir Rodmond Roblin speaking in the legislature. These remarks, as reported in the press, contain what appear to me to be reflections upon myself and while I do not wish to detain the House or to use such an occasion as a means of advertising, I am desirous of calling the attention of the House to the matter so that there shall be no misunderstanding in regard to it. The remarks that I desire to call attention to are contained in the Winnipeg Telegram of January 15. They relate partially to the conduct of the recent by-election in the constituency of Macdonald, Man., and partly to my connection with the administration of the Department of the Interior. To take the last first, in replying to the leader of the Opposition, Sir Rodmond Roblin, says, as reported by the Telegram:

He also speaks of the great loss that Manitoba has made in transferring seven million acres to the Dominion Government. Again I regret his want of information. Let me tell him it was less than 1,164,000 acres, and while there was a prospect and a claim justly founded for a great many more acres of land, yet by virtue of the mal-administration and the vicious enmity of the Hon. Frank Oliver to this province, these lands were all alienated from us, and in the last year and a half the Liberal Government was in office not one acre was transferred to Manitoba although some $50,000 or $60,000 was filched from the revenue of this province by the said Frank Oliver to assist him in preventing Manitoba from getting any of the lands to which he——

Mr. PELLETIER.

The leader of the Opposition, Mr. Norris. —refers.

The other part of Sir Rodmond Roblin's remarks, to which I wish to direct attention, as appearing in the Telegram, is as follows:

The election——

Speaking of the Macdonald election.

—was directed, seemingly, by a gentleman of the name of MacNutt, of Saskatchewan, and Frank Oliver, of Alberta. They brought with them men from every part of the Dominion. Eleven Frenchmen were brought from Quebec, political heelers from Ontario, political crooks from Saskatchewan and Alberta, and they intended to defy the honest opinion of that electorate by means that the law expressly state shall not be employed.

The Telegram does not come down to details as to the means, but the Free Press report of the same debate quotes Sir Rodmond Roblin thus:

Who were bringing this whiskey and money? Not Norris, but Frank Oliver and Thomas MacNutt, and the heelers from Saskatchewan. 'Whereof I speak I know,' said the Premier.

In regard to the first part of the quotation I have read as to the disposition of the swamp lands in Manitoba, I again draw special attention to the statement of Sir Rodmond:

These lands were all alienated from us.

And, further, he said that by reason of my action there had been filched from the province of Manitoba $50,000 or $60,000 by me to assist me in keeping the province from getting any of the lands to which the reference is made. In the other part of his remarks he states directly that the campaign in Macdonald was directed by Mr. MacNutt and myself; and that we brought political crooks and heelers from Ontario, Alberta, and Saskatchewan. In regard to that matter I will say that I did take some part in the election in Macdonald and that I did request the assistance in that election of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) and two of the sons of the hon. member for Gloucester, N.B. (Mr. Turgeon). These are the only persons who took part in that campaign, so far as I am aware, that I in any way suggested or requested should take part in that campaign. The further suggestion is made that Mr. MacNutt and myself brought whiskey into the constituency, as well as these heelers from Saskatchewan, and the Premier of Manitoba says: 'Whereof I speak, I know.' I only wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that with regard to these particular statements I have called attention to, Sir Rodmond Roblin, Premier of Manitoba, recently knighted by

His Majesty, speaking from his place in the Legislature of Manitoba, stated what was untrue, knowing it to be untrue.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY—STRIKE OF EMPLOYEES.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, &c., exchanged between the Minister of Labour and the Canadian Pacific railway strikers on their application for a board of conciliation and investigation.

He said: I understand that application was made last fall by a certain class of the employees of the Canadian Pacific railway for a board of investigation and that after due notification had been given to the Canadian Pacific railway the Minister of Labour declined to appoint a board. The newspapers at the time were full of a discussion of the question, and in spite of the protest made by the employees, I understand the board has not been appointed. I know, as a matter of fact, that many of the men are still without employment and are ventilating their grievances against the company. I do not wish to pass judgment on the action of the company towards its employees; I merely rise to state that it seems extraordinary that when the law with reference to industrial disputes has been in existence for some years with a certain measure of success, it should not have been applied in this case. I hope the Minister of Labour when he is present in the House will explain the circumstances.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL: I desire to make a few observations, not as to the cause of the strike or as to the differences between the company and its employees, because I may say frankly that I know very little about that phase of the question, but I do know that in my own constituency there are a number of men who are on strike at the present time as a result of the matter referred to in this motion. I understand that these men, together with all the other men belonging to the brotherhood, are asking for an increase of their wages which at present range from $30 a month to $48 a month for a ten hour day. There may be some good reason why the company would not give the men the increase they ask, but I would like someone to tell me how the Canadian Pacific railway can expect to find competent men, men such as I have in mind, married men with families, men who have been in the employ of the company for years, in the position of freight checkers, night clerks, assistant night clerks, bridge building clerks, roadmaster's clerks, &c., for the paltry sum of from $30 to $48 a month. I presume, however, that when the papers are brought down, as I believe the minister will bring them, we will have all the information that can be given upon the subject; and we will know whether or not the information which we have received is correct. I have here the names of ten men, all residing in my own constituency, in my own town, men whom I know personally and intimately, men who are in many cases above the ordinary average of intelligence, and men against whom I am satisfied the company has not one word of complaint. These men have been eking out an existence on salaries, as I said before, ranging from $30 to $48 a month. These men asked for an increase of salary, and it would seem that they should be entitled to a reasonable increase. When the papers are brought down, we will probably find out what objection the company has to increasing their salaries.

I am also informed that the company claims there is some dispute between the men and the company as to recognition of the rights of the union. By the provisions of chapter 20 of the Acts of this House of 1907, known as the Industrial Disputes Act, with which practically all members of the House are familiar, there is a statement of law which in my judgment the Minister of Labour has disregarded; that is the point to which I wish to direct his attention just for a few minutes. I will read section 15 of that Act, and not give my interpretation of it. Section 15 is as follows:

For the purpose of determining the manner in which, and the persons by whom, an application for the appointment of a board is to be made, the following provisions shall apply:—

1. The application shall be made in writing in the prescribed form, and shall be in substance a request to the minister to appoint a board to which the existing dispute may be referred under the provisions of this Act.

2. The application shall be accompanied by—

(a) A statement setting forth—

(1) the parties to the dispute;

(2) the nature and cause of the dispute, including any claims or demands made by either party upon the other, to which exception is taken;

(3) an approximate estimate of the number of persons affected or likely to be affected by the dispute;

(4) the efforts made by the parties themselves to adjust the dispute; and

(b) A statutory declaration setting forth that, failing an adjustment of the dispute or a reference thereof by the minister to a Board of Conciliation and Investigation under the Act, to the best of the knowledge and belief of the declarant, a lockout or strike, as the case may be, will be declared, and that the necessary authority to declare such lockout or strike has been obtained.

3. The application may mention the name of a person who is willing and ready and desires to act as a member of the board re-

presenting the party or parties making the application.

I am informed from what I read in the newspapers, and I do not think the minister will deny the fact, that an application, complying in every particular with the requirements of section 15 of the Act, was presented, not to him but to his predecessor in office, just before the latter retired from the position of Minister of Labour some time in the month of September, 1911; the application set forth certain disputes between the Brotherhood of Canadian Railway Employees and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, giving all the particulars required by the Act, and substantiated by a formal declaration of one of the responsible officials that if the Government did not grant the board, the men would go on strike. This application was made in the month of September, 1911, and was left over for the present Minister of Labour to decide. Some time in the month of January, 1912, we are told that the present Minister of Labour refused the board, perhaps not in words, but in effect, by saying to the men that the company claimed that the man about whom the trouble had arisen had not been dismissed because he was a member of the brotherhood, and that the company had good reasons for dismissing the man from the position which he held. The matter was allowed to go on, and nothing was done. In the month of June, 1912, a second application was made by the brotherhood, substantiated by all the necessary data and affidavits required by section 15 of the Act, the same as in the first case. On this occasion, according to the statements of the men, the Minister of Labour suggested that they should send a couple of delegates down to Montreal to wait upon the officials of the company and see if an understanding could not be arrived at. I do not think any person can find fault with the minister if he took that course, as it certainly would be better to have an amicable arrangement between the men and the company than to resort to a board. The men went down to Montreal, and they say that the minister told them positively that their delegates would be protected. Whether that is true or not, I presume the minister will tell us. The two men, however, who went down, lost their positions; whether because of their temerity to go up against the Canadian Pacific and demand their rights, or whether for some good cause, I do not know. The board was not granted; and so far as we are able to learn no reasons were given by the minister for his refusal to grant the board. About the first day of October, 1912, a third application was made by the brotherhood, supported by all the necessary data and affidavits, exactly the same as in the other two cases. As I said before, I understand there were two grounds of dispute. One was the matter of wages; the other was recognition of the brotherhood and certain rights which they claimed, certain rules which they wished adopted. This, bear in mind, was presented to the minister on or about the first day of October. As I construe the law, the Minister has not any discretion in the matter; he might possibly refer this to what is called the Conciliation and Labour Act, an Act passed some years before the Industrial Disputes Act was passed, in so far as it referred to railway employees; but he did not do it, and unless he does it or unless he takes some means of divesting himself of the duty of acting under this Act; then I say under section 6 of the Act he is compelled, if he respects the authority conferred upon him by the statute, to grant the board and go on and carry out the law as it is provided. Section 6 is as follows:

> Whenever, under this Act, an application is made in due form for the appointment of a Board of Conciliation and Investigation, and such application does not relate to a dispute which is the subject of a reference under the provisions concerning railway disputes in the Conciliation and Labour Act, the minister, whose decision for such purpose shall be final, shall, within fifteen days from the date at which the application is received, establish such board under his hand and seal of office, if satisfied that the provisions of this Act apply.

The minister has never denied that the provisions of this Act apply. The application was presented to him on or about the first day of October, 1912, substantially complying with all the requirements of section 15 of the Act. The minister did not within fifteen days establish that board under his hand and seal of office; he has been deliberately putting those men off for a year, and not giving them the rights which they should have under the law. In the statements they furnished the minister on all of those three occasions, they stated to the minister that if he did not give them the board, they would strike. Now, let us see what that means. Under section 56 of the Act, no employee of a company has the right to strike until he has applied for a board and the board has been granted; and if he does strike before the board is granted, or before the recommendation has been made, he is guilty of a criminal offence and is liable to a penalty fixed by section 59. The minister knows that these men threatened to strike. He knows that if they had struck before a board was granted, or during the consideration of the application, they would have committeed a criminal act. And yet, for a whole year, under a threat of striking, under the real necessity of striking, the minister refuses this board, and refuses to give these men a chance to have their

grievances heard in the manner provided for by law. That is the branch of the case to which I particularly direct the attention of the minister.

We find that no action was taken by the minister for nearly a month and a half—not, in fact, until Parliament met. On the very day when Parliament met, or the day before, when it looked as if there might be a good-sized row in the country, the minister finally capitulated. I am told he went to the men and said he would give them a partial board, only so far as relates to the Ottawa district. The men refused. And finally, he granted what the newspapers called a 'partial board' of investigation. What that means, I do not know. But we know that an investigation was held by the board appointed by the minister; and, if we can believe the reports of the newspapers, the board practically sustained the men in every proposition;—in the proposition that the men were entitled to recognition; that their rules and regulations were entitled to be accepted by the company; that they were entitled to an increase of pay—I think the amount was left in abeyance to be decided between the company and the men. And not only that, but the men were to be taken back in their old positions and given pay from the time they struck. That decision was made, I believe, about the middle of December. A month and a half has gone by, and we know that the men have not been taken back, because they are still walking the streets doing nothing; and, so far as we know, no attempt has been made by the minister to induce the company to take the men back. It may be that the minister can give us information upon that subject. But I have a suspicion that if the Minister of Labour was as anxious to force the Canadian Pacific railway to take back these men as he was to force the Grand Trunk railway to take men back—and agreed to hold up legislation unless they did it—there would be no difficulty in having the men restored to their positions. The position of the minister is remarkable, when you compare his conduct in this case with that in the case of the men who struck on the Grand Trunk railway.

Mr. GRAHAM: They blamed the Minister of Railways of that time.

Mr. CARVELL: They blamed everybody. But now, we blame the Minister of Labour. And we do not intend to get away from that point. I arraign the Minister of Labour, and no other man. I believe that if he had exercised the influence with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company which he possesses, and which his Government possesses, this strike would never have occurred; or, even though it had occurred, the company carry out the recommendations of the board. It seems to me that it is a most remarkable position in which the minister finds himself. It is in contravention of the express provision of the laws of this country, and is an injustice to hundreds and hundreds of hard working men all over the Dominion. I think it is going to take some explaining on the part of the minister to convince these labouring men that they have been treated as fairly as the law of this country demands they should be treated; and it is going to take a good deal of explanation to convince not only the labouring men but the public at large that the great Canadian Pacific Railway Company has not a little more control over the Minister of Labour than it is in the interests of the labouring people of this country it should have.

Hon. T. W. CROTHERS (Minister of Labour): This motion has been on the Order Paper for three or four weeks. I have been here on several occasions expecting it to be taken up. It comes up today unexpectedly to me. I do not know that there is any practice requiring a member of this House having such a notice on the Order Paper to give the minister any special notice of his intention to bring it up on a particular day, but I think it was a courtesy, that, perhaps, the hon. gentleman the member for Rouville (Mr. Lemieux) should have shown the minister concerned to give him notice a day or two before in order that he might be prepared. I am not prepared to go into the details, I have not the application or any of the papers in connection with the case. However, in a general way, I shall endeavour to explain the charges that I have heard. I had not the advantage of hearing my hon. friend from Rouville at all, so I do not know what he has said in regard to the matter. As to my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), I heard a portion of his remarks. I am speaking from memory, but I think I am right in saying that I heard nothing about this application whatever until last October. My hon. friend speaks of 'a year' and of an application made to my predecessor. I think I am right in saying that I heard nothing about this application or about any dispute until October or November. Possibly it might have been in August, it certainly was not as soon as we came into power. This application was made on behalf of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees. You will see, from the name, that it is broad enough to include every man employed in every department of every railway company in Canada. This application was made only on behalf of these employees in the service of the Canadian Pacific railway. It includes thirty-six different classes of employees, from the man employed in un-

loading a car for a few hours or for a day or two to the chief clerks in the different departments, and covered five or six thousand men. The application was that investigation should be made into these thirty-six classes of employees of the Canadian Pacific railway over the whole system, the main line, all the branches, all the trolley lines that they run, covering altogether from 10,000 to 11,000 miles—thirty-six classes of employees and twenty-nine grievances in each class. My hon. friend from Carleton speaks of an increase in wages. That was only one of twenty-nine grievances.

Mr. CARVELL: Was that any reason why they should not be entitled to a board?

Mr. CROTHERS: One moment. My hon. friend seems to have the idea that, under certain circumstances, the Minister of Labour is obliged to establish a board. The hon. gentleman read only a section which applies to this matter—section 15; I think he referred later to section 6. But section 15 is followed by section 16, and, in substance these two sections provide that where an application is made on behalf of a number of employees by their officers, evidence should be adduced to satisfy the minister that these officers have the authority of a majority of the men for whom they assume to act. And he will find that, by section 18, it becomes the duty of those who make application for a board to serve the other party to the dispute with a copy of the application, who without delay is to send the minister a statement in reply, and by section 8 he is required to name a member of the Board. I think that makes it perfectly clear that it is not the duty of the Minister of Labour to establish a board simply because an application has been made; the other party has to be heard from, and both sides of the case carefully considered. That is the view, I am told, taken by my predecessors in regard to the Act, and it is the view which I myself have taken. It is not a new thing to refuse a board of conciliation. The hon. member for Carleton may find five or six cases in which boards have been refused during the last twelve months because it was thought the applicants did not bring themselves within the meaning of section 6 of the Act referred to by my hon. friend. He will notice that the closing words of section 6 are: 'if satisfied that the provisions of this Act apply.' A board of conciliation is, therefore, not granted merely because an application is made. Both sides of the case have to be heard, and a conclusion reached as to whether the applicants have brought themselves within the meaning of the Act, and consequently, whether or not the board ought to be established.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Would the hon. gentleman give the House some of the reasons adduced by the employees in support of their request for a board of conciliation?

Mr. CROTHERS: From memory, I may say that one was the alleged necessity for an increase in wages—a certain percentage based on the salaries the different classes of employees were then receiving. There were also some statements, I think, in connection with promotions, requiring the superintendents of the various divisions to bulletin any vacancy that might occur, and that the next employee in order of seniority should be promoted to that position. There were twenty-nine of these grievances—I cannot undertake to remember the whole of them—and thirty-six classes of employees, covering a system of nearly 11,000 miles. There was no satisfactory evidence that they had received authority for their action from the majority of the men for whom they assumed to act.

Mr. CARVELL: Did they not swear they had authority?

Mr. CROTHERS: I think not.

Mr. CARVELL: I am informed otherwise.

Mr. CROTHERS: There is a statutory declaration in connection with the statement. There were some five or six thousand individuals in these different classes, and I think the number of those who struck was pretty clear evidence that they were not authorized to make the application by a majority of the members of the order, for I do not think there were as many as five or six hundred strikers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Was that the reason given by the minister to the men for his refusal—that they were not duly authorized?

Mr. CROTHERS: One reason given was that it would be impracticable to make such an investigation as they were demanding, covering the whole system of 11,000 miles and thirty-six classes of employees, with twenty-nine grievances for each class. I told the men that, if they would limit the scope of the inquiry to a reasonable territory—say the Ottawa division—with the liberty of calling witnesses from such places as Port Arthur and Montreal, I would grant the board, but they refused to accept that unless I would undertake in writing to extend to them the right to strike throughout the entire system if the result of a board so constituted were unsatisfactory. Of course, that was an impossibility. They refused to accept the pro

position, but they returned later and accepted the offer I made before the strike, and the board was established as a result of that acceptance. If the hon. member for Carleton has examined the report of the majority of the board, he will find they stated that I acted wisely in taking the course I did, and in suggesting that the scope of the inquiry should be so limited. I pointed out that if there was an inquiry made respecting say the Ottawa division, the company would accept over the whole system whatever recommendation might be made by the board, or they would reject it over the whole system.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What were the findings of the board?

Mr. CROTHERS: I cannot tell you from memory, but some of the findings have been stated by the hon. member for Carleton. One of the findings was that those who went on strike should be reinstated.

Mr. LEMIEUX: That the men should be reinstated?

Mr. CROTHERS: That was the majority report; the minority report recommended that the company should take back any they might require within the two weeks following the date of the report. Another suggestion was that those who went out on strike should be paid their full salary during the whole of the time they were out. I understood from the men that their chief grievance was the matter of wages, but when they came before the Board of Conciliation they waived that entirely, and there is no provision regarding the matter in the award, except a general statement that the wages ought to be increased. I had not expected that this motion would come up to-day or I would have had here all the papers bearing upon the question, but I think the general statement I have made should be satisfactory at this time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: Mr. Speaker, I am not altogether satisfied with the explanation made by the Minister of Labour. This matter has been dealt with in the newspapers for many months, and from the statements so made it was difficult to understand the real extent of the differences between the minister and the railway organization.

Mr. CROTHERS: I may say that I wrote a letter to one of the officials who made application on behalf of the men. That letter was published, and it set forth very fully the reasons for the refusal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: My hon. friend stated that one of the objections given by him to the granting of the board of conciliation was that it would involve the investigation of some twenty-nine grievances alleged by this railway organization. It seems to me that is hardly a sound objection to make to such a request. I do not know the character of the organization, but, as I understand it, it comprises the different classes of railway employees, being styled the Brotherhood of Railway Employees, or something to that effect. That organization has the right to be heard, whatever may be its extent or the labour it has to perform. The fact that the organization comprises various classes of labour does not justify the answer that the grievances are too numerous, and for that reason a board of conciliation cannot be granted.

Mr. CROTHERS: My right hon. friend has stated only one of the reasons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: The other reason was purely technical. The only two reasons given why the board should not be granted are these: One was purely technical, that the men were not duly authorized; the other was as to the extent of their grievances. As to the first, that the men were not duly authorized, I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Labour would not be properly discharging his duty if he were simply to insist upon the technical aspect of a demand of that kind. In the circumstances his duty, in my humble judgment, would be to say 'your application is not technically correct; it requires this and this; make it so, and then I shall hear you.' But simply to tell the men, we shall not give you a board because you have not strictly conformed to the letter of the statute might be a technical application of the law, but it is not doing substantial justice to the men. I discard that altogether as a reason why my hon. friend did not act. If he were to tell me that that was the motive that impelled him to refuse the board which they asked for, I would tell him, and I think I would be justified in saying so, even by the hon. members behind him, that he had not properly discharged his duty.

Now, I come to the real question of the merits, and if I understand the reason urged by the hon. minister it is that he refused to give to those men the board which they were asking because the board would have been obliged to go into twenty-nine different grievances. If there had been one hundred grievances, or if they had twenty-nine grievances to be heard, they should have been heard on the twenty-nine; if they had one grievance, they should have been heard on the one. What would have been the consequences if the men had acted strictly on the answer given by my hon. friend the Minister of Labour? You would have had a strike involving, as I said, the whole system of the Cana-

dian Pacific railway, and disorganizing their whole road. That it did not extend was because of the decision which the hon. gentleman obtained from them that they would accept an investigation into one item of their complaints.

Mr. CROTHERS: Into one division of the system.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: I stand corrected: one division. Then I suppose that in that division you would have to go into all their grievances. Perhaps it may have been wise or unwise to do so—I do not say at the present time that it was unwise; if you obtained that from the men, so far so good. But it seems to me that it would have been better to have given the men an investigation into their twenty-nine grievances extending over the whole system. Then my hon. friend would have prevented a strike. Otherwise, I think the men would have been within their rights if they had struck. It would have been deplorable, but I do not think they would have come under the law, or that they would have been guilty of criminal action. I think everybody will agree that this Act which has been beneficial to the country, and which has done a great deal of good, even if not perfect, should be administered in as gentle and conciliatory a manner as possible, and if it is administered in a conciliatory manner I think the Act will work still better than it has done in the past. As I said at the opening of these remarks, it is perhaps premature to come to a conclusion until we have the papers. I simply rose to say that the nature of the answer given by my hon. friend the Minister of Labour did not satisfy me that in this matter the Act had been applied in the conciliatory manner in which it should have been applied.

Mr. BORDEN: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to discuss this question until the papers have been brought down, but in the meantime, I should like to say to my hon. friend from Rouville that this motion and a great many other motions stand on the Order Paper and maintain their precedence as a matter of courtesy. That courtesy is one which is always extended as a matter of course, but I should have thought that that ought to include the equal courtesy on the other side of the House that when a motion is to be brought up involving an attack upon a department of the Government some notice should be given by the member to the minister of his intention. When a motion has stood for weeks and maintained its precedence through the courtesy of the Government, I think that the courtesy expected on one side should equally be expected on the other side. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour had no intimation whatever that this motion was to be discussed in this way to-day.

I agree entirely with what the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said, that it is impossible to discuss this question intelligently and fairly until the papers are brought down. When the papers have been brought down, it will be open to discussion in the fullest manner that can be desired. I do not think that the right hon. gentleman quite apprehended the answer which was given by my hon. friend the Minister of Labour. As I understood the Minister of Labour, he was setting forth certain reasons on account of which he thought that the investigation suggested by the men would be, in the form suggested, a very cumbrous and difficult investigation, inasmuch as it related to a very large number of men, scattered all over the system, and embracing, I think my hon. friend stated, some thirty-six different classes and relating also to a great many grievances. I do not attach very much importance to the number of grievances provided the other considerations, to which the hon. the Minister of Labour directed his attention, were not in the way of an effective investigation. As I understand it, and I speak subject to correction, the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees is composed of a very large number of men included within a great many different classes, embracing practically all those who are not members of any other railway organization. It follows from the nature of the organization of this brotherhood that it includes a great many different classes of railway employees who are not closely or specially related with each other in the character of their work and in the nature of their employment. As I understand my hon. friend the Minister of Labour he was impressed with the fact that a general inquiry into the grievances of a very large number of departments, covering all the divisions of a great railway system, might not lead to a very effective or thorough investigation, and that it would be better in the interests of the men themselves that the investigation should be so restricted that it would not occupy a very long time, and that the merits of the case could be got at at once by an investigation in respect to the men employed on one division and to the grievances which were probably common to them as well as to other divisions of a great railway system. It was only in that light as I understood it, that the Minister of Labour had difficulty about granting this investigation when it was first asked for in the month of August last. I am quite sure it could not have been earlier than the month of August, because I heard nothing of it before I left for England in the latter part of June; but

I did hear something about it very shortly after I came back. I think the suggestion was first made to the hon. the Minister of Labour some time in the month of August, and probably, in the latter part of that month. Eventually, my hon. friend the Minister of Labour did grant a board to investigate a particular division. The railway company did not join in constituting the board, and some person was appointed to represent them by the Department of Labour. The board took into consideration the various questions in respect of the men employed upon that division, and made its award. There is no difficulty whatever about bringing the correspondence down. There is nothing to conceal in the matter, and there is no disposition to avoid the fullest possible debate or criticism that any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House may desire to make in respect of the action of the Department of Labour. I know that the Minister of Labour took a very great interest in the matter and the action that he took was such action as, in his judgment, would be best in the interest of the men themselves. As he has already pointed out, the board which was constituted by the department under the authority of the statute, has approved of the action of the minister, and of the limitation which he imposed on the scope of its inquiry. Under these circumstances I do not see that there is any legitimate criticism upon the action of the Minister of Labour and I hope that, notwithstanding the fact that some of the men are, I believe, still out of employment, arrangements will be made by which the difficulties between the men and the company will be brought to an end and that any grievances which they have felt by reason of their treatment by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company will be removed.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM: This discussion is particularly interesting to me because it reveals such a remarkable attitude on the part of hon. gentlemen, including the hon. Minister of Railways, the hon. Minister of Labour and others on the Government side of the House. I cannot see, if they are going to be orthodox, how they can let the Minister of Railways out of this difficulty because, but a few months ago, I was attacked on every platform in this country as Minister of Railways, because I had not settled strikes. Surely the Minister of Railways is not going to allow the Minister of Labour to take all the blame for this. If it was not right a few months ago for the Minister of Labour to assume that responsibility it cannot be right now. If the Minister of Railways in the late Government was a great sinner because he did not take hold of the Department of Labour and settle strikes, the present minister must be a bigger sinner because he thinks that his predecessor was all wrong. One of the reasons given why I must be opposed in South Renfrew was that I had not been true to the railway men in the strike on the Grand Trunk railway and the statement was made that the railway men were so incensed about it that they insisted that I must be defeated in South Renfrew. However, that was imagination on the part of the Minister of Railways.

Questions of this kind, having reference to railway disagreements, as pointed out by my right hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, must be handled very carefully and in a conciliatory spirit. There has to be some give and take. I read this morning with some interest the report of a speech made by Earl Grey recently in which he pointed to the Lemieux Act as one of the best things we have on the statute book of Canada, if properly worked. As to these twenty-nine grievances, the reason why there should not be an investigation of them is only imaginary. As the Minister of Railways knows, these were included in the schedule that the men presented for ratification or for discussion. They asked that a certain schedule be applied to them and that includes such things as promotion, salary, recognition and methods of adjusting differences—twenty-nine in all. These things are included in almost every schedule that is presented to any railway company or minister of railways or board of management. This organization is a little bit peculiar in this respect that it includes practically all the employees not included in other brotherhoods. There is the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Firemen and Maintenance of Way. But, there are several classes, such as clerks, freight handlers, porters, &c., who did not belong to any organization. It was thought desirable that as all the other employees on the various railways belonged to brotherhoods that looked after their interests, those who had no home, so to speak, although they had various forms of employment on the railway, should be brought into a fold of their own and called by one common name.

Now, the peculiar situation is this, that the Government itself, on its own railway, gives this very brotherhood the things that it asks for a board to compel a railway company to give. That is the anomalous position in which the Government finds itself. The Intercolonial railway management, with the approval of the department, has recognized this brotherhood, has granted it a schedule as to salaries, promotions, everything that the other brotherhoods have practically in the different departments in which they labour, but when the same brotherhood, including the same class of men with the same arrangements,

comes to the Government and says: Give us a board so that we will have a chance to show that we have good reason to ask this company to improve our conditions in order that they may be equal to the conditions that you, yourself, give us on your own road, the Government declines to give such a board.

Mr. CROTHERS: Speaking from memory, I think that is not true, that all the different classes mentioned in this application were granted by the Intercolonial railway or the Government what they asked for. The Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals sent me a list showing those included in those applications whose requests were not granted by the former Government when my hon. friend was Minister of Railways.

Mr. GRAHAM: My memory is—and of course it does not affect the principle at all—they were all included. Some of them may have been left out, but it is true that the Government recognized this brotherhood and, after consultation with the brotherhood, came to a settlement with them in regard to their various grievances and requests. A board, if granted in the first place, might not have given this brotherhood all they asked, but they would have recognized them and given them probably all to which they were entitled. If the Lemieux Act is carried out, or if any other law along the line is to be made workable, it has to be done with an eye, not only to the interests of the men but to the interests of the company as well. There is no particular reason why a board should not be granted and let them make the investigation. That is what the Act is for, that is what the provision for a board is for. I have tried to point out that the various grievances, even if there were a thousand of them, would not be a reason for not granting a board because the greater the number of grievances the greater the necessity for having them redressed. The wide extent of territory covered is no good reason for refusing a board. I cannot see that it is any reason at all. The board does not have to visit the entire territory it does not have to go over all the ground, it does not have to ask all the men to come as witnesses, but it can sit in one central place, bring one or two witnesses from every division and in that way cover every case. The grievances of these men will be in common; in fact, the officers, in a great many cases, can give all the evidence that is required. It might take a little longer than if the territory were smaller or it might take a little longer than if there was only one class of employment.

But, what is the Department of Labour for? To bring labour troubles to an end, if possible, and, if they are too great to be solved in that way, to bring the men and companies together through this board. That is work the Department of Labour should do, and that is what it has been established to do. I am reminded by an hon. member that the Department of Labour has nothing else to do, and the whole hearing of that grievance would not have entailed as much labour on the department as a Cabinet minister has to perform every three or four days at least while the House is in session. Perhaps I might be excused were I to speak with some warmth on this question, because, throughout the length and breadth of Ontario particularly, and all over the Dominion of Canada, for weeks and months, I, as Minister of Railways, although I had no connection with the Labour Department, was enthusiastically lied about, because I did not settle the Grand Trunk Railway strike. Men were paid to go through the province of Ontario and through the county of South Renfrew to tell the railwaymen that I had deceived them, that instead of helping them I had worked against their interests in all of which there was not an iota of truth from top to bottom, and, as time goes by that falsehood is being nailed, and during the past few weeks I have many evidences that the railwaymen are beginning to find out on which side of the House their real friends are to be found.

Mr. W. A. BUCHANAN (Medicine Hat): I have been accused of having become a partisan of the Minister of Labour because I commended his action in going through western Canada and investigating labour conditions there, but to-day I have to criticise the action of the minister in connection with the matter which we are now discussing. I believe that this particular brotherhood has been treated unjustly; I believe that they have the right to have their case considered by a board of conciliation, and that the report of such a board should have been given consideration by the Minister of Labour. One of the main contentions set up by the men was for recognition of the order, and let me point out that it is a Canadian order incorporated under the laws of Canada and in that respect it differs from many of the other labour organizations in connection with the railways of Canada. Those of us who are anxious to build up the union forces as Canadian institutions are anxious to encourage this particular order and the Government of Canada seemingly did so by giving it recognition on the Government railways. I can say, from evidence which

has been submitted to me, that the wages paid by the Canadian Pacific railway to these employees in western Canada are outrageously low. The Minister of Labour refused the application for a board of conciliation at the commencement and following that refusal the men in western Canada went out on strike. They were quite willing to go back to work as soon as the minister granted the board, but so far as western Canada is concerned, he has not yet done so. A board was granted, as I understand it, with respect to from Port Arthur east, and I have been told that the minister promised that if, that board reported in favour of the men he would be quite willing to grant a board for western Canada.

Mr. CROTHERS: It was stated in the first place that if the award that might be made by the board appointed to investigate in reference to the Ottawa division were not satisfactory; if that board did not get all the evidence that the men desired to place before the public, and they desired a further board for the West it would be granted. I understand they are satisfied; they do not want any more evidence; they have not asked for any.

Mr. BUCHANAN: The report of the majority of the board for eastern Canada was favourable to the men in regard to the particular matters investigated. If the Minister of Labour had taken the same attitude in respect to the Canadian Pacific railway in this case as he took last year when he held up a Bill concerning the Grand Trunk because they did not settle with their men, the employees of the Canadian Pacific railway might have been able to get satisfaction from the company in this particular instance. But Sir, there is an impression amongst the railway employees of western Canada, that the Canadian Pacific railway has been able to get the ear of the Minister of Labour and to prevent investigations being held. This is not the only case in which investigation was refused during the past year. I have in mind the case of the Brotherhood of Railroad Conductors in Alberta, who applied for a board of conciliation in regard to a dispute they had with the Canadian Pacific railway as to the treatment of certain conductors, and the Minister of Labour, on a technicality which I do not think he could properly defend in this House refused to grant the board. The men out there feel that the Canadian Pacific railway employees are not given that fair treatment by the Government to which they are entitled. The Minister of Labour speaks of the difficulty of dealing with this particular case on account of the number of classes of labour that were included in this brotherhood, but in western Canada numerous investigations have been held in connection with the mine workers and as we know there are a great many classes of labour included in the mine workers organization and it takes a long time to investigate their complaints, but in nearly every case these investigations have brought about a settlement by reason of the publicity given. There would, I am sure, be no difficulty in following the same course in the case of the Brotherhood of Railway Employees. The publicity feature of the Industrial Disputes Investigation Act is the strongest feature in it, because by this publicity practically the public are left to decide the merits of the case, and had there been that publicity in this instance which the law contemplates, I am quite sure that a settlement would have been effected long ago.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw): I think there is more importance to be attached to this discussion than might appear on the surface. The question involved is one which touches two of the most important problems we have in Canada; it touches the labour question and it touches it at perhaps its most important point, namely, the part labour performs in carrying on our transportation. In might be in the mind of the Minister of Labour that the body of men who approached him were of comparatively minor importance, but the principle is there just the same. If the minister is to say to one that his Department—or his court, for in a sense it is a court—is to be open only when he in his arbitrary fashion so wills, and that he, for reasons best known to himself, and kept almost entirely to himself, may sometimes deny those privileges and this means to obtain justice, he takes away not only the usefulness of the Department of Labour, but he takes away the confidence of the working people in that department. It will require very few instances such as this to confirm in the minds of the workingmen of the Dominion the suspicion that the Department of Labour is not an impartial tribunal. What is it that has made such a success of our Board of Railway Commissioners? It is that at both ends of the game they have the most implicit confidence, when they appear before that department, that they are getting what is called a square deal. Let the impression go out once or twice, which has undoubtedly gone out in this instance, that the hon. Minister of Labour has not had an open ear or open mind for the labouring people, and the usefulness of that department is at an end. The principle is there, if in a question of doubt or a matter in which my hon. friend is not certain whether he will give the railway the benefit of the doubt, I think that

is more serious than if the other impression should prevail. The minister should guard himself more particularly against refusing the services of his department for the poor and the weak, because it is just for the poor and the weak that his department exists. If it is a question of might being right, and might prevailing, then there is no excuse for the Department of Labour. It is just to avoid conflicts between capital and labour, and just to prevent the strong from bullying the weak, that the Department of Labour exists. I for one wish to express the hope that the Minister of Labour, when another occasion arises will not be afraid of erring on the side of the weak and on the side of the labouring classes, and not on the side of the great corporations.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou): I do not think that the Minister of Labour, on the only occasion when a matter affecting his department has been before the House for consideration since the opening of the session, should hold up his hands and plead for special consideration, because he did not get special notice of this motion to-day. It is eminently proper and right that courtesy should always exist between members on both sides of the House in regard to bringing on the discussion of special questions. Personally I have two matters on the Order Paper, in regard to which I have understandings with ministers on the other side of the House, as to when they shall be discussed. It is hardly fair for the Prime Minister to take the ground that when matters are not reached on these private members' days, we are only entitled to discuss them in the House by special courtesy, because there is no way in which they can be dealt with, except the method which at present prevails.

Mr. BORDEN: If a motion is not reached, it drops, at least, it does not retain its precedence unless it stands by consent. That has always been done as a matter of common courtesy, and sometimes motions have stood three, four and five times. I suggest that when that is done, and ministers are very much engaged with departmental affairs, the same courtesy might very well be extended by the other side of notifying the minister that a motion, which has stood four or five times, will be brought up on a particular day.

Mr. MACDONALD: I quite agree that that courtesy should exist between hon. members on both sides of the House; but I thought the hon. gentleman in his previous remarks was indicating that the Opposition were receiving some special consideration, because their motions remained on the Order Paper.

Mr. KNOWLES.

Mr. BORDEN: There is a rule in regard to it.

Mr. MACDONALD: I know the rule; but I also know it is impossible to adhere strictly to the rule that certain particular subjects be brought up on particular days. Apart from all that—and I should be the last one to say that courtesy should not exist—my hon. friend the Minister of Labour has not had occasion to be bothered, as he has not been in his seat often when private members' days are on. I have no doubt that my hon. friend, who has made this motion, has frequently allowed the matter to stand because the Minister of Labour was not here. I want to say further that the Minister of Labour, when this one particular item, which I think is the only one on the Order Paper relating to his department, comes up, ought to be prepared to discuss it at any time, without having to apologize to the House that he has not his papers with him, or is not able to give the House full information. The Minister of Labour is not overworked by any means; and if he adopts the policy in regard to this question of the operation of this Act respecting industrial disputes, that he is not going to grant boards except when he chooses, he will have still less work to do. I think he ought to be prepared at any time to defend his action one way or the other in the House. If he is going to do less work in the office, he ought to be in a position to do more work in the House. I followed with some care the ground upon which the Minister of Labour sought to justify his failure to deal with the question; practically he said, because there were twenty-nine grievances, therefore there was something wrong, and he could not put this Act into operation. The Act contemplates certain statutory, preliminary requirements that must be complied with by those who seek to avail themselves of its propositions. The minister has the right to see first whether the matter of the complaint is one which comes within the provisions of section 2 of the Act, where the definition is given as to the matters that are to be dealt with. As soon as he decides that the subject matter of the complaint comes within the purview of the Act, all the minister has to do is to see that the statutory requirements have been complied with. The fact that there are twenty-nine grounds of complaint is no reason why the minister should refrain from granting a board or delaying in regard to the matter. If the Act is not sufficiently broad for the minister at this time to exercise his functions under the Act, and permit the investigation to be made, because of the numerous classes of grievances that are to be discussed, then the minister ought to amend the Act in order

to make it more clear. The minister does not proposed to amend the Act, notwithstanding the fact that a large number of the hon. gentleman's friends in my province, where we have a large number of working men, went to the country in 1908, and declared that this Industrial Disputes and Investigation Act was a menace to labour in this country. Notwithstanding that position was taken everywhere and appeals were made in regard to the pledges given to labouring men in my county, the hon. member comes into office, and as Minister of Labour assumes the responsibility of that Act; accepts it as a piece of good legislation, and sits in his place as a minister for a year and six months without proposing any amendment to it and without apparently intending to propose any amendment to it. In connection with this Industrial Disputes and Investigation Act and its operation and effect, my hon. friend the Minister of Labour either considers it a good Act or he does not consider it a good Act, either it is an Act which is in the interests of preventing strife, a piece of legislation which affords a means whereby disputes between labour and capital can be settled amicably, or it is not. If the Minister of Labour thinks it a good Act, he should enforce it according to its provisions; if he does not think it a good Act, why does he not amend it? I asked the Minister of Labour before the holidays what his views were in regard to this Act and whether he thought it should be amended. I know that there are gentlemen, if not sitting behind him, there were some who sat alongside of him in the last House, who were very strenuous in their objections, who went to their constituents in my province, particularly the mining population, and declared that if the Conservative party came into power, this Act would be repealed. My hon. friend the Minister of Labour does not attempt to repeal it; he is apparently attempting to nullify it by preventing the operations of its terms; that is the way he intends to carry out the promises made by his associates. It seems to me it is about time the Minister of Labour should tell this House and the country just where he stands in regard to the matter, and whether he intends in good faith to carry out this piece of legislation. The House and the country ought to know whether the Minister of Labour intends to operate this Act which is on the statute-book fairly and equitably as he finds it, or if he thinks it inadequate in any way, whether he intends to amend it or whether or not he intends to nullify it by failure to put into force its provisions. That is the question which naturally arises in the discussion of this resolution.

Mr. W. F. CARROLL (South Cape Breton): I am one of those who always took the ground that the means provided by this Act were the best possible means of settling disputes between capital and labour; and I have found it necessary on all occasions, in my part of the country, the mining district of Nova Scotia, to defend this Act from the attacks of the friends of the present Government. All through the Dominion elections of 1908 and 1911, the Conservative candidates in the ridings of South Cape Breton and North Cape Breton took the ground that this was not a good Act and that it was not of benefit to the labouring classes. Last year, I asked the Minister of Labour, during the discussion of his estimates, if it was his intention to amend this Act in any way, and he said that no such intention was then under consideration. Now, I take it that if this Act is not workable, if it is not good for the purpose for which it is intended, it should be removed and some other Act put in its place. But we find that the Act is acceptable to the present Minister of Labour and to the Government, and the only question now is as to the administrating of it. Yet, on almost the first occasion on which the present Minister of Labour has been called upon to administer it he has failed.

Mr. CROTHERS: I desire to correct the hon. gentleman. There were thirty boards appointed during the past year.

Mr. CARROLL: I allowed for that; I said 'almost.'

Mr. CROTHERS: The hon. gentleman should stick to the truth.

Mr. CARROLL: I am sticking to the truth. I said 'almost' the first time the minister was called upon to administer the Act in a serious case, he has failed to administer it according to its terms. It is not sufficient for him to come before the House and the country and tell us that these labouring people, who have not the technical knowledge of this Act, failed on technical points in bringing their application before the department. That is no reason why an application should be turned down. I know as a matter of fact, that under the Department of Labour some years ago very many applications were made which were technically not correct, but, on all occasions with which I had anything to do, it was pointed out to the people concerned that the applications had been improperly made, and they were allowed to renew their applications. Again, we are given to understand that this application was refused, in the first instance, because it involved too many difficulties, too much trouble

and because there were too many classes of people who had applied for the same board. I would point out that if this application had been granted, rules would go into force which would affect these classes of employees of the Canadian Pacific railway from the Pacific to the Atlantic. They would draw up a schedule of wages for each particular class, and it would be as easy to investigate all these classes under one board as it would be to investigate them under twenty. As a matter of fact, if the custom which the Minister of Labour has laid down were established, then, when he appointed a board for a certain division of the Canadian Pacific railway he would have to go over the same work as many times as there are divisions on the system. That does not strike me as being a good cause for turning down an application, any more than the other cause alleged by the minister, that there were too many grievances to be corrected. Why, that is the very reason why the Act was put upon the statute-book. The more grievances there are to be investigated, and the more classes of labour are affected, the more reason for investigation. I think that is a lame excuse for the Minister of Labour to give for refusing the application of the Canadian Pacific railway employees.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I do not rise with the intention of making a speech, because I did not intend from the beginning to make a speech; I merely intended to move for the papers to enable me to get the information on the matter before I speak to the House on this question.

Mr. SPEAKER: Before the hon. member closes the debate, if there are others who desire to speak, this is their opportunity.

Mr. RICHARD BLAIN (Peel): I desire to say a very few words on this resolution. The motion before the House is for a copy of all correspondence, &c., exchanged between the Minister of Labour and the Canadian Pacific railway strikers on their application for a board of conciliation and investigation. That seems to me a very reasonable resolution, and I am sure it will be voted for unanimously. The correspondence passing between a minister of the Crown and any person in this country having a grievance may fairly be called for to be placed upon the table of this House; and the Prime Minister and Minister of Labour have assented to the terms of this resolution. Why hon. gentlemen on the other side should take so much time discussing this question without the papers is something more than I can understand. Why do not they wait until the correspondence which will reveal the facts is laid upon the table of the House before they take it up so fully? I cannot see any reason except that they are very anxious to get something upon which to condemn the Minister of Labour, rather than to assist the labouring men who have grievances against the Canadian Pacific railway. If there were any disposition on the part of the Minister of Labour to refuse the House information, if there were a disposition on the part of the Government to withhold any correspondence, then these hon. gentlemen would be right in bringing the matter up and discussing it at this moment. The hon. member for Pictou stated that when the Lemieux Act was passed a large number of members in opposition objected and stated in effect, that when their party came into power, of course, they would repeal this law by unanimous consent. I was in the House when that matter was discussed, and I think I remember the debate clearly. I do not think there was any criticism of the nature indicated, nor will 'Hansard' show that there was any such criticism. There was a considerable discussion upon the Act. Why should not there be criticisms offered concerning a law of this kind when the matter is up for discussion? But nothing was said at that time with a view to preventing the Act from being used as far as possible for the benefit of the public and of those who have grievances for settlement. Those who speak in this way think to lend colour to their suggestion that there had been a refusal on the part of the minister to grant a board to investigate the grievances in this case. The hon. Minister of Labour clearly pointed out that he did grant the board. And when the board was granted, those having grievances came forward, stated their case, and a decision was given. Surely the minister cannot be condemned for that. If my hon. friends wish to discuss the decision that was rendered, that is an entirely different matter, but there should be no hasty condemnation. I cannot see why hon. gentlemen, before the documents are placed on the table of the House, and before they have seen or read the correspondence that has taken place, should be so ready to strongly condemn a Government that has done everything possible, and a minister who has done everything possible, to give the men an opportunity of expressing their grievances, and to take such action as to make the grievances right as between the men and the Canadian Pacific railway.

I do not think I can add anything further to the debate upon this matter. For my part, I think that what the right hon. leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Labour have stated ought to be sufficient to dispose of this resolution. I am sure the hon. gentleman who moved the resolu-

tion would not suggest that this discussion should broaden out to any very great extent, but that the House should wait patiently in view of the fact that the Government are so willing to lay on the table of the House everything in connection with the whole matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I had not intended to discuss the merits of this case when I put this resolution before the House. As the minister stated a moment ago, this resolution has been on the Order Paper practically since the beginning of the session, and my hon. friend the Minister of Labour should not have been surprised, when it was brought up, if some of the members evidenced a willingness to discuss the question to which it refers. I say again that I had no intention of discussing the merits of the case; in fact, when you, Mr. Speaker, read the motion this afternoon, I looked across the table and saw that the minister was not in his seat. I queried the Prime Minister, who immediately stated that the hon. minister would come back, and I understood from him that I should proceed with the moving of the resolution. I fully understand that, as a matter of courtesy, when any attack is to be made against any of the departments, the minister naturally expects from the opposition benches a notice that such an attack is proposed to be made. I repeat again—for I desire to maintain my reputation for courtesy in the debates of this House—that I would not take any undue advantage of the absence of a minister, or the fact that he was not informed of my intention of attacking him.

I would like to say a word or two, now that the matter has been gone into, about the Act itself. The reason why the motion is chiefly to know the whys and wherefores of this strike. As a great deal of correspondence was published last fall in the newspapers blaming the minister for his conduct in the matter, I wanted to ascertain the facts of the case. The hon. minister is aware that at the last labour congress held in Guelph, Ontario, a motion was passed dealing with the Lemieux Act, and one of the reasons adduced by the labour people for condemnation of the Act was the character of the administration of that Act by the Department of Labour. I am free to say that, knowing as I do the officers who administer the affairs of the Department of Labour, I believe there is no desire on their part to make this Act unworkable. On the contrary, knowing, as I do, Mr. Ackland, the very able deputy head of the department, as well as the other officers, I feel sure there is no ill-will in that department, but I am under the impression that the decision of the minister in the present case was practically the cause of the resolution adopted at the last session of the labour congress.

Mr. CROTHERS: That congress was held long before there was any refusal of a board in this case, and the only case referred to as justification for condemning the department for delay was the one respecting the Montreal Street Railway Company, an application in regard to which was made before we came to power. A similar resolution was passed by the same congress at the convention held in Calgary in the summer of 1911. This matter was delayed not by reason of any fault on the part of my predecessor, but by reason of an application made to the courts of Montreal, which granted a stay of proceedings.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Let me read this resolution adopted by the congress:

> While this Congress still believes in the principle of investigation and conciliation and while recognizing that benefits have accrued at times to various bodies of workmen under the operation of the Lemieux Act; yet, in view of decisions, rulings, and delays of the Department of Labour in connection with the administration of the Act——

And so on. The present case, which is the object of this motion, may have happened after this sitting of the Congress. But one can also see that one of the objections urged by the labour people against the administration of the Act is the fact that there are delays incurred and technical objections raised by the department. Whilst I do not wish to deal with the merits of the case in question, I may say that if the hon. gentleman gives, in the cases that come before him, the same ruling which he endeavoured to explain this afternoon, it is not at all surprising that the labour classes demand the repeal of the Act. The hon. minister must not forget that since the inception of this Act, the Labour Department has itself, practically in all cases, prepared the procedure for the applicants, and it was the intention of the law that the Department of Labour should willingly and freely lend its services in order to facilitate to the labour classes the investigation provided by the Act. The hon. minister cannot get away from the fact that whenever an application is made to him, it is his duty to help, as much as possible, the framing of the procedure necessary to put the board in operation. The very title of the first Act passed by this Parliament indicates the intention of the legislation. It is an act of conciliation and of investigation, and such an Act cannot be safely operated unless the minister and his employees in the Department of Labour facilitate to the applying parties the speedy creation of a conciliatory board.

The minister should not be afraid of the magnitude of the case. We all know that labour has sometimes imaginary grievances, but when labourers come with a series of grievances it is quite easy for the minister or the deputy head of the department to find out which of them shows where the shoe pinches. I hope, therefore, that in the future my hon. friend the Minister of Labour will not be deterred from acting by the fact that twenty-nine or thirty grievances are brought to his attention by labourers. He could easily select from the list of grievances those that obviously should be investigated. I need not say that this Act, in spite of the resolution adopted by the Labour Congress last fall, has been the instrument of settling within the last five or six years ninety per cent out of one hundred. I do not know what the statistics of the Department of Labour were for last year. My hon. friend said he had thirty or thirty-five boards, but I dare say the percentage is about the same. It would be a great pity, indeed, if through undue severity or undue leanings—the department should defeat the very ends of this legislation. The Minister of Labour in a case of investigation should be like justice itself, above all suspicion and such leanings. The fundamental principle of this legislation is to investigate the causes of conflicts, or quarrels before quarrels or conflicts actually take place. It is based on the well known dictum of Abraham Lincoln, that if you must have a quarrel why not settle it before, rather than after. Therefore, it is of the most importance that acting on that principle the Act should above all be given fair play by the head of the Department of Labour, as I hope it will be given fair play in the future.

Motion agreed to.

THE RULE ON NOTICES OF MOTION.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have already called attention to the rule governing notices of motion, but in view of the fact that it seems to be overlooked sometimes, I may be permitted to call attention to it again. Rule 31 provides:

> Notice of motions not taken up when called may, upon the request of the Government, be allowed to stand and retain their precedence; otherwise they will disappear from the Order Paper.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the rule in case the Government is not ready?

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the Government will then say stand.

Mr. EMMERSON: We will hear of it again.

Mr. MacNUTT: I rise to a question of privilege. A few days ago there appeared in the Winnipeg papers and in a number of other papers, the report of a speech made, or purported to have been made, by Sir Rodmond Roblin, Prime Minister of Manitoba. According to that report I was bracketted with the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Oliver) as having corrupted the electorate of Macdonald by taking into that constituency money and whiskey and heelers.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have already had a similar question before the House. I did not refer to the rule then, but I think it my duty to do so now. With reference to what is usually called a question of privilege, there appears to be a wide difference of opinion. Bourinot says with reference to it in the third edition of his book:

> In the Canadian Commons members have been in the habit of correcting reports of their speeches, or inaccurate statements in the press on the ground of privilege; but these are personal explanations, not matters of privilege, and are allowed by the indulgence of the House.

Mr. PELLETIER: We have had this question discussed already this afternoon.

Mr. MacNUTT: I suppose the hon. member for Edmonton can take care of himself, but he is not supposed to deal with my case. I think I can deal with that myself.

Mr. PELLETIER: The hon. member for Edmonton has thought fit to say very ugly things about a gentleman who is absent from this House.

Mr. MACDONALD: What did the other man say about the hon. member for Edmonton who was far away.

Mr. CARVELL: The hon. member for Edmonton did not deny the statement referring to the hon. member for Saltcoats (Mr. MacNutt.).

Mr. PELLETIER: I think the hon. member for Edmonton went far enough this afternoon.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that there is no objection to the hon. member being heard. If it was objected to, my ruling would be that he is not entitled to be heard.

Mr. PELLETIER: This afternoon the member for Edmonton rose to a question of privilege in order to make an attack upon Sir Rodmond Roblin, Prime Minister of Manitoba.

Mr. MACDONALD: Not at all.

Mr. MURPHY: He is not immune from attack.

Mr. PELLETIER: When he is not present—

Mr. MURPHY: What about this hon. member when he was attacked in Manitoba?

Mr. MACDONALD: What about Roblin attacking in Manitoba the hon. member for Edmonton who was here?

Mr. PELLETIER Let them fight it out between themselves.

Mr. SPEAKER: I would like it to be well understood what a question of privilege is. It gives a right to an hon. member which he does not enjoy in other circumstances. That was my object in drawing the attention of the House to it.

Mr. MacNUTT: I have no desire to make any attack on anybody in the present case, but simply to place this matter right so far as I am concerned.

Mr. PELLETIER: This is not the proper time for that, and I object.

Mr. MacNUTT: This is what was said:

In no case——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. MacNUTT: I am reading this statement.

Mr. SPEAKER: As it is objected to, I must rule that this is not the proper time to take it up either as a question of privilege or by the indulgence of the House. If it is by the indulgence of the House it must be with the absolute consent of the House without any objection.

Mr. MACDONALD: Do we understand that the hon. the Postmaster General objects to the hon. member for Saltcoats contradicting this slander on himself?

Mr. SPEAKER: That was my understanding.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let there be no misunderstanding. The rule has been laid down by Mr. Speaker, and we know what it means. It has already been violated this afternoon by the hon. member from Edmonton, and the Prime Minister of the province of Manitoba has been attacked in his absence. I do not think that should be repeated.

Mr. EMMERSON: I think the hon. the Postmaster General is out of order.

Mr. PELLETIER: Let us drop it.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): I wish to be perfectly clear about one of these explanations for which we are from time to time indebted to yourself. You have made very clear to me the difference between a question of privilege and a personal explanation. What I want to be clear about is this: Whenever a gentleman like my hon. friend (Mr. MacNutt) rises to make a personal explanation, in doing so, is corrected by you, does he require to have the consent of every individual member in this House? Is that what is meant by the consent of the House, or would it not rather be the evident consent of the House, an expression that is commonly used in the British House as meaning the huge majority of the House? I want to know exactly from you whether one gentleman objecting can say to every other member of this House that the consent of the House shall not be given for a personal explanation, especially in the case of a gentleman like my hon. friend, who has himself acted, with very great credit, for many years as speaker of a provincial house and has no personal enemies in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: I take it that the indulgence of the House practically means the consent of the House, and the consent of the House must mean the consent of the whole House. With reference to a question of privilege, there are two considerations involved. One is as to the time at which it may be taken up, and the other is, what is in reality a question of privilege? A question of privilege may be taken up before the Orders of the Day are entered upon or at any other time during the business of the House so long as it does not interupt the proceeding under consideration at that time. But, it would require to be of such gravity as to justify an hon. member bringing it up at any time except the proper time or while other business is going on, as in this case. With regard to the indulgence of the House, I take it that the indulgence means the unanimous consent of the House. Whether right or wrong, that is my understanding of the matter.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—EXTENSION TO NON-RAILWAY COUNTIES.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the time has arrived in the commercial and industrial development of the province of Nova Scotia when the Intercolonial railway of Canada should be extended into the non-railway counties of the eastern section of that province.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to introduce this motion to-day, but as the Government thinks it proper to adhere rigidly to the rules I shall not ask for any indulgence but will proceed with the motion. I hope that this rigid application of rules will not be lop-sided and that it will be applied to the right as well as to the left.

Mr. SPEAKER: The observations of the hon. member are scarcely in order, he is

reflecting upon the Chair. I have endeavoured to be as impartial as my human nature will enable me, and I hope the hon. member does not mean to have inferred anything to the contrary.

Mr. McKENZIE: I readily understand that the Chair has to put the rules into force with strictness when the attention of the Chair is called to them, and my reference is to ministers and supporters of the Government who have thought it proper to apply for a rigid enforcement of these rules which it seems to me is not necessary. It so happens in this case, that it does not make very much difference whether I move this motion now or not. I hear the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and some of his supporters say hear, hear, to that, and I want my people in the county of Victoria and in the province of Nova Sotia to know that hon. gentlemen supporting the Government see fit to receive in that manner, a statement as to whether or not it is desirable to have the needs of my province brought before this Parliament.

Mr. HAZEN: If the hon. member refers to me, he is absolutely in error. I never opened my mouth or uttered a syllable in regard to the matter one way or the other.

Mr. McKENZIE: Then it was his friend behind him from British Columbia who broke in.

Mr. BARNARD: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: And possibly the Postmaster General.

Mr. PELLETIER: I did not open my mouth either.

Mr. McKENZIE: It would not be advisable for the Postmaster General to open his mouth, because every time he does he puts his foot in it. This question of railways in the Maritime provinces and particularly in the province of Nova Scotia has been discussed often and often in this House, and to-day I shall confine my observations to the lack of railway communication in the county of Victoria, which is one of the non-railway counties in Nova Scotia. There were days in the history of Canada and in the history of the finances of this country when lack of money might be pleaded as a reason why these necessary works could not be undertaken, but we have now reached that stage of financial affluence when we have really more money than we can handle in this country, and when the congestion is to be relieved by sending some thirty-five million dollars of our money out of the country. If we have money to that extent, which enables us not only to attend to our own urgent needs at home but besides to send this enormous amount to help our friends across the water, no good reason can be given to the people of Nova Scotia and the people of the island of Cape Breton and of the county of Victoria, why their railway needs should not be attended to. I submit to the Prime Minister and to the members of his Government that on this question a decision was reached in 1910 and in the early part of 1911, to which decision the Prime Minister was a consenting party. The necessity for a railway in the county of Victoria was then acknowledged, the money was appropriated by this Parliament for the building of that railway, and proper steps were taken to commence to build it. The county of Victoria was not alone included in the provision made by Parliament, but the county of Halifax by common consent, and the county of Guysborough, and a part of the county of Pictou, were included in the batch of counties that were regarded as non-railway counties and for which the moneys were provided. I am not finding fault with the Prime Minister because he is getting a railway built in the eastern part of Halifax county and possibly extending slightly into the county of Guysborough, but I submit to him that he was a consenting party to the solemn decision arrived at by this House that not only should the railway be built in the county of Halifax, but in the county of Victoria and in the county of Guysborough as well. I do find fault with the Prime Minister that while he continues the work in his own county of Halifax, he is a consenting party and possibly the moving party in cutting out the continuation of the same work in the counties of Victoria and Guysborough. The province of Nova Scotia is not so very large that it should be subjected to sectionalism of this kind. The very same need which exists for a railway in the county of Halifax exists in the counties of Victoria and Guysborough and if it is fair and right to build this railway in the county of Halifax, it is equally fair and right and proper and necessary to build a railway in the counties of Guysborough and Victoria. The Government is under the very same obligations to the people of Victoria and Guysborough that it is under to the people of Halifax, or Yarmouth, or any other part of Nova Scotia. The rule was laid down by the Minister of Railways last year that no railway would be built unless there was a fair prospect from a business standpoint that the traffic on it would be sufficient to pay the interest on the expenditure, and while that prospect may be justifiable, it is strange that the only section of this line which it was ad-

mitted would not pay the interest, is the very section, which, in the province of Nova Scotia, the Minister of Railways is now building. A gentleman who was a colleague of the Prime Minister in this House before the last election, made a speech upon the resolution which I moved on the 12th of November, 1910. In that speech he acknowledged that the road in the eastern part of Halifax county would not pay interest. The Prime Minister himself, then leader of the Opposition, on appearing in Halifax and advocating the building of the road by the former Government, admitted that for the first year at all events there was not a very great prospect of this road paying the interest. In the face of that evidence, we have that road being built, whereas roads that have so very much better reasons for being built that they would come within the very rigid rule of the minister, were left out in the cold. It is quite unnecessary for me at this stage to bring again to the notice of the Minister of Railways the steps which have been taken. The good faith of the position which we took at that time has been proved over and over again; that is not questioned by the Department of Railways, by the Government, or by the people of the county of Victoria. All we ask, and all I urge upon the Government is that the same even-handed justice should be meted out to us in that section of the country, that is handed out to other parts of the province of Nova Scotia. I submit that the county of Victoria is one of the oldest settled countries in eastern Canada; its coast line is very extensive; its fisheries are extensive; its mineral resources are extensive; but on account of bad railway facilities, it is impossible for us to induce capital to give attention to the development that the importance of these resources demand. We had hoped that after a delay of nearly two hundred years, we would be given this boon of a railway; it has not been given to us; it has been cut off. It is not yet too late, and I speak with due deference as to the ideas that the Prime Minister may have about this matter, that I may be doing him an injustice in saying that he has treated us somewhat harshly in this matter. He may have good things in his mind in respect to us; but it is certainly my duty to bring to the notice of this Government, as I have persisted in bringing to the notice of the former Government, the needs that we have in the county which I have the honour to represent. As I succeeded in having this thing acknowledged, the principle admitted and the money voted by a former administration, surely my right hon. friend does not think he is assuming any particular responsibility in carrying out what no member on either side of the House can criticise as a question of principle. It has been admitted; it has been acted upon; and there is nothing now really but to carry out the solemn contract into which this Parliament has entered to give to the county of Victoria and the other non-railway counties of the provinces what they stand so much in need of and what was really denied them when they should have had it many years ago. I need not tell the Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways or the Government the many excellent resources we have in the county of Victoria and in the other non-railway sections of the province. I speak on this occasion without any particular preparation; I had no intention of bringing this motion up to-day; but I am rather forced to bring it up, and I am glad to have it dealt with at as early a stage as possible. Even now I think I have sufficiently reminded the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways of the true condition of things to enable them to have no doubt as to what their course will be in regard to what the real purpose of this motion is.

Mr. BORDEN: I was not in when my hon. friend alluded to some particular line of railway in his own constituency, to which he desired to call the attention of the Government.

Mr. McKENZIE: The Prime Minister will remember that in 1910 and 1911, it was intended to build some section in the county of Halifax, in the county of Guysborough, and in the county of Victoria. It was from a place called Estmere, that the road which was contemplated at that time, and which the former Government undertook to build.

Mr. EMMERSON: In the consideration of this question there is a section of eastern Nova Scotia which certainly is entitled to a great deal of consideration; and in giving that portion of Nova Scotia consideration, it will also be giving to a large section of the county of Westmorland railway facilities, which would be to the very great advantage to the people of that section as well as of very great advantage to the Intercolonial railway itself. I refer to the construction of an extension of what is known as the Shediac branch of the Intercolonial, down through the parish of Shediac to Cape Bald, and thence on through the parishes of Botsford and Westmorland along by way of Baie Verte to the county of Cumberland, through Tignish and thence on to the eastern portion of Nova Scotia, affording transportation facilities to a large section of eastern Canada that is now entirely deprived of those facilities. I simply mention the extension of this particular branch, if the principle involved in this resolution is

accepted and approved of by the Government, I invite particularly the attention of the Minister of Railways to this section. It could be done in a way that would be a very great advantage in connection with the Intercolonial itself.

Mr. BORDEN: What would be the eastern terminus?

Mr. EMMERSON: The eastern terminus would be in Halifax or what is known as the Brulé route. Perhaps my right hon. friend the leader of the Government is familiar with that route known as the Brulé route.

Mr. BORDEN: That was from Truro to Brulé.

Mr. EMMERSON: Yes, it would come out at Truro. Some people have recommended that that railway should go to Country Harbour; others have advocated that such a line of railway, that is an extension to Painsec through the county of Westmorland, Cumberland and Colchester should come out at Truro; in any event it solves the problem which I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Railways has had presented to him for solution in connection with the double-tracking of the Intercolonial. There are those who advocate the double tracking of the Intercolonial from Moncton right through to Truro, and thence to Halifax; there are others as well who claim that it would be to the very great advantage of Canada that the Intercolonial should have a second route, not exactly a double track along the same roadway, but it would afford an outlet for the congestion of freight business. If it were constructed from Painsec junction, where there is a double tracking between Moncton and that point, if that were extended on through the parishes of Shediac, Botsford, Westmorland and through the rich and fruitful county of Cumberland, thence on through Colchester, and then either go to Truro or more directly to the eastern section of the province of Nova Scotia, whichever route was deemed the most favourable, would be a very great advantage to the Intercolonial as a transportation railway. It would be of immeasurable advantage to those sections of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia which it would thus traverse. I simply invite the attention of the Minister of Railways to this project which has been under consideration for many years. It is a proposition which I have always favoured, and I believe it is one the execution of which would be justified today. These matters, however, are always the result of an evolution of ideas and conditions, and come about with the change in the course of trade events and the educative forces which influence the judgment of men. I think the public mind is ready for the acceptance of this idea. It becomes only a question of adopting the principle and constructing additional branches of the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I placed a resolution on the Order Paper, which I intended to discuss at a future day, relating to the same matter as affecting the constituency I have the honour to represent. But as the matter is before the House, and as the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways are in their places, I desire to say a few words with regard to the matter. We had not the pleasure of the presence of the Prime Minister the other day when the question was being discussed, and the Minister of Railways did not favour us with very much information with regard to what he intended to do in eastern Nova Scotia. Besides, the hour was late, and the resolution to which we were speaking was adjourned.

This matter is of very great importance to the county I have the honour to represent. The history of what has taken place in the last three years need not be repeated, as it is familiar to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways. Referring to the remarks of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), as to a proper terminus of the road when extended, I would point out again, as I have done on various occasions before, the advantages of the port of Country Harbour. There are also great advantages in regard to the line itself, the main one being that it passes through a level country where there would be very slight engineering difficulties, and where a good level road corresponding with the other parts of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway could be obtained. Anyone who is familiar with the geography of Nova Scotia will know that as you go east from the county of Colchester the mountains flatten down. The height of land is, I am told, only about three hundred feet between the county of Guysborough and the county of Antigonish. Consequently, a very level road could be obtained, starting from Moncton and going towards Oxford utilizing the Oxford branch and passing through the extensive coal fields of Pictou—and it is of itself an advantage to a railway to pass through great coal fields— and proceeding to the port of Country Harbour. In that way you avoid the Cobequid mountains and the difficulty of the grade. And when we reach Country Harbour, we have a port 100 miles nearer to Europe, and one of the best harbours on the eastern coast of Canada. The Royal Commission appointed some years ago to investigate the question of harbours on the coast of Canada referred especially to the port of Country Harbour as one of the

great harbours on the coast. There is no doubt that Country Harbour would be suitable for the terminus of a great line of railway. There is a great deal of interest taken in my constituency in the question whether the present Government really intend to do anything in regard to it. I need not say, there was very great disappointment felt when it was known that the Prime Minister and his Cabinet had decided to abandon the steps taken by the late Government to build the branch in my constituency, and all the greater disappointment when it was felt that they were being discriminated against. For everybody who understands the position in eastern Nova Scotia will admit that the requirements of the people of the county of Guysborough are fully as great as the requirements of the people of eastern Halifax. The road projected through the eastern part of Nova Scotia and terminating at Country Harbour touches the ocean in the vicinity of a great fishing area where traffic would be drawn from both east and west. I submit to the Prime Minister that it is a better proposition as a railway scheme, in some respects, than the one in his own constituency; and, as both of these projects were started together, and a similar provision was made each of them, and as he found them in the same position when he took office, we feel that he should have treated the county of Guysboro the same as he treated the county of Halifax. I know that in his heart he feels so himself; it is only fair play that this should be done. However, if he is prepared now to give us the accommodation we need so very badly, we will forgive him for a great deal that he has done in the past. It is of urgent importance to us in the county of Guysborough, and I felt I could not allow this opportunity to pass without making a special appeal to the Prime Minister and the Government in regard to it. I referred the other night in speaking about this matter to the probable traffic on the proposed line. I pointed out that it passed through a good agricultural country, and a good lumber country and reaches the sea at two points, and would in that way collect a large amount of traffic from our fisheries. I pointed out also that in order to have a complete disposition of this matter it would be necessary to extend the Guysborough branch to Canso. Canso is the point where we may expect the greatest results as regards the Atlantic fisheries. Anyone acquainted with these fisheries will say that there is no point of such advantage. For more than a hundred years Canso has been regarded as one of the best fishing ports on our coast. I pointed out, only a few weeks ago, that as much as 300,000 pounds of fresh haddock and cod had been landed at the port of Canso in one day. You will find that that amounts to fifteen carloads of fish, and, at the price ruling at that time—which, I understand, was one and one-half cent per pound—would represent a value of about $45,000. That, of course, was an extraordinary occasion, but it is worth pointing out to the Minister of Railways that on one day fifteen carloads of fresh fish were landed at Canso. This gives an idea of the possibilities of the traffic. In addition to building the branch line, provision, of course, would have to be made for cold storage, and for placing the product on the western market. Our market is growing constantly, but we could develop the trade to a much greater extent if we were more readily within reach of the West markets. At present we have a boat running weekly to Boston, where a large traffic in fresh fish is carried on, but if we had a more frequent boat service to Boston we would be able to dispose of the surplus of our fresh fish. If the industry was properly developed, the home market would not consume all the fish caught on that coast; it would have to be salted and smoked and disposed of in some other manner.

Mr. BORDEN: What is the proper market for the fish caught at Canso at the present time?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Montreal is the best market for our fresh fish, but I am told by men who are familiar with the trade that the Montreal market will not take more than three carloads of fish a day and if we produced say fifteen carloads, we would not be able to dispose of it in that market. Unfortunately, the people engaged in the fishing industry have not been able to reach any points very much farther west than Montreal. I see no good reason why, if we had the proper facilities, we should not place fresh sea fish in larger quantities on the Toronto market, and even on the Winnipeg market, as well as other towns in the western provinces. Quanties of smoked fish are now being sent from the eastern portions of Canada to the Pacific coast, and, in the county I have the honour to represent, carloads of smoked haddock are being forwarded via the Canadian Pacific railway and sold in Victoria and Vancouver, a good trade being carried on in that way. But cold storage is necessary to the shipment of fresh fish in order to place it upon the market in good condition. We have been enjoying the advantage of a contribution made by the Government towards payment of the express rates over the Intercolonial railway, which is a very good thing, and has assisted the trade to a very great extent. But our

great need in the county of Guysborough is a branch line railway from some point on the Intercolonial—and I do not think we can get a better point than Sunnybrae—to Country Harbour and Guysborough, and extending from thence down the shore to the port of Canso. This would put us in a position to develop a very large fishing trade in that vicinity, and to build up an industry which is really one of the best in that part of Nova Scotia.

Mr. BORDEN: Might I ask whether the steamship service between Canso and Mulgrave is carried on all year, and if it is a daily service?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, we have a boat running daily between Canso and Mulgrave. If we did not have that we could not transact the business at all, as we would have a sixty-mile drive by coach in order to reach the railway. The difficulty, however, is that the fish cannot be shipped profitably when transhipment over the Intercolonial railway is involved. Fish dealers say if they were able to put the fish direct from the wharf into the car it would be an immense advantage in carrying on the business, and I am told that wherever the fresh fish business has developed to a great extent, as it has in Aberdeen, Grimsby, and other ports of Great Britain, the railway train backs down the wharf and the fresh fish is loaded in the car and placed on the market as soon as possible.

Mr. BORDEN: Does this matter involve the question of expense, or detriment to the quality of the fish, or both?

Mr. SINCLAIR: The more quickly the fish can be placed on the market, the better it will be, and the less handling it requires.

Mr. EMMERSON: You cannot very well have transhipment, can you?

Mr. SINCLAIR: We have now to tranship—we load the fish on board the boat in boxes, they are placed in a refrigerator car at Mulgrave, and forwarded to the Montreal market; that is the present system. I am told by the fish dealers that it is impossible to develop a large business in that way, and that it will be necessary, if the business is to extend, to have a branch line railway extending right down to where the fish are, so that they can be placed on the trains and sent to the market in the shortest possible time, and without transhipment.

Mr. STANFIELD: I did not intend to take part in this debate, but as the hon. member for Westmorland mentioned the constituencies of Colchester and Cumberland——

Mr. EMMERSON: I think I mentioned Westmorland.

Mr. STANFIELD: At any rate, the House will pardon me if I mention the county of Colchester for just a few moments. Ever since I have been a member of this House I have urged upon the Government the necessity of building some branch lines in Colchester county. True, I have never wearied the House with any extended remarks upon the matter, nor do I now propose to do so, but I would urge upon this Government the necessity of looking into the matter and ascertaining whether some branch lines should be built in the county I have the honour to represent. The hon. member for Westmorland mentioned the double-tracking of the Intercolonial railway from Painsec Junction to Amherst, and thence via Parrsboro through Colchester county to Truro. I am not going to say a word for Cumberland county, as the hon. member for that county is here and will speak for himself, but I may say that the section of my county through which the proposed railway will run is one of the finest districts in the country. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in urging the advantages that will accrue to the people in the construction of this branch line, but if, at some future time, I have an opportunity of taking the Minister of Railways over that district, he will see for himself what the advantages would be, both to the Intercolonial railway and to the county. I would also like to mention two other roads which should be looked into. The one from Brulé to Truro, and another called the Stewiacke and Landsdowne railway. A number of years ago a railway charter was granted and the construction of that railway was started, but, unfortunately, the company became bankrupt, and some of the farmers who were interested in the company suffered greatly. If the Government can see its way clear to take up the railway project at any time, I can say that the member for Colchester and the people of that county will very deeply appreciate his action.

Mr. RHODES: I had not the remotest idea that this resolution was to be moved to-day, but I cannot allow the opportunity to go by without offering a few remarks on the subject, for I yield to no representative of the East in my desire to be of some real service in bringing about any action necessary to the development of the province, and especially that part of Nova Scotia with which this resolution is connected. But I cannot refrain on this occasion from remarking on the circumstances that the sentence 'the time has arrived' has been used with wonderful frequency in the House since the Christmas vacation. It is

only a few days ago since the hon. member for Rouville moved a resolution that in his opinion the time had arrived to encourage a parcel post system in Canada.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Time flies.

Mr. RHODES: Indeed it does, and I am reminded of that by the fact that resolutions are being moved with great frequency by hon. members opposite who say that the time has arrived. And yet for fifteen years the opportunity was in their hands and was not grasped. All I can say is that if the time has arrived since the incoming of the present Administration, this country is to be congratulated upon having an administration so progressive as to bring about in a short time such a marvellous change. If that conclusion is not satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite, if the conditions have not changed with such remarkable rapidity, then hon. gentlemen opposite, when they had the reins of power, were negligent in the performance of their duty and did not avail themselves of the opportunity to bring about the services which they now advocate.

Mr. EMMERSON: You have a splendid opportunity to correct that.

Mr. RHODES: And we are doing so rapidly. The hon. member for Rouville says the time has arrived for a parcel post system in Canada, forgetting that for many years he was at the head of the Post Office Department, and that the opportunity lay in his hands to introduce the very system which he advocates now so strongly in this House. Then we come to the hon. member for Westmorland. He was at the head of the Railway Department for a period of years, and he supported an administration which was in power for fifteen years. During that period I noticed no great development along the lines of the policy which he now advocates, although during all those years the opportunities for development and the natural resources of the East were as great as they are to-day. During that period my hon. friend's voice was not heard advocating the branch line policy. Perhaps I might make it stronger and say that his energy was not shown in adding branch lines to the Intercolonial when he had the opportunity to do so.

Mr. EMMERSON: I built one at Amherst.

Mr. RHODES: Any railway facilities which were added by my hon. friend at Amherst were due to the necessities of the situation and arose from the fact that in the town of Amherst we have an energetic body of citizens, through whose thrift, energy and enterprise the demand for increased railway accommodation has increased.

Mr. EMMERSON: I congratulate myself that I recognized the necessity.

Mr. RHODES: Then the hon. member for North Cape Breton comes along and says the time has arrived for extending railways there.

Mr. McKENZIE: The same old resolution.

Mr. RHODES: Quite so, but I hope my hon. friend does not expect the same action as was taken by the past Administration.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why should I not?

Mr. RHODES: I do not know whether the hon. member would admit that conditions have improved in such a marked degree in his constituency since the 21st September, 1911, as to demand at the present moment an extension of the railway policy. If he does, he should come over to this side of the House. If conditions there have not changed but are practically the same, and railway facilities are still demanded, then the Government, which he supported for many years, was remiss in its duty.

I have this to say in a general way. The Liberal party were in power in this country for over fifteen years, and yet, during all that time not one mile of railway was added to the Intercolonial railway in the province of Nova Scotia. Yea, more, the Administration of that day, the Laurier Administration, brought down a great policy to construct the National Transcontinental railway which was regarded as the master work of the hon. gentleman who now leads the Opposition. His slogan throughout the country, having reference to this great railway scheme, was, 'let Laurier finish his work.' And yet, strange to say, that railway, which is being built at a cost of hundreds of millions of dollars by the people of this country, touches every province in the Dominion except the province of Nova Scotia, and, of course, the province of Prince Edward Island, to which it cannot go. So far then from hon. gentlemen opposite having practised when they had the opportunity what they now preach, they deprived the province of Nova Scotia of the only opportunity at hand of some railway development within its boundaries by the extension of the National Transcontinental railway to that province. Because of political exigencies they preferred to allow it to terminate in a field outside of the city of Moncton, an inland town in the province of New Brunswick.

What has the present Administration done with respect to the building of rail-

ways in Nova Scotia? They have actually under contract, and the contractors are at work on a branch line of railway from Dartmouth to Deans in the county of Halifax, a distance, speaking from memory, of sixty miles. So that fifteen months after the present Administration took office we actually have railway development beginning in the province of Nova Scotia as against the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite neglected their duties for fifteen years. I fancy I hear hon. gentlemen opposite say, 'Oh, it is all very well, but tenders were called for this railway construction prior to the last general election, and if any credit is due, it is due to the previous Administration.' Let me point out in answer to that, that while this project might not have been the one, hon. gentlemen opposite and their friends in the province of Nova Scotia always dangled proposed railways before the people of that province before a general election. It was notorious in the province. Take for instance the county which I have the honour to represent. Before the general election of 1908 survey parties, three of them, I think, went about surveying a proposed route of railway at a season of the year when proper surveys could only be carried on with extreme difficulty, when the time at their disposal would not permit of proper surveys being made. The results of that survey, as will be disclosed by any practical engineer who looks into the work done at that time, show that the work, and the money expended on it, were practically wasted. But it served hon. gentlemen opposite at the time because the projected railway was unquestionably intended to influence the votes of the people at the general election. The same is true with respect to a proposed line of railway from Amherst to Tidnish, a distance of, speaking from memory, from eighteen to twenty miles. I think surveys were undertaken at three different periods, and I have no hesitation in expressing my firm belief that on none of those occasions was there the slightest intention on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite to seriously construct a railway over that ground. I have pointed to the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite are free to crtticise to-day but that when they were free to fulfil they did not do so. I have pointed out that although we have only been in power a short time, we have actually undertaken railway development in Nova Scotia, as instance this short line from Dartmouth to Deans. But hon. gentlemen will not forget that magnificient scheme of development now under way at the port at Halifax. Hon. gentlemen opposite for years turned a deaf ear to the pleadings of boards of trade, the citizens of Halifax and the people of the province of Nova Scotia generally to undertake some comprehensive scheme of development to make that magnificent harbour one of which the whole Dominion of Canada would have a right to feel proud. When any money was expended at all in connection with the port of Halifax it was some small sum spent in a picayune way and very frequently in a manner that would best yield votes for hon. gentlemen opposite at election time. The present Administration did not wait until two or three years, or until a general election was about to be announced, to come forward with some dazzling scheme to try and scoop in the votes of the people of Nova Scotia, but they approached this matter in a businesslike way; they went to Halifax, looker over the ground, employed the best engineers that could be obtained and they took, as a consulting engineer, Mr. Cowie, of the Montreal Harbour Commission, down there to assist them in arriving at a conclusion. These men examined the question very carefully and, without any elections being in prospect at all, this magnificent project for the improvement of the harbour of Halifax was launched in a non-partisan way and before a non-partisan gathering by the Minister of Railways and Canals. I must refer again as evidence of the appreciation of the work of the present Minister of Railways and Canals and of the present Government to a statement made by the president of the Halifax Board of Trade. I refer to Mr. Michael Dwyer, a life-long Liberal and who proclaims himself a Liberal to-day. He said:

> The present Minister of Railways has proven himself a big man and, in my judgment, the greatest Minister of Railways that Canada has ever had.

So far from hon. gentlemen opposite having had it in their mouths to criticise the present Administration in respect to its railway policy in Nova Scotia, it is their bounded duty as representatives of Nova Scotia to congratulate the present Administration on the comprehensive way with which it has dealt with these matters in that province. The hon. member for Westmorland mentioned the fact the other day that one of the reasons which had retarded the development of the Maritime provinces was that in those provinces there had been too much politics. He said that we were all too prone to take some mean, picayune, party advantage and that we sought that before we sought the development of the Maritime provinces. I agree with him but I fear that hon. gentlemen opposite, even by their mild remarks to-day, are in a measure liable to the very criticism which was uttered in this House, I think, only yesterday.

So I say that it is the duty of representatives from the Maritime provinces not

to oppose this Administration but to congratulate them for the manner in which they have grappled with the railway problems of Nova Scotia. One thing more; I see a memorandum here with respect to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). One would fancy, when he was speaking of the magnificent port of Country Harbour, that he had recently discovered that there was such a place in the county of Guysborough. I think that I heard some mention of this port last year, but I do not think that he made any mention of it, certainly not that I can recollect, prior to the 21st of September, 1911. He must have discovered that magnificent harbour since that date and that being the case I can only say that perhaps it is another tribute which should be laid at the door of the present Administration. Marvellous things have certainly taken place since the accession of this Government. In view of the statements which I have so imperfectly made, in view of my belief in the comprehensive way in which this Government have striven to promote the development of Nova Scotia and in view of what they have already done, and what they project, I beg to submit in amendment to the resolution before the House the following:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

The House desires to record its appreciation of the action of the Government in extending the Intercolonial railway in portions of the province of Nova Scotia which have hitherto been without railway facilities and its further appreciation of the comprehensive scheme of development at present under way to develop the port of Halifax as one of the national ports of Canada.

Hon. FRANK COCHRANE (Minister of Railways): I think the hon. member for Cape Breton North (Mr. McKenzie) began his remarks on this resolution under a misunderstanding. There was no attempt on the part of the Government to force him to go on to-day; in fact, I think that my hon. friend the Postmaster General said 'stand,' and as the resolution was naturally in my department, I would have got up and said that there was no objection to it standing to-day. In reference to the particular road he speaks of, I find that the Government only put in the Estimates for 1911, $200,000 to start the construction of this road from Alva to Baddeck, but, when the tenders came in, I think I am safe in saying that the ex-minister and the Government felt that the figures were so extremely high that they should not do in this case, as they had done with reference to the road from Dartmouth to Deans—let the contract. I might also state that full and proper surveys had not been made of that twenty-two miles. There surely must be a better route which will enable the road to be built on a cheaper basis. To give the House one instance—in that twenty-two miles there are no less than six bridges, estimated to cost $394,959.50. The lowest tender on that twenty-two miles of road was for $1,500,000 or at the rate of 65,000 or $66,000 per mile. There should, of course, be good reasons to justify any government undertaking to build such a short line at such a large expenditure per mile as would be required in this case. I do not think the late Government reached any decision as to the building of the railway referred to by my hon. friend, because the surveys were not, in fact, completed, and I think there was a little dispute between the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) on the question as to where the road should be started and what route it should take afterwards. We have made considerable inquiries with reference to both railways. I consider, however, that it is my duty to get a qualified traffic man to go down over both of these routes to make an investigation and, I am sorry to say, I have not yet had time to do that. The engineer who lays out the route of the railway is not the proper man to estimate what natural resources may be found in the country, or what justification, from a commercial point of view, there would be for constructing the railroad. I believe that an expert in traffic matters should be sent to consider the situation. I may assure my hon. friends on both sides of the House that I for one, as a member of the Government, am ready at all times to develop our country, not one portion of it, but every portion of it, by opening it up to railway facilities wherever there is the least justification for so doing. With regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) about double-tracking the Intercolonial railway, I may say that in order to put the Intercolonial railway on a competitive basis and so that we may get the most out of its motive power, a great deal of money will have to be spent on it. Take the line from Truro to Sydney, over which there is a great deal of traffic, and I think I am safe in saying that it is in such shape to-day that we cannot continue to operate that line, in view of the heavy traffic of the Sydney steel products there is on it, in the condition it is at present. The bridges must be strengthened, it must be laid with heavier steel, we must get a better alignment, and the grades are altogether too high. By spending a sufficient sum of money on that road, we could increase the haulage of our motive power

at least 50 per cent. We have for a number of years, been hauling the product of the Sydney steel works to Montreal at an exceedingly low price, a price which has not paid, and I believe that on the whole we will have to raise the rates in order to save ourselves from a net loss. I trust that when another session comes I will be able to bring before my colleagues and the House a proposition for putting that road on a proper basis so that we can compete with any other railroad. As to double-tracking the Intercolonial railway from Truro or St. John to Halifax, I feel that when there is sufficient traffic there I shall only be too willing and ready to have the proposition dealt with; I know that that section of the country is well developed to-day, and it cannot be long before it will absolutely demand that we double-track. I have no hesitation in saying that so far as railway development is concerned, not only in Nova Scotia, but in every part of Canada, I am willing and ready to proceed with it, as soon as it is possible to get the proper information and the proper surveys.

Rt. Hon. R. L. BORDEN (Prime Minister): I wish to say a few words in reply to the observations that have fallen from my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) and my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). No one doubts that a very important question has been raised, not for the first time, by my hon. friend from Cape Breton. The subject was discussed, as he may remember, upon a motion which he introduced a few years ago, and after a good deal of debate in the House, I understand that the late Administration came to the conclusion that instead of depending upon private corporations for the purpose of railway extension throughout the province of Nova Scotia, it would be better to extend the Intercolonial railway gradually into those counties which have been unequipped with railway facilities. When the present Government came into power, it did not fail to realize the very great importance of such a policy, and there were before the Government proposals in respect of the county of Cape Breton and also in respect to the counties of Pictou and Guysborough. I have pointed out on former occasions, to my hon. friends on the other side, that it is impossible to undertake everything at once, and it is impossible also to undertake any of these matters without giving them a reasonable business consideration. As the Minister of Railways has pointed out, there was in addition to the other difficulties, very great divergence of opinion, as to the best route that could be selected, particularly in regard to the extension into the county of Guysborough. The Minister of Railways did not feel himself possessed of the information necessary to enable him to come to a conclusion with regard to these matters, and they stood over. Some inquiry and some investigation has been made during the past summer. The Minister of Railways has been absent during a portion of the past summer for the purpose of making a personal investigation of the problems that arise in connection with the Hudson bay route, and for that and other reasons the question of railway extension in the counties of Pictou and Guysborough, as well as the extension in the county of Victoria, has not received as much attention as the Government desired it should receive during that period.

I am in entire sympathy with what my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) has said, not only on this occasion, but on other occasions, with regard to the importance of the fishing industry of Nova Scotia and the opportunity for its development, the hon. gentleman has shown that he has made a very careful study of the situation. There is a great deal of truth in his suggestion that the market for the fresh fish in Nova Scotia may be extended much beyond the limits which have been assigned to it up to the present time. My hon. friend from Guysborough has spoken of extending the market as far west as Toronto, and it seems to me that is not an extravagant estimate of the limit which might be assigned.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I did not mean to say that no fresh fish from Nova Sotia was going to Toronto now; a considerable quantity is going to Toronto, but not as much as there should be.

Mr. BORDEN: I was not aware that any considerable quantity of fresh fish from Nova Scotia got to the Toronto markets. Like my hon. friend from Guysborough I have taken a very considerable interest in this question, although I have not perhaps made as close a study of it as he has, but I am informed by persons in Montreal and Toronto, who are familiar with the trade, that one great factor in getting any considerable portion of the market in these cities is the absolute necessity of having a definite stated quantity which can be supplied from day to day without fail. I realize that in that connection it is very important that railway facilities should be afforded. In the first place, you must have fishing centres upon the coast, which will in ordinary weather at least, and without regard to anything except very extraordinary weather conditions, produce a certain stated quantity of fish which can be transmitted to the interior, because the merchants in large cities like Montreal and Toronto must supply their customers; and they will not make contracts with those

who supply fish in Nova Scotia or elsewhere, unless they are certain that those contracts will be observed and that the supply will be forthcoming. I think that the recent invention of the motor boat and the very great use which has been made of those boats along the coast of the province of Nova Scotia, together with a sufficient development of railway facilities in that province, and if possible better facilities than exist even at present upon the Intercolonial, should lead in the first place to a great development of the fishing industry of the province of Nova Scotia, and in the second place to the extension of our markets very much further west than the city of Toronto. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), who is very familiar with these conditions, knows that fish caught on the Pacific coast are brought all the way across Canada in very large quantities indeed, and are taken into the United States, into Boston principally, although perhaps into New York as well; and it is said that after being caught on the Pacific coast and transported all the way across Canada to New York or Boston, some of them come back to Canadian cities and are consumed by our own people. If these are the facts, and I am informed on the very best authority that they are the facts, is there any reason in the world why the province of Nova Scotia, with its enormous opportunities for the development of the fishing industry should not supply fish not only to Montreal and Toronto, but to Winnipeg and the other splendid cities which are already growing up in the prairie provinces? It seems to me that there is no reason why this should not be done. I should like to assure my hon. friend from Guysborough, so far as my desire is concerned, and so far as my efforts will be availing, I shall be prepared to co-operate with him and with other hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in bringing about conditions that will enable this to be accomplished. We have perhaps as fine opportunities for development of the fishing industry in all the Maritime provinces and in the province of Quebec also, as are to be found anywhere in the world. If the enterprise of our neighbours to the south has enabled them to go upon the Pacific coast, to engage in the prosecution of the fishing industry there upon an enormous scale, to bring the fish across the continent, and to supply not only the cities of the United States but the cities of Canada as well, shall we not be thought somewhat lacking in enterprise if we do not give to the development of the fishing industry of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, and Quebec, every possible assistance and every possible facility that can reasonably be afforded? I am very glad indeed that my hon. friend has brought this matter once more to the attention of the House. I should like to assure him and assure my hon. friend from Guysborough as well, as the word 'discrimination' has been used in the course of this debate, that there is no desire or intention on the part of the Government to discriminate against any part of the province of Nova Scotia or any other part of the Dominion of Canada in respect of railway development. I beg of them to remember that everything cannot be done in one year; that this matter is now receiving the attention of the Government; and that besides the extension of the Intercolonial railway into those portions of Nova Scotia, which have not yet had the convenience of railway development, there are other matters that have to be kept in regard by the Government. My hon. friend from Cumberland has spoken of the development and equipment of the harbour of Halifax, that is to commence in the immediate future. While in one sense that does affect the port harbour and port of Halifax peculiarly, nevertheless I am sure that hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House in the province of Nova Scotia will remember that it is of importance, not only to the city of Halifax, not only to the province of Nova Scotia, but to the whole Dominion of Canada, that that port, as one of the finest ports of Canada should be so developed and equipped that it can take its place in competition with any port on the American continent for the purpose of the carrying trade. That of course will involve the expenditure of a very considerable sum of money.

My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has also spoken of a matter of very great importance to the people of Nova Scotia, and a matter of special importance to all the counties of Cape Breton and of the Eastern portion of the province of Nova Scotia, that is to say, the improvement of the roadbed, grades and curvatures upon the Intercolonial railway east of Truro, so that traffic can be handled upon that portion of the road as cheaply and as efficiently as upon any railway on the American continent. That is a subject which has already received the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals; that is a proposal with which the Government is in thorough sympathy. We have a very fine property indeed in the Intercolonial railway, although so far as returning interest upon the investment is concerned, it has not made a direct return in that regard up to the present time. Although not making a direct return in that regard, it has subserved a great national purpose in binding together the provinces of Canada which at the original inception of this Confederation, where without any tie or link of any kind. I hope that the Intercolonial will so be developed in future

under the guidance of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, that it will, even more than in the past, subserve the high purpose for which it was projected by the fathers of Confederation.

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

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams in regard to the employment of ticket takers on the Intercolonial railway between Truro and Sydney, and of all representations, complaints, letters received in opposition to the appointment of same.—Mr. Macdonald.

For a copy of all Orders in Council and of all correspondence relating to the extension of facilities for obtaining information useful to Canadian trade and commerce in connection with the British Consular Service.—Mr. Ames.

1. For a return showing the persons from whom property has been purchased, or property upon which an option of purchase has been obtained on behalf of the Department of Railways and Canals for the purpose of the proposed Intercolonial railway terminal improvements at Halifax, N.S.

2. The quantity and character of the property purchased.

3. The amount paid for the same or the amount payable, if any option to purchase property for such purpose is exercised.—Mr. Maclean (Halifax).

For a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams between the Minister of Marine and Fsheries, or any officer of his Department, and J. A. Gillies, K.C., Sydney, relating to the purchase from John B. Nicholson, of a site for a salmon hatchery at Snidlope Lake, Richmond county, N.S., and also of all accounts, charges and vouchers received from the said J. A. Gillies, for services in connection therewith and the payments made to the said J. A. Gillies in respect of the same.—Mr. Kyte.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other papers and documents, relating to the resignation of Lt.-Col. W. F. More, 20th Regiment, Halton Rifles, and also of the resignation and the reply thereto.—Mr. Macdonald.

House adjourned at six o'clock.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—TWELFTH PARLIAMENT, 1912-1913.

Abbreviations: 1r., 2r., 3r.=first, second, or third reading. Amdt.=Amendment. Com.=Committee. Con.=Consideration. Div.=Division. M.=Motion. Rep.=Report. Res.=Resolution. Sec.=Section.

Accountants' Association. *See* **Private Bills.**

Achim, Mr. Honoré (Labelle)
Simard, A., account of, 3121.

Acton Vale public building, 8858.

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 6, 84, 158, 207, 288, 375, 478.
Amendments proposed: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 41; Mr. Mondou, 570.

Adulteration Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 10281. 2r., 11648. Com., 11648. 3r., 11649.

Advocate, schooner, 1168, 1562.

Agricultural Instruction Bill. Res., 2146. 1r.,2159. 2r., 8061. Com., 8116, 8507. 3r., 8814.
Amendments proposed: Mr. Oliver, 8814; div., 8815. Mr. Bureau, 8816; div., 8818.

Agriculture
Credits, 3124.
Department
Estimates, 6289, 6728, 10257, 10378.
Mailing list, 624.
Encouragement of, 10, 17, 139, 376, 458, 1952, 7464.
Lecturers for Quebec on, 8651.

Aikins, Mr. J. A. M. (Brandon)
Alberta Interurban Railway Company Bill, 8586.
Bank Act Amendment Bill, 82.
Banks and Banking, 10094, 10097, 10119, 10363.
Canada Hail Insurance Company Bill, 3778.
Chairman, acting as, 5816-5875.
Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bill, 1946.
Grain Bill, 9873.
National Transcontinental Railway estimates, 11223.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1171.
Royal Mint, 8672.
Rules of the House, 6353, 7481.
Terminal elevators, 8683.

Alberta
Land sale, 7467.
Natural gas in, 3889, 6419.
Sheep imports, 4062, 4425.

Aldershot camp supplies, 2725, 5155, 6256, 8130, 9213.

Alien Labour Law
Dismissal of inspector, 8121.
Importation of photo-engravers, 7725, 8036, 8227.

Ames, Mr. Herbert B. (Montreal, St. Antoine)
Banking and Commerce Committee, 6250, 8854.
Banks and banking, 10283, 10290.
Budget, 10448
Taxation and revenue, 10448.
Surplus, uses of a, 10452.
Trade of Canada, 10456.
Immigration, 10458.
Tariff revision, 10459.
Cost of living, 10461.
Canada Northwest Loan Company, 7344.
Canadian Explosives, Limited, Bill, 2876.
Dominion Trust Company Bill, 3412.
Independent Order of Foresters Bill, 7342.
National Transcontinental Railway estimates, 11099, 11137.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1292, 9473.
Railway Act Amendment Bill, 9822.

Amherst Point wharf, 1164.

Amherst paving inspector, 1549.

Ammon post office, 11942.

Amundsen, Captain, 4098.

Animal Contagious Diseases Bill. Res. and 1r., 9622. 2r., 9863. Com., 9863. 3r., 9865.

Animals, health of, 6290.

Annuities. *See* **Government Annuities.**

Antarctic expedition. *See* **Scott.**

Antigonish
Food Inspector, 4059.
Public Works
Estimates, 2371, 2617, 3551, 11972, 12122.
Proposed censure of Minister, 10191-10257.

Antwerp, Canadian agent at, 3035.

Apple trade of Nova Scotia, 6414.

Archives Bill. 1r., 11460. 2r. and com., 11939. 3r., 11941.

Archives estimates, 11540.

Arctic expedition. *See* **Stefansson.**

Arisaig postmaster, 2370.

Armouries
Amount expended on, 6232.
List of, 6297.

Armstrong, Mr. J. A. Macdonald (North York)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Macdonald by-election, 179.
Immigration, 180.
Banks and banking, 180.
Naval defence, 181.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3625.

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Chairman, acting as, 4628, 5770-5782.
Express rates, 3444.
Highways improvement, 8206.
Judges, increase of, 11641.
Parcel post, 1521, 11827.
Radiotelegraphy, regulation of, 786.
Telegraph service, inter-Imperial, 9031, 11663.

Art. *See* **National Gallery.**

Arthabaska post office, 597.

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Agriculture Department estimates, 10272.
Banks and banking, 10135.
Georgian Bay canal, 2648.
Highways improvement, 8594.
Post Office estimates, 11422.
Public buildings in Quebec, 1161.

Askwith, Sir George, report of, on Industrial Disputes Act, 3184.

Asselin, Olivar, employment of, 592.
Report of, 1951.

Atlantic and Superior railways, 2169.

Atlantic. *See* **North Atlantic, Ocean,** *and* **Transatlantic.**

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, 3891, 6743.

Auditor General, office of, 8033, 9216, 10144.

Automobiles
Purchase of, 1154.
Militia Department, 8132.
Post Office Department, 8126.

Avignon post office, 5153, 6745, 7622.

Aylmer, Quebec, post office, 7811, 8128.

Baie des Chaleurs Railway, 2168.

Baie St. Paul wharf, 11073.

Baillie, John, employment of, 603.

Baker, Mr. George H. (Brome)
Banque Immobilière Bill, 2146.

Ball, Mr. R. J. (South Grey)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Tariff, 198.
Canada, prosperity of, 199.
Cement duty, 202.
Naval defence, 202.

Bank Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 82; 710.

Bank Bill. Res., 1170, 1267. 1r., 1271. 2r., 1841, 2285, 2419. Com., 10082, 10282, 10348. 3r., 10651-10676.
Senate amendments, 11576; div., 11601.

Bank certificates, issue of by Treasury Board, 2210.

Bank notes of Canada, circulation of in United States, 8672.

Banks and banking, 16, 180, 208, 468, 2317, 3124, 6484, 10135. *See also* Bank Bill.

Banker's Island hospital, 4059.

Banque Internationale, 2199, 4278, 11202.

Bar of House. *See* **Miller.**

Barker, Mr. Samuel (East Hamilton)
Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation Bill, 2605.
Canada Permanent Trust Company Bill, 2606.
Canadian Medical Association Bill, 3871.
Chairman, acting as, 5906-5917.
Delvigne, Maurice, patent bill, 11019.
Fenian raid bounty, 6671.
Independent Order of Foresters Bill, 7341.
Intercolonial Trust Company, 3981.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5893, 5906.
Parliamentary procedure: second appeal on one question, 5893.

Barker, Mr. Samuel—Cont.
Railway Companies Incorporation Bill, 8121.

Barnard, Mr. Geo H. (Victoria, B.C.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 159.
By-elections, 160.
Election promises, 160.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 8492.

Barry's Bay drowning disaster. *See* **Mayflower.**

Bassano public building, 807.

Bathurst letter box service, 6496.

Bay Fortune breakwater, 6259.

Beattie, Mr. Thomas (London)
Port Nelson Company, Limited, 2656, 7185.

Bedford mail service, 2169.

Beland, Hon. H. S. (Beauce)
Agriculture, aid to, 8521.
Berthierville wharf, 2368.
Conservation Commission, 6467.
Customs seizure at Notre Dame des Bois, 620.
Debates, official
French translation, 11963.
Omission of pairs, 8463.
Dismissals
Beauce customs officer, 1504.
Berthier employees, 1953.
Bleriot, postmaster, 634.
Dorchester postmasters, 3420.
St. Anselme postmaster, 635.
St. Frederick postmaster, 634.
St. Gabriel de Brandon mail receiver, 1745.
Dorchester County mail contracts, 619.
Fenian raid veterans, 601, 2614, 9595.
Immigration bonuses, 601.
Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 8872.
Japanese treaty, 7155.
Lanoraie wharf, 2619.
Mail bag locks, 7214.
Money and coinage, 8358, 8460.
National Transcontinental Railway: employment of Alexander Alexander, 1015.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2533, 2549, 4624, 4807, 5003, 5438, 6032, 5707, 9587, 9708.
New Zealand battle cruiser, 4421.
Panama Canal, 601.
Parliamentary procedure: Friday sitting, validity of after midnight, 5003.
Pilotage commission, 6189, 6498.

Beland, Hon. H. S.—Cont.
Privilege, 6047.
Public Works estimates, 11080.
Quebec harbour loan, 8044.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7827.
St. Gabriel de Brandon property purchase, 2166.
Seven Islands lightkeeper, 9222.
West Indian trade, 601.

Bellemare, Mr. A. (Maskinongé)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech: naval defence, 576.
Naval Forces of the Empire, 576, 4213.

Bennett, Mr. R. B. (Calgary)
Banks and banking, 10123, 10368, 11585.
Canadian Accountants' Association, 3839.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4366, 11775, 11786.
Companies Act, 2961.
Experimental farms, 10264.
Freight rates, western, 8965, 8971.
Highways improvement, 11999.
Judges, increase of, 11629.
Lead bounties, 10184.
Natural gas exports, 6428.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3942, 3982, 4775, 5928, 5822, 5907.
North Empire Fire Insurance Bill, 4411.
Parliamentary procedure
Irrelevance, 5822, 5907-5910.
Money grant, amendment of, 5857.
Power, Lenore, divorce bill, 11746.

Bennett, Mr. Wm. H. (East Simcoe)
Canadian Northern railway subsidy, 11773.
Central Railway Company Bill, 2160.
Chairman, acting as, 5928, 5958.
Dredge Industry, 611.
Freight rates, western, 8943.
National Gallery of Canada, 9002.
Naval forces of the Empire, 9527.
North Atlantic rates, 9068.
Power, Lenore, divorce bill, 11745.
Public Works estimates, 11149, 11497.
Trent canal, 11264.
Beresford breakwater, 1737.
Berthierville wharf, 2368.

Best, Mr. John A. (Dufferin)
Fruit marking, 9686.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5725.

Bickerdike, Mr. Robert (Montreal, St. Lawrence)
Cattle embargo, 617.

Biological Board, 3554.

Black Cape East post office, 4424.

Blain, Mr. Richard (Peel)
Agriculture, aid to, 8079.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1979.
Census of Canadian-born and British-born, 3414.
Chairman, acting as, 5277-5283, 5734-5735, 5985-5989, 6026-6041, 6214.
Freight rates, western, 8956.
Parliamentary procedure: appointment of temporary chairman, 6006, 6026-6041.

Blondin, Mr. P. E. (Deputy Speaker)
See also Deputy Speaker, *and* Chairman's rulings.
Naval forces of the Empire, 9296, 9299.

Boivin, Mr. Geo. H. (Shefford)
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9731.
Dismissal of postmasters, 12095.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11527, 11530, 12109.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1610, 4991, 5005, 5875, 9348, 9580.
Parliamentary procedure: Chairman and French language, 5875, 5877.
Post Office estimates, 11280.
Public Works estimates, 12116.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7605, 9350, 9361, 9580.

Bonaventure
Census enumerators, 2369, 2416.
Government expenditures, 7219.
Patronage, 3416.
Signal station, 10415, 11074.
Weights and measures inspectors, 6744.
Works overseer, 7622, 7623.

Bonaventure river buoys, 11204.

Borden, Rt. Hon. R. L. (Prime Minister)
Accountants' Association, 3977.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Cartwright, Sir Richard, the late, 42.
Monk, Hon. F. D., retirement of, 43.
Transportation, 43.
Naval defence, 43, 578.
National Transcontinental Railway, 44.
Cement duty, 45.
Redistribution of representation, 45.
By-elections, 46.
Reciprocity with United States, 47.
Mr. Mondou's amendment, 578.
Antarctic expedition: death of Captain Scott, 3454.
Archives, 11460.
Baldwin, Eugene O., dismissal of, 8032.
Banks and banking, 10, 291, 2298.

Borden, Rt. Hon. R. L.—Cont.
Banque Internationale, 2227.
British Columbia, financial claims of, 6736, 6942.
Brown, Mr. James P., the late, 11461.
Canadian Explosives, Limited, 2578.
Canadian Northern Railway subsidy, 11747. 11793, 11847, 11850, 11853, 11855.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1967.
Cement duty, reduction of, 45.
Civil Service
Commission, 6469.
Murray, Sir George, report of, 1360.
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 5622, 6105.
Conservation Commission, 6456, 6721, 9697, 12060.
Debates, official: reporting in committee, 5149.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9766.
Dismissals in Nova Scotia, 917.
Dismissed employees' right to have counsel, 8182.
Farmers Bank: reimbursement of depositors, 12164.
Fenian Raid veterans, 6419.
Georgian Bay Canal Company, 2592.
Gold and silver marking, 3174.
Government Railways Claims Bill, 11905.
Grain Bill, 8682, 9125, 9129.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company bonds, purchase of, 1576.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, loan to, 11861, 11871.
Haggart, Hon. John, death of, 5613, 5632.
High Commissioner's office, 3356, 6452.
Highways improvement, 8188, 8843, 11981.
House of Commons
Ascension Day adjournment, 8739.
Ash Wednesday adjournment, 2656.
Business of the House, 10416.
Christmas adjournment, 1170, 1266.
Committees, select standing, 368.
Easter adjournment, 6047.
Government business, precedence of, 2279, 3181.
Internal Economy Commissioners, 5.
Law branch, 2720, 10412.
Morning sittings, 8739, 9227.
Staff, classification of, 11952.
Wednesday sittings, 2279.
Housing problem and town planning, 12056.
Immigrants, female, protection of, 12166.
Imperial conference of 1911: explanation, 7722.

Borden, Rt. Hon. R. L.—Cont.
Imperial Underwriters Corporation, 4418.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 8554, 8868, 12027.
Estimates, 6752.
Extensions in Nova Scotia, 2003.
Halifax terminals, 6790.
Japanese Treaty, 6497, 6949, 7050, 7138, 7148, 7200.
Letter from Hon. T. Nakamura, 7550.
Justice Department estimates, 12035.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 8476, 10834.
Mail bag locks, 6933.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3647, 3733.
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 6166, 6474, 12055.
White, Comptroller, retirement of, 6412.
National Transcontinental Railway: extension of time, 3351.
Naturalization in Canada, 7636, 7818.
Naval affairs
Imperial squadron at Gibraltar, 10066.
Policy of Government, 43, 578, 952, 12139.
Naval Aid Bill. On 1r., 676, 1019. On 2r., 3235, 4257. In com.: sec. 1, 4283, 4335; sec. 2, 4458, 4486, 4656, 5160, 5163, 5208, 5270, 5458, 6013, 6030, 6041 (m. to rep. progress), 5638, 5815, 5846, 7223, 7237, 9243, 9275 (m. to postpone); sec. 3, 9314, 9328, 9329 (m. to postpone); sec. 4, 9349, 9374, 9410 (m. to postpone); sec. 5, 9433, 9437 (m. to postpone); sec. 6, 9437, 9443 (m. to postpone). On m. for con., 9445, 9539. On m. to rep., 9573, 9575. Rep., 9590. On m. for 3r., and amdts., 9950, 9957, 9982, 9991, 10026.
Later sittings on, 3546.
North Atlantic rates, 9093.
Ontario Superior Courts Bill, 6640.
Panama canal tolls, 969.
Parliamentary procedure
Adjournment motions, 7844.
Answers of length, 3042, 3119.
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 4826, 6013, 6017.
Irrelevancy, 5815.
Money grant, amendment of, 5832, 5846.
Obstruction, 6043.
Papers, original, production of, 9224.
Questions, notice of, 6878, 7036.
Recalcitrant witness, motion regarding without notice, 3663.
Returns, copies of, 1563,3124, 4282.
Rules for limitation of debate. *See that title.*
Speaker resuming chair without committee report, 6162, 6310, 6392.
Statements of members, acceptance of, 5825.
Parliamentary representation, 45, 6941.
Patents, extension of, 2574, 4317.
Pulp duty in United States, 12137.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 2190.
Quebec merger, 2184.
Railway Commission, 9693.
Reciprocity with United States, 47.
Redistribution of representation 45.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 2989.
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 717, 886.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7388, 7830, 8240, 9352, 9364, 9446, 9452, 9575.
Russian Canadians sent to Siberia, 7636, 7818, 10067.
Russian immigrants, treatment of, 10955.
St. John Ambulance Association, 6166.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6528.
Schreiber, Mr., salary of, 6455.
Scott, Sir Richard, death of, 8457.
Sheep, purchase and sale of, 649.
Steel rails, remission of duty on, 6863.
Stefansson arctic expedition, 4167.
Stewart, W. J., salary of, 12057.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11899.
Tuberculosis, Friedmann treatment of, 4169.
Turpentine, purity of, 11649.
West Indian trade agreement, 43, 2121, 8774.
Wolseley, Field Marshal, death of, 6733.

Boulardarie Centre post office, 2616.

Boulard lighthouse keeper, 8858.

Boulay, Mr. H. (Rimouski)
Debates, official
French daily edition of, 11076.
French translation of, 11965.
Experimental farms, 10267.
French, reading of estimates in, 6479.
House of Commons messengers, 2162.
Intercolonial Railway
Dismissals, 933.
Estimates, 12074.
Revenues, 11204.
Trains, speed of, 6802.
Langevin, J. O., employment of, 9221.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10709, 10746.
Militia estimates, 11056.
National Transcontinental Railway; 11251.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4026.
Pilotage Commission, 7637.

Boulay, Mr. H.—Cont.
Post Office estimates, 11375.
Preston, W. T. R., employment of, 2370.
Public Works estimates, 11085.
Quebec immigration officers, 1367.
Railway Commissioner, Chief, salary of, 9935.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10860, 10882, 10890, 10916, 11311.
Rimouski public works, 3041.
St. Lawrence channel buoys, 10413.

Les Boules mail service 10413.

Bounties. *See* **Lead.**

Bourassa, Emile, payment of, 6300, 7217.

Bourassa, Mr. J. Boutin (Lévis)
Dismissals
St. Lambert postmaster, 3421.
St. Romuald d'Etchemin postmaster, 3421.
Verrault, Joseph, postmaster, 7626.
Eureka, steamer, chief engineer of, 8655.
Intercolonial Railway
Chaudière Junction employees 11570.
Roadmaster Lavery, 11571.
St. Jean caretaker, 8655.
Sale of papers at Lévis station, 6262.
Lévis
Camp supplies 6261.
Military property 11941.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5013.
Quebec Harbour Commission, 11803.
Seed grain for Quebec, 8650.
Three Rivers mail service, 8654.

Boyce, Mr. A. C. (West Algoma)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Macdonald by-election, 255.
Reciprocity with United States, 259.
Naval defence, 262.
Fruit marking, 9687.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3662.
Naval forces of the Empire, 262, 4727, 4918, 5771.
Parliamentary procedure
Offensive personal references, 5775.
Recalcitrant witness, motion regarding without notice, 3662.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3313.

Boyer, Mr. Gustave (Vaudreuil)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 135.
Aid to agriculture, 139.
Macdonald by-election, 142.

Boyer, Mr. Gustave—Cont.
School question in Manitoba, 147.
Agriculture, aid to, 139, 8519.
Highways improvement, 8529.
Hudson wharf road, 957.
Ile Perrot
Bridge, 11199.
South wharf, 9842.
Naval forces of the Empire, 135, 4535, 5972, 5657.
Rigaud
Arsenal, 7624, 10416.
Post office, 808, 6745, 8131.
Wharf, 11804.
Ste. Justine Mongenais mail contract, 808.
Ste. Marthe postmaster, 809.
Vallée des Erables post office, 1161
Graham wharf, Vaudreuil, 809.

Boys, Mr. W. A. (South Simcoe)
Power, Lenore, divorce bill, 11742.

Bradbury, Mr. George H. (Selkirk)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Macdonald by-election, 388.
Cement duty, reduction of, 389.
Chairman, acting as, 5724-5728.
Fruit marking, 9678.
Indians, Cote's band of, 8642.
Flags, Use of, Bill, 6.
Grain Bill, 9892.
Highways improvement, 8598.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5724.
Pollution of navigable waters, 6, 8607, 11666.
Railway divisional points, removal of, 9934.
St. Andrew's dam, 11179.

Brandon quarter section, sale of, 7385. ..

Brennan, V., fishery guardian, 1160.

Bridgewater drill shed, 1164.

Brinston postmaster, 1369.

Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3364.

British Columbia
Claims of, 6735, 6942.
Fisheries
Decisions respecting, 4064.
Protection service, 3031.
Regulations, 2616.
Public buildings, 6231.
Telegraph lines, 6242.

British trade preference, 2013-2107.

Broder, Mr. Andrew (Dundas)
Highways improvement, 11993.
Immigration, female, 12165.
Post Office estimates, 11272.

Brouillard, Mr. Ovide (Drummond and Arthabaska)
Arthabaska post office, 597.
Dismissals
Arthabaska works overseer, 635.
Bon Conseil postmaster, 811.
Daveluyville postmaster, 811.
Drummondville caretaker, 635.
Ste. Clothilde postmaster, 810.
St. Cyrille de Wendover postmaster, 811.
St. Paul de Chester postmaster, 810.
St. Remi de Pingwick postmaster, 811.
Victoriaville, collector, 636.
Warwick postmistress, 636.
Wickham West postmistress, 636.
Gilbert, Arthur, employment of, 621.

Brown, Mr. James P., death of, 11461.

Brown, Mr. James P. (Chateauguay)
Naval forces of the Empire, 5232.

Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Medicine Hat)
Agriculture credits, 3145.
Alberta
Indian reserve, 622.
Natural gas, 3889, 6419.
Sheep imports, 4062, 4425.
Woolgrowers, protest of, 4062.
Banks and banking, 2440, 10135.
Bassano Government building, 807.
Boards of conciliation, 699.
Burdett, port of entry, 807.
Canadian Northern railway, 4369, 6195.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1972.
Canadian Western Railway Bill, 4410.
Cardston collector of customs, 1017.
Customs estimates, 11544.
Elevators, grain, 2503.
Emigration from Canada, 4428.
Experimental farms, 10265.
Freight rates, western, 8945.
Fruit industry, 9671.
Gleichen customs office, 807.
Grain Bill, 9898.
Grand Trunk Pacific loan, 11863.
Hay and straw grades, 11943.
Homestead entries for women, 3889.
Homesteaders' pre-emption fee. 9840. 11569.
Homesteading in dry belt, 11568.
Indians, estimates for, 11563.
Kootenay Rifles, 1018.
Letter carriers, western, 11920.
Mail bag locks, 7215.

Buchanan, Mr. William A.—Cont.
Medicine Hat
Homestead inspectors, 9220.
Lands agent, 807.
Mail delivery, 2416.
Post offices, 806.
Mounted police, 6476.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4604.
Police Point reserve, 6253.
Pre-emption payments, interest on, 3035.
Railway Commission, 9693.

Buckhorn bridge, 1949, 3553.

Budget, 9624, 10419, 10530.
Delay of, 6435.

Buoys
Contracts, 802, 4427, 5152, 6947.
Supervision of, 6181.
Vessels, construction of, 6221.

Burdett customs port, 807.

Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Accountants' Association, 3784.
Agriculture, aid to, 8524, 8816.
Arcand M., employment of. 8463, 8645, 8741.
Canada Hail Insurance Company, 3779.
Canadian Medical Association, 3882.
Cap de la Madeleine wharf, 1560, 1744.
Estimates in French, 6411.
Experimental farms, 10268.
Forest fires, 6466.
Grand Mere public building, 1018.
Mail bag locks, 7213, 8355.
Minister of Militia and Defence, speech of, 9841.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4655, 5107, 5957.
Patents, renewal of, 4316.
Pointe a Citrouille lighthouse keeper, 6948.
Private secretaries, 6472.
Privilege, 3747, 3932.
Railway Commissioner, Chief, salary of, 9940.
Three Rivers
Letter carrier, dismissal of, 6262.
Public building, 1550, 1744, 9840.
Translators, access of to reading room, 9844.

Burnham, Mr. John H. (Peterborough West)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
By-elections, 118.
French Canadians, rights of, 127.
Banks and banking, 11586.

Burnham, Mr. John H.—Cont.
Buckhorn bridge, 1949, 3553.
Canadian Medical Association, 3842.
Election Act Amendment Bill, 950.
Female immigrants, protection of, 12166.
Floods in the United States, 6624.
German army, increase of, 4482.
Highways improvement, 8593.
Lead bounties, 10154, 10191.
Marriage laws in federal territory, 583.
Militia estimates, 11043.
National Gallery of Canada, 9008.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4680, 4829, 9401.
Old age pensions, 943, 6939, 10527.
Parcel post, 11842.
Public Works estimates, 11505.
Railway subsidies, 11669.
Titles of Honour Bill, 1547.
Trent canal, 11263, 11297.

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Minister of Agriculture)
Agricultural Instruction Bill, 2146, 8061, 8117, 8507, 8814, 8817.
Agriculture, Department of, estimates, 6728, 10258-10278, 10378-10411.
Animal contagious diseases, 9613, 9615, 9620, 9863.
British cattle embargo, 1565.
Conservation Commission, 6467.
Experimental farms, 6289, 10258-10278.
Fruit and vegetables, duty on, 6944.
Fruit marking, 9662, 10082, 10084, 11931.
Highways improvement, 8606.
Japanese treaty, 6991.
Lead bounties, 10190.
Meat inspection, 6290.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5706, 9323, 9996.
Patents, renewal of, 3833.
Pollution of navigable waters, 8631.
Railway subsidies, 11688.
Sheep, purchase and sale of, 648.

Butter, imitation, at Saskatoon, 2831.

By-elections, the recent, 36, 46, 53, 103, 116, 118, 133, 142, 179, 195, 203, 208, 215, 221, 224, 246, 255, 265, 278, 318, 343, 379, 388, 408, 425, 463, 478, 492, 510, 515, 553.

Cabinet changes, rumoured, 4279.

Cable lines, lower St. Lawrence, 6241. *See also* **Radiotelegraphy.**

Cable rates to Great Britain, 3031. *See also* **Telegraph.**

Campbellton-Gaspé steamship service, 3418, 4420, 7214, 7621.

Canada Grain. *See* **Grain.**

Canada Shipping Bill. Res., 787. 1r., 792. 2r., 913. Com., 913. 3r., 1654.

Canadian Biscuit Company, 4423.

Canadian Northern Railway
Subsidy Bill. Res., 11693, 11746. 1r., 11801. 2r., and Com., 11843. 3r., 11847. Div., 11858.
Amdts. proposed on 3r.: Mr. Oliver, 11847; div., 11848. Mr. Macdonald, 11850; div., 11851. Mr. Graham, 11853; div., 11854. Mr. German, 11854; ruled out, 11856; appeal and div., 11856.
Maximum grades, 11572.
Mileage, 11570, 11805.
Payments, 6948.
See also Private Bills.

Canadian Pacific Railway
Control by Railway Commission Bill. 1r., 2415.
Employees' strike, 1957.
Irrigated lands, 4423.
Stock, issue of new, 606, 631.

Cap de Madeleine wharf, 1560, 1744.

Capilano Indian reserve, 8640.

Cardin, Mr. P. J. A. (Richelieu)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech: Richelieu by-election, 515.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4697, 5582.
St. Pierre de Sorel, postmaster, 3415.
Ste. Victoire postmistress, 7629.
Sorel workshops, 7889.

Cardston customs collector, 1017.

Carleton
Light keeper, 11075.
Revetment wall, 11073.
Wharfinger, 11075.

Caron, J. E., Quebec Minister of Agriculture, 9341.

Carroll, Mr. W. F. (Cape Breton South)
Accountants' Association, 3784.
Banks and banking, 10095.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1978.
Criminal Code amendments, 11614.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9811.
Dismissals, 846, 1003.
Main-à-Dieu postmistress, 702.
Whitney Pier postmistress, 703.
Fenian raid bounty, 6675.
Government annuities, 9605.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11532.

Carroll, Mr. W. F.—Cont.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 1816.
Estimates, 6787.
Lobster canning licenses, 4421, 12054.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10806-10808.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3104, 5724, 9446, 9579, 9987.
New Waterford customs office, 6901.
Photo-engravers, importation of, 7725, 8036, 8227.
Pollution of navigable waters, 8633.
Poison iron works, 8641.
Post Office estimates, 11280.
Power, Lenore, divorce bill, 11741.
Railway mail clerks, 11914.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10909.
Rules for limitation of debate, 8371.
Scaterie Island fog alarm keeper, 631.
Steam trawling, 3340.
Steel rails, remission of duty on, 6866.

Cars, official private, purchase of, 592, 798, 3175, 6298, 12087.

Carson, A. B., appointment of, 3121.

Cartridges, manufacture of, 6257.

Carvell, Mr. Frank B. (Carleton, N.B.)
Accountants' Association, 3978.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 223.
Macdonald by-election, 224
Mounted police, 232.
West Indian Trade, 234.
Reciprocity with United States, 236.
Agriculture, aid to, 8089, 8116.
Agriculture, Department of, estimates, 10402.
Archives, 11940.
Asselin, Olivar, 592.
Banks and banking, 1269, 1932, 10089, 10104, 10283, 10307, 10354.
Budget
Agricultural implements and the tariff, 10557.
Automobiles, duty on, 10563.
Boots and shoes and the tariff, 10564.
Butter and eggs, imports of, 10567.
Cotton industry, 10554.
Expenditures, increase of, 10534.
British preference, 10536.
Tariff and taxation, 10535, 10574.
United States markets and reciprocity, 10539.
Woollen tariff, 10552.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4399.

Carvell, Mr. Frank B.—Cont.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1957.
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 6113.
Conservation Commission, 6462.
Criminal Code amendments, 11616.
Customs estimates, 12105.
Dismissals, 834, 848, 8025, 11574.
Divorce court, need of a, 6737, 11740.
Dominion notes, printing of, 6487.
Fenian raid bounty, 6687.
Fisheries in New Brunswick, 12051.
Florenceville, Upper Wicklow, mail service, 8128.
Forest fires in New Brunswick, 6462.
Fredericton
Military grounds, 1555.
Pier washout, 7035.
Land purchase at, 621.
Freight rates, western, 8958.
Fruit marking, 10083, 11930.
Gobeil, Antoine, employment of, 10824.
Gobeil, Joseph, employment of, 10825.
Haggart, Hon. John, death of, 5614.
Highways improvement, 12014, 12091.
Imperial Underwriters' Corporation, 4414.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11517.
Japanese Treaty, 7085, 7152.
Judges, salaries of, 8055, 11638.
Laforce, J. E., employment of, 3120.
Landry, A., appointment of, 6583.
La Patrie printing contract, 8125.
Lead bounties, 10149.
Macdonald by-election, 224.
Mail bag locks, 7034, 7212, 7617, 8124, 8356, 8649, 9214, 9595.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10775.
Militia estimates, 6726, 11012, 11024-11063.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3360, 3686.
Montreal
Harbour master, 9841.
Immigration officials, 618.
Post office, 2167.
National Transcontinental Railway
Estimates, 11131, 11206, 11227.
Freight rates on, in New Brunswick, 6815.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3532, 3556, 4286, 4435, 4757, 4997, 5133, 5169, 5935, 5974, 5992, 5638, 5841, 5876, 7357, 9242, 9336, 9438, 9588, 9976 (amdt).
Ontario superior courts, 6630.
Ottawa Government buildings, 6230.
Parliamentary procedure
Chairman and French language, 5876.
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 5878, 6007.

Carvell, Mr. Frank B.—Cont.
Friday sitting, validity of after midnight, 4997.
Money grant, amendment of, 5841, 5859.
Previous question, moving of in committee, 9336.
Questions without notice, 7035.
Recalcitrant witness, motion regarding without notice, 3360.
Patents, renewal of, 3078, 3353, 4317, 11016, 11020.
Post Office department
Automobile for, 8126.
Law clerk, 8358.
Quebec legal adviser of, 7810.
Privilege, 6050.
Public Works estimates, 11164, 11185, 12118.
Railway subsidies, 11673, 11691, 11843.
Railway works, inter-sessional, 594.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10843, 10856, 10890, 10922.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 764, 1133, 1307, 2954, 3315, 3362.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7492, 8308, 9587.
St. Fabien postmistress, appointment of, 3893.
St. John Ambulance Association, 6168.
St. John and Quebec Railway, 622, 11673, 11691.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6509.
Salmon fishing regulations, 6226.
Southampton Railway Company, 10415.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11877.
United Shoe Machinery Company, 11667.
Volunteer bounty, 8906.
West Indian trade, 334, 905, 8743, 8802.

Cash, Mr. Edward L. (Mackenzie)
Cardinal canal tolls collector, dismissal of, 1744.
Yorkton homestead inspectors, 1018.

Cattle
British embargo on, 610, 1564.
Exports of, 611, 624, 1366.

Cement
Duty, reduction of, 30, 45, 52, 85, 188, 202, 274, 296, 302, 336, 389, 413, 457, 496, 542, 550, 611, 9645, 10605.
Imports, 599, 816.
Purchases, 7382.

Census of Canada, 960, 3414.

Chabot, Mr. John Leo (Ottawa)
Canadian Medical Association, 3402, 3842.

Chairman and Acting Chairman, rulings of
Appeal, no second on one question, 5895; appealed from: div., 6024.
Chairman understanding language not that of Speaker not applicable to temporary chairman, 5874.
'Closure,' term applied to action of House unparliamentary, 6036; appealed from, 6039.
Crown grant, purpose of, not changeable, 5854.
Friday sitting, validity of after midnight, 5004.
Irrelevancy, 4473, 4508, 4775, 5824, 5832, 5874, 5880, 5888, 5917.
Merits of bill, on m. for com. to rise, 5868, 5883; appealed from: div., 5869, 5884.
Order of day on m. for com. to rise, 5931; appealed from: div., 5931.
Personal arguments why com. should rise, 5881; appealed from: div., 5882.
Principle of a Bill in com., 5816; appealed from: div., 5817.
Question of, may be raised by member, 5832.
Quoting from previous debate, 5983; appealed from: div., 5984.
Out of order to ask for unobtainable information, 4628.
Point of order debatable only by permission of chair, 4823; appealed from, 4824; ruling reversed, 4825.
Previous question
Not movable in com., 9330.
Not movable on non-debatable motion, 9339; appealed from: div., 9339.
Rules of debate, new, interpretation of, 9362, 9363; appeal: div., 9377, 9571, 9589.
Section regularly before com., 9372; appeal, 9377; div., 9377.
Tedious repetition, 4509, 4515, 5832, 5920.
Undebatable: m. to postpone further con., 9370; appealed from: div., 9370.

Chambly canal, 2723, 10823.

Champagne, A. George, employment of, 10414.

Charlton, Mr. William A. (Norfolk)
National Sanitarium Association, 963.
Naval forces of the Empire, 10054.

Chartered Accountants. *See* **Private Bills.**

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 6015.

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W.—Cont.
Fishery advisory board, 3417.
Hants, strike in, 8647.
Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 1822.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10804-10806, 10813-10815.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5385.
Port Hood harbour, 956, 1734.
Public Works estimates, 11184.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10918.

Chisholm, Mr. William (Antigonish)
Antigonish
Estimates, 2371, 2617, 3551, 11972, 12122.
Food inspector, dismissal of, 4059.
Arisaig postmaster, 2370.
Biological board, 3554.
Crispo, Jeffery M.: complaint, 3416.
Cross Roads-Ohio-James river mail service, 3178.
Dismissals
Intercolonial Railway employees, 9222.
Macdonald, A., 988.
McNeil, Lauchlin, 834.
Postmasters, 12095.
Fenian raid bounty, 7810, 8652.
Fish trawling, 3285, 3329.
Government railways provident fund, 745.
Grosvenor mail service, 10412.
House of Commons Law Branch, 10412, 11969.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11518-11529.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 8873, 8875.
Country Harbour branch, 2416.
Hay transportation, 1015, 3175.
Freight rates, 12066.
Pension fund, 8146.
Judges in Nova Scotia, 11807.
Kentville public building, 3031.
Landry, Adolphe, employment of, 1362.
Linwood mail contract, 605.
Minister of Public Works, proposed censure of, 10192.
Mint, Ottawa, employees wages in, 12113.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4137, 4511, 4899, 6015, 9205, 9234.
Post Office estimates, 11432.
Public Works estimates, 11477, 12115.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11897.
Tracadie lobster hatchery, 962.

Civil Service
Age limit, 800.
Murray, Sir George, report of, 1360, 4469.
Vacancies and appointments, 598.

Clark, Mr. Hugh (North Bruce)
Banks and banking, 10130.
Election Act amendment, 8459.

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Agriculture
Aid to, 8064.
Credits, 3157.
Banks and banking, 2481, 10355, 11587.
Didsbury postmaster, 6752.
Freight rates
Equality of, 10959.
Western, 8950, 10959.
Highways improvement, 11985.
House of Commons staff, classification of, 11954.
Immigration, female, protection of, 12166.
Japanese treaty, 7159.
Lead bounties, 10151, 10163, 10189.
Luncheon with Minister of Militia and Defence—denial, 9950.
Mint, Ottawa, 8672.
Natural gas in Alberta, 6433.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1196, 3999, 4311, 4353, 4478, 4521, 4914, 5278, 5402, 5892, 5961, 5970, 5985, 6021, 7320, 7345, 9387, 9452, 9528.
Parcel post, 1518, 11829.
Parliamentary procedure
Appeal, second on one question, 5892.
Privilege, questions of and personal explanations, 1985.
Post Office estimates, 1138.
Rules for limitation of debate, 8433.
St. John Ambulance Association, 6172.
Steel rails, remission of duty on, 6869.
West Indian trade, 2020.

Clarke Mr. W. A. (North Wellington)
Customs estimates, 8732.
Highways improvement, 8841.
Railway divisional points, removal of, 9929.

Clements, Mr. Herbert (Comox-Atlin)
Experimental farms, 10265.
Steel rails, remission of duty on, 6873.

Clocks for public buildings, 7467, 8124, 8462, 9216.

Closure. *See* **Rules.**

Coal miners in British Columbia, 12134.

Coal, Welsh, purchases of, 795.

Coast Guard newspaper, 1550.

Coasting trade of Canada, 1561.

Cochrane, Hon. Frank (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Canadian Northern and Quebec Railway, 3410.

Cochrane, Hon. Frank—Cont.
Canadian Northern Railway Bill, 4365.
Canadian Northern Railway subsidy, 11693, 11846.
Freight rates
Equality of, 10970.
Western, 8935.
Government railways provident fund, 719, 721, 729, 777, 8135-8156.
Highways improvement, 949, 8183, 8581, 8591, 8820, 11973, 12091.
Hudson Bay Railway, 10940.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 937, 2001, 8551, 8859, 12024.
Car shortage, 288.
Employees, transfer of, 645.
Estimates, 6753, 12066.
Freight rates, 938.
Halifax terminals, 10896.
Pension fund. *See* Government railways provident fund.
Running rights over, 157.
National Transcontinental Railway
Estimates, 11099, 11128, 11210-11255.
Operation in New Brunswick, 6936.
Quebec terminals, 12063.
Statement, 6810.
Time, extension of, 3350.
Peterborough lift-lock contract, 156.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 2190.
Quebec bridge, 11255.
Railway Commission, 9688.
Railway Commissioner, Chief, salary of, 9918.
Railway divisional points, removal of, 7718, 9930.
Railway subsidies, 11669, 11843.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10816, 10844, 10952, 11255-11268, 11294, 11319, 12061-12095.
St. Peters, expropriation of lands at, 977.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11873, 11878.
Toronto terminals, 11073.
Walberg claim, 6343.

Cockshutt, Mr. William F. (Brantford)
Banks and banking, 10139, 10365.
Budget
Condition of working classes, 10500.
Manufacturing in Canada, 10502, 10511.
Tariff and expenditures, 10506.
Imports and exports, 10515.
Imports of agricultural implements, 10518.
Financial outlook of Canada, 10522.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1620, 9481.
Technical Education Commission, 2724.

Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 6050; div., 6159.

Coderre, Hon. Louis (Secretary of State)
Archives, public, 11939.
Election charges, 6064.

Coinage, Canadian, 8460.

Cold Storage warehouses, 1558.

Cole Harbour wharf, 3033.

Colonels, honourary, 2174.

Companies Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 150.

Companies, incorporated, 604, 605, 2575, 2700, 2879, 3014, 3023.

Conciliation, boards of, 699.

Conservation Commission, 6456, 6721, 8651, 12056, 12060.

Conservation Commission Bill. Res., 9696. 1r., 9697. 2r., com. and 3r., 9946.

Co-operation. *See* **Agriculture Credits.**

Co-operative Credit Societies Bill. 1r., 9039.

Cost of living, 2164, 6442, 6622, 10444, 10468, 10494, 10603, 10620.

Country Harbour postmaster, 8462.

Criminal Code Amendment Bill. 1r., 10,070. 2r. and com., 11603. 3r., 11623. Senate amdts., 12138.

Crocket, Mr. Oswald S. (York, N.B.)
Meek divorce bill, 11740.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3682.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3591, 5883.
Patents, renewal of, 3832.
Power, Lenore, divorce bill, 11743.
Southampton railway, 8121.

Crothers, Hon. Thomas W. (Minister of Labour)
Alberta, natural gas in, 6425.
Alien labour law: dismissal of inspector, 8122. *See also* Immigration.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1962.
Devereaux, Charlotte, dismissal of, 6711.
Donaldson homestead entry, 7957.
Farmers Bank, 8293.
Forest reserves and parks, 10065, 11649.
Hutchinson, Lois B., bounty for, 10679.
Immigration
Estimates, 11548, 11554, 11562.
Female immigrants, protection of, 12168.
Importation of photo-engravers, 7741.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 8489, 10839.
Labour estimates, 12131.
Living, report on cost of, 6622.

Crothers, Hon. Thomas W.—Cont.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3748, 4709, 5431, 5769, 10022.
Offensive personal reference, complaint of, 5770-5775.
Ontario superior courts, 6638.
Railway Belt water powers, 9592, 11921...
Rules for limitation of debate, 8301.
Russian immigrants, treatment of, 11077.
Strikes commission, 6840.
United Shoe Machinery Company, 11668.
Volunteer bounty, 8905, 9941.

Crown lands, sales of, 614.

Cruise, Mr. Robert (Dauphin)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Macdonald election, 203.
Reciprocity with United States, 204.
Freight rates, 205.
Manitoba boundaries, 206.
Banks and banking, 208.
Experimental farm in Dauphin, 6417.
Fishing on Lake Winnipegosis, 6259.
Mail bag locks, 7617.
Manitoba
Separate schools, 206.
Swamp lands, 1888.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4886.
Riding Mountain
Drainage, 6416.
Forest reserve, 6255.

Cumberland postmaster, 1017.

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Banks and banking, 2317.
Chairman, acting as, 4821-4824, 4826.
Criminal Code amendments, 84.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9739.
Dredging contracts, 6406.
Naturalization Act amendment, 1362.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4299, 5547.
Privilege: wire fencing, 154.
Public Works estimates, 11162.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3385.
Wednesday sittings, 2282.
West Indian trade agreement, 2103.

Customs and Fisheries Protection Bill. 1r., 1097. 2r., 3272. Com., 3280, 3318. 3r., 9845.

Customs
Estimates, 6295, 6881, 8014, 8690, 12105, 11544.
Foreign vessels, importations in, 3416.

Customs Tariff. *See* **Tariff.**

Dairy imports and exports, 595.

Davidson, Mr. Avard L. (Annapolis)
Dismissals in Nova Scotia, 1000, 8163.
Fenian raid bounty, 6695.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10789-10795.

Debate, limitation of. *See* **Rules.**

Debates, official report of. *See* **House of Commons.**

Delisle, Mr. Michel S. (Portneuf)
Conservation Commission, 8651.
Dismissals
Harvey Junction postmaster, 4429.
Portneuf lightkeeper, 2179, 2373, 2374.
Rivière à Pierre postmaster, 633.
St. Marc des Carrières postmaster, 633.
St. Ubade postmaster, 632.
Grondines maritime telephone station, 3892, 7624.

Ice breaking in the St. Lawrence, 808.
Lord, Dr., employment of, 11571.
Minister of Justice, payments to, 8127.
Newville mail service, 619.
Portneuf telephone operators, 6745.
Postal orders tariff, 8653.
St. Bazile mail service, 618.

Demers, Mr. M. Joseph (St. John and Iberville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Banks and banking, 468.
Canada, prosperity of, 471.
Naval defence, 472.
Banks and banking, 469, 1929.
Chambly canal, 2723.
Champagne, A. George, employment of, 10414.
Dismissals
Ash and Bloody Island lightkeeper, 1953.
Point à la Mule lightkeeper, 638.
St. Jean collector, 635, 7634.
St. Jean lockkeeper, 638.
Naval forces of the Empire, 472, 3200, 4775, 5671.
Noyan customs officers, 620.
Post Office estimates, 11452.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7789.
St. Jean immigration building, 1166.

Deposits in banks and with Government, 1166.

Deputy Speaker (Mr. P. E. Blondin)
See also **Blondin, Mr. P. E.** *and* **Chairman's Rulings.**

Deputy Speaker (Mr. P. E. Blondin)—Cont.
Reading of documents in French, 1120.
Proposed censure of, 9710; div., 9820.

Deschamps, Raoul, employment of, 699.

Desjardins, A., employment of, 2174.

Des Prairies river dredging, 935.

Devereux, Charlotte, Indian school teacher, 612, 6699.

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Aylmer post office, 7811, 8128.
Georgian Bay canal, 2591, 2621, 9230.
Highways improvement, 12010.
Hull wharf, 585.
Investigations of political partisanship, 2161.
Labouring classes, condition of, 1738.
Living, high cost of, 2165.
Mail bag locks, 7890.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2505, 4633, 4641, 5326, 5967, 5768, 5827, 9546.
Ottawa river dredging, 656.
Parliamentary procedure
Irrelevance, question of, raised by Chair alone, 5827.
Money grant, amendment of, 5839.
Privy Council, Canadian appeals to, 1580.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7674.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6530.
Schooner Advocate, 1562.
South Onslow-Quyon mail service, 6261.
West Indian trade agreement, 2049, 2122.
Wright county post offices, 585.

Diamond Light and Heating Company. *See* **Miller.**

Dickin, George, homestead inspector, 1161.

Digby customs official, 8654.

Dismissals
Abel, P., lightkeeper, 8858.
Alain, J., postmaster, 11573.
Alameda postmaster, 657 (i)
Aldershot camp caretaker, 5155.
Allaire, Dr., 944.
Andover preventive officer, 634.
Anse aux Gascons wharfinger, 10529.
Arthabaska overseer of works, 635.
Ash Island lightkeeper, 1953.
Astephen, A., emigration inspector, 3422.
Aultsville postmaster, 1368.
Barrington fishery inspector, 1160.
Barss, A., postmaster, 7811.
Bayfield, H. A., captain of dredge, 3030.
Beauce customs official, 1504.
Bellemare, W., postmaster, 4429.
Bergeron, C., postmaster, 9222.

Dismissals—Cont.
Beyter, D., lightkeeper, 8640.
Bezanson, J., postmaster, 3179.
Bleriot postmaster, 634.
Boulardarie postmaster, 2616.
Bourdages, P. B., lightkeeper, 7628.
Bourge is river lighthouse keeper, 1500.
Bourk, Lt. Col., mail clerk, 1745.
Bourque, A., Bonaventure marine employee, 7628.
Brennan, J. F., lockmaster, 8656.
Bujold, L., lightkeeper, 7627.
Burriss, R. A., immigration agent, 810.
Cacouna Indian agent, 1746.
Cape Traverse postmaster, 1501.
Cardinal canal toll collector, 1744.
Caribou Island lightkeeper, 640.
Chiasson, Edouard, customs collector, 8726.
Chisholm, D., customs official, 4059.
Cleroux, A., immigration agent, 7386.
Coaticook customs collector, 8018.
Coleraine postmistress, 2179.
Contrecœur postmaster, 3893.
Descouse and West Arichat, 818, 917, 3746, 3933, 4064, 6540.
Deseve, A. L., fishery overseer, 11574.
Devereux, Charlotte, Indian school teacher, 612, 6699.
Didsbury postmaster, 6752.
Disraeli postmaster, 637.
Doctor's Brook sub-collector, 988.
Dorchester county postmasters, 3420.
Doré, F., lightkeeper, 8858.
Douglas, Howard, superintendent of Dominion parks, 957, 3894, 7220.
Drummondville public building caretaker, 635.
Dunn, Albert, engineer, 7221.
East Mountain Lake fishery inspector, 1954.
Ehler, W. E., lightkeeper, 8133.
Fafard, J. E., 1953.
Farran's Point postmaster, 1369.
Fraser, A., postmaster, 12095.
Fruit inspectors, 2619.
Gallant, J. J. D., lighthouse keeper, 3179.
Gallant, P. P., fishery overseer, 3028.
Gendron, E., lightkeeper, 3890.
Giffin C. G., fishery officer, 959.
Grondines lightkeeper, 2373.
Guysborough fishery officer, 631.
Half Island Cove postmaster, 700.
Hanley
Land agent, 7220.
Postmaster, 7220.
Herbertville postmaster, 2178.

Dismissals—Cont.
Heckey, R., immigration agent, 3422.
Hilford fishery overseer, 639.
Hobema Indian agent, 639.
Inman, C. R., immigration inspector, 1162.
Intercolonial railway employees, 933, 2162, 3038, 7387, 8655, 9222.
Irish, F. R., postmaster, 12095.
Joliette
Arsenal keeper, 1555.
Customs official, 1502.
Postmasters, 2373.
Kingsborough postmaster, 6259.
Habillois, Alex., postmaster, 7627.
Labour Gazette correspondents, 805.
Lacroix, E., postmaster, 7221.
Lancups postmaster, 3894.
Landry, J. E., lightkeeper, 8133.
Landry. *See* Descouse.
Lanigan, Martin, postmaster, 940, 6736, 7632, 11808.
Larry's River preventive officer, 8733.
Lavoie, Calixte, postmaster, 811.
Leclerc, L. P., postmaster, 811.
Lions, V., dredge captain, 2620.
L'Islet postmasters, 1745, 1746, 3037.
Livingstone, G., New Campbellton customs officer, 2617.
Lotbinière county, 816, 9215.
Macdonald, Gordon, homestead inspector, 810.
MacKenzie, J. B., fire ranger, 9344.
MacKenzie, J. B., fruit inspector, 9842.
McDonald, Duncan, customs officer, 812.
McGraw, B., lightkeeper, 8655.
McLean, J. W., medical officer, 3422.
McLellan, J. A. L., lightkeeper, 12163.
McNeil, Lauchlin, postmaster, 834.
Main à dieu postmistress, 702.
Malpeque customs collector, 1501.
Marcotte, Madame, postmistress, 7627.
Marcotte, Omer, postmaster, 811.
Middle Country Harbour postmaster, 701.
Morrow, J., customs collector, 8132.
Mulgrave preventive officer, 639.
Munro, W. L., 10687-10703.
Nadeau, E., immigration agent, 9344.
Niobe, H. M. C. S., 8226.
Normandin postmaster, 2178.
North Sydney
Immigration agents, 3422.
Medical examiner, 3422.
Oxford customs collector, 712, 978.
Paquin, Ernest, postmaster, 939.
Pelletier, J. H., engineer, 933.
Pelletier, Odilon, excise officer, 809.

Dismissals—Cont.
Petite de Grat preventive officer, 6902.
Pettit, W. V., postmaster, 7891.
Phee, J., lighthousekeeper, 3180.
Pilot of steamer Earl Grey, 641.
Point à la Mule lightkeeper, 638.
Pointe A. Citrouille lighthouse keeper, 6948.
Port Daniel fishery overseer, 7221.
Port Felix lightkeeper, 9949.
Portneuf lightkeeper, 2179.
Portneuf telephone operators, 6745.
Postmasters in Maritime provinces, 9609.
Potvin, Pierre, postmaster, 811.
Pouliot, Mr., mail carrier, 3037.
Preventive officers in Quebec, 710.
Printing Bureau employees, 7222, 7383.
Quebec
Customs officer, 6263.
Medical examiner, 6262, 6263.
Radstock mail receiver, 1502.
Regina homestead inspector, 1954.
Richards, Stephen, 10770.
Rimouski
Government employees, 2178, 2179, 3041.
Lightkeeper, 2620.
Postmaster, 2373.
Rivière à Pierre postmaster, 633.
Rouleau, George, postmaster, 810.
Rousseau, Napoleon, postmaster, 810.
Royal Military College employees, 632.
Rutherford, John, forest ranger, 622.
St. Anselme postmaster, 635.
St. Ferdinand de Beaurivage postmaster, 702.
St. Fortunat postmaster, 637.
St. François Xavier de Brampton postmaster, 636.
St. Frederic postmaster, 634.
St. Gabriel de Brandon mail receiver, 1745.
St. Gervais postmaster, 702.
St. Henri de Lévis postmaster, 3420.
St. Henri de Taillon postmaster, 2178.
St. Jean
Inland revenue collector, 635.
Lockkeeper, 638.
Mail carrier, 3894.
St. Lambert de Lévis postmaster, 3421.
St. Leonard, N.B., immigration agent, 11204.
St. Marc des Carrières postmaster, 633.
St. Romuald d'Etchemin postmaster, 3421.
St. Ubalde postmaster, 632.
Ste. Victoire postmistress, 7629.
Salmon River Indian teacher, 612, 6699.

Dismissals—Cont.
Saskatoon Dominion lands clerk, 6263, 6746.
Seven Islands fishery overseer, 9843.
Sherbrooke customs appraiser, 638, 6896, 6899.
Sintaluta postmaster, 10413.
Slack, W. F., clerk of works, Ottawa, 3037.
Sonora postmaster, 701.
Sorel shipyards, 953, 1370.
Standen, J. R., postmaster, 11574.
Stormont, N.S., postmaster, 632.
Stratford Centre postmaster, 637.
Terrebonne postmaster, 617.
Thibadeau, L., postmaster, 11573.
Three Rivers letter carrier, 6262.
Tignish
Customs officer, 1501.
Light keeper, 3180.
Postmaster, 1502.
Tracadie Road postmaster, 701.
Trenton inland revenue officer, 1500.
Trois Saumons lightkeeper, 1745.
Vaudreuil county postmasters, 1954.
Verrault, Joseph, postmaster, 7626.
Victoriaville excise collector, 636.
Viel, J., postmaster, 4429.
Warwick postmistress, 636.
Webber, J. M., lightkeeper, 7811.
Webster, Dr., port physician, 3894, 10796.
Wendover wharfinger, 629.
West Arichat, 818, 917.
White, J., postmaster, 3551, 3555.
Whitney Pier postmistress, 703.
Wickham West postmistress, 636.
Winchester postmaster, 1369.
Yukon officials, 2177.

Disraeli
Property, option on, 8131.
Public buildings, 6742.

Ditching machinery, duty on, 6441, 6642.

Divorce court, need of, 6737, 11740.

Doherty, Hon. C. J., payments to, 8127.

Doherty, Hon. C. J. (Minister of Justice)
Accountants' Association, 3835.
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 6065.
Criminal Code amendments, 10070, 11604, 11611.
Customs and Fisheries Protection Act, 3299.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9788.
Dominion Police, 8034, 8564.
Exchequer court, patent appeals in, 1838, 3351, 8051.

Doherty, Hon. C. J.—Cont.
Judges, additional, 11624, 11806, 11926.
Justice Department estimates, 6280, 10973-11011.
Landry, Leon N., dismissal of, 3746, 3933, 6571.
Law Lords in Great Britain, appointment of, 7818, 8060.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3715.
Naturalization, uniform British, 2386, 9347.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5849, 5878.
Ontario superior courts, 6305, 6626.
Pardon of convicts: confidential papers, 919, 3746.
Parliamentary procedure: Chairman and French language, 5878.
Pelagic sealing bill, 11321.
Penitentiary Act amendment, 11330-11345.
Prisons Act amendment, 10953.
Privy Council, Judicial Com. of, 7818, 8060, 9834.
Reprieve of prisoners, 1839.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7441.
Russian Canadians sent to Siberia, 7813.
St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary dismissals, 945.
Supreme Court Act amendment, 8057, 8568, 9822, 9826, 9834.
Supreme Court Registrar's salary, 8052.
Waterloo county deputy judge, 6288.

Dominion Lands Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 1946.

Dominion Northwestern Railway Company Bill. 1r., 1547. 2r., 1875. Com., 3400. 3r., 3401. Senate amdts., 6197.

Dominion notes, printing of, 6486.

Dominion Police Bill. 1r., 8034. 2r., 8564. Com., 8564. 3r., 8568.

Donaldson homestead entry, 2720, 3264, 3745, 7805, 7892 (proposed censure of Hon. Robert Rogers), 8012 (div.), 8226, 8360, 8465, 8859.

Doncaster Indian reserve, 4422.

Donnelly, Mr. James J. (South Bruce)
Banks and banking, 10141.
British cattle embargo, 1564.

Doors, imports of from United States, 2172.

Dorchester county mail service, 619.

Dorsett, W. E., investigating commissioner, 1159.

Douglas, Mr. J. M. (Strathcona)
Banks and banking, 2357, 10293.
Canadian Pacific Railway freight rates, 11572.

Douglas, Mr. J. M.—Cont.
Fenian raid bounty, 2614.
Fruit industry, 9673.
Justice Department estimates: penitentiaries, 11006.
Militia estimates, 11029.
Moosejaw immigration building, 11200.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4737.
Orange, George, 2373.
Winchester postmaster, dismissal of, 1369.

Dredges and Dredging
Cape Breton, 698, 1550.
Industry, 611.
Little Passage, 7468.
Miramichi river, 587.
Prince Edward Island, 8653, 9840.
Restigouche, 6743.
Rideau canal, 6249.
St. John, 6207.
Yarmouth, 3033.

Dry Docks, 586, 705, 1290, 1361, 1406. *See also* Port Arthur.

Duchemin, H. P., payments to, 1016, 7811, 8130, 8462.

Dugal, G. A., employment of, 3887, 4058.

Dullman, release of, 6610.

Dumping clause, 594.

Dussault, G. A., employment of, 3418.

Du Vernet, Dr., appointment of, 8460.

Earl Grey steamer, 3035.

East River, deepening of, 653, 4060, 6229, 6735.

Edmonton
Customs collector, 1018.
Public buildings, 6231.

Edwards, Mr. John W. (Frontenac)
Agriculture, aid to, 8098, 8508.
Budget, 10575
Farmers and the tariff, 10577.
The Liberal party and tariff reduction, 10583.
Liberal pledges, 10587.
Canada's export and import trade, 10591.
Tariff commission, 10594.
The duty on farm implements, 10594.
Canadian Medical Association, 3846, 3865.
Dismissals and appointments, 6607, 8021.
Ditching machinery, duty on, 6658.
Experimental farms, 10271.
Fenian raid bounty, 6677.
Highways improvement, 8546, 8605, 8827.
Hughes, Major W. S., appointment of, 3177.

Edwards, Mr. John W.—Cont.
Milk tests, 8076.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1492, 1582, 4512, 4668, 4712, 5480, 5707, 9454.
Opposition leader, salary of, 8358.
Penitentiaries estimates, 10976, 10989.
Pollution of navigable waters, 8633.
Portsmouth penitentiary, 1156, 1157, 3176.
South African war scrip, 8918.
West Indian trade agreement, 2069.

Election Act Amendment Bills. 1r., 84, 950, 8459.

Emigration from Canada, 4428.

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Westmorland)
Accountants' Association, 3836.
Ammon post office, 11942.
Banks and banking, 1271, 2419, 10107, 10314, 10320, 10348, 10351, 10670.
Brazilian Traction and Power Company, 3014.
Canadian Medical Protective Association, 3403, 3842.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4397.
Carson, A. B., appointment of, 3121.
Express rates, 3423.
Foresters, Independent Order of, 7180.
Freight rates, western, 8983.
Fur farming, 2177, 2370.
Gaspereaux river fisheries, 12048.
Gatros wharf, 3178.
Government railways provident fund, 720, 724, 731.
Gutelius, T. P., employment of, 8131.
Hay, free transportation of, 703, 886.
High Commissioner's office, 6452.
Highways improvement, 12016.
Rules for limitation of debate, 8386.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 834, 1746, 1949, 1990, 1949, 3122, 3552, 8860.
Cars and locomotives, 2165.
Dorchester spur line, 2164.
Estimates, 6752, 12068.
Gas plant, 3123.
Kindling wood, 958.
Linoleum purchase, 3417.
Management, 630, 1157, 6839, 6876.
Mail facilities, 6293.
Ocean limited train, 1366.
Pension fund, 8145.
Running rights over, 157.
Sackville wharf, 3548.
Train ticket agents, 2166.
Winter clothes for employees, 2722.
Japanese treaty, 7175, 7188.
Judges, additional, 11642.

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—Cont.
Lanigan, Martin, dismissal of, 940, 7632.
Life-saving stations, 6201.
Macdougall, C. B., case of, 6604.
Mail bag locks, 7214, 8355.
National Transcontinental Railway: Moncton-Edmundston division, 1950.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4171, 4502, 5122, 5335, 5987, 6010, 5880, 5897.
North Atlantic rates, 9091.
Parliamentary procedure
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 6010.
Irrelevancy, 5881, 5882.
Returns, notification of, 3124.
Speaker resuming chair without committee report, 6161, 6306.
Privilege, 696, 1946.
Privy Council decisions, 1580.
Railway divisional points, removal of, 7722.
Registered letters, the rate on, 11914.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 2983, 3366.
Richibucto wharf, 9220.
Rules of the House, 6161, 6306.
St. John Ambulance Association, 6171.
Shediac fishery overseer, dismissal of, 3028.
West Indian trade agreement, 2079, 2119.

Erinville post office, 7616.

Escuminac River post office, 4424.

Esquimalt dry dock, 8641.

Estimates. *See titles of departments.*

Ethier, Mr. Joseph A. C. (Two Mountains)
Lacroix, E., postmaster, dismissal of, 7221.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4852, 9475.
Privilege, 6047.

Eureka chief engineer, 8655.

Exchequer Court Bill. 1r., 1838. 2r., 3351. Com., 3352. 3r., 3355. Senate amdts., 8051.

Experimental farms, 2171, 6417, 7386, 7808, 8651, 10258.

Express rates, 3423, 6256, 9343.

External Affairs, department of, 3356, 6456.

Fairville post office, 3034.

Farm Weeds, distribution of, 624.

Farmers Bank, 629, 803, 2725, 6734, 12164.

Farnham military camp, 3890.

Fenian raid veterans, 612, 625, 700, 801, 1741, 2171, 2614, 6418, 6509, 6659, 6726, 7219, 7810, 8652, 9595.

Financial Statement. *See* **Budget.**

Finance Department estimates, 6480-6496.

Fisheries
Advisory Board, 603, 3122, 3417, 10818.
Bounty, 8461.
Exhibit at Toronto exhibition, 10818.
Fighting Island, rights on, 2724, 3036.
Fisher, Ward, inspector, 1164.
Lobsters
Canning licenses, 4421.
Fishing licenses, 9950.
Hatcheries, 627, 628, 806, 7216, 9950, 10816.
Packers, 4427.
Licenses to Japanese, 1165.
Mowat, M. M., appointment of, 7219.
Oyster culture, 10814.
Protection of, 6222, 6507, 10815, 12046. *See also* Customs and Fisheries Protection Bill.
Regulations, 8127. *See also* British Columbia.
Winnipegosis lake, 6259.

Flags, use of, Bill. 1r., 6.

Floods in the United States, 6624.

Fore river shipyard, 4290, 4328.

Foreign vessels, sale of goods from, 3416.

Foresters, Independent Order of, Bill. 1r., 949. 2r., 1310. Com., 7178, 7337. 3r., 7337.

Forest Reserves and Parks Bill. 1r., 10064. 2r. and com., 11649. 3r., 11655.

Forget, Sir Rodolphe (Charlevoix)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech: Richelieu by-election, 478.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 2992.

Fortier, Mr. Edmond (Lotbinière)
Bergeron, C., dismissal of, 9222.
Boulard lightkeeper, 8858.
Dismissals in Lotbinière county, 816, 8858.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5552.
Post offices in Lotbinière county, 9215.
Public Works estimates, 12130.
Seed grain for Quebec, 8649.
Wharf construction, 8858.

Fort Lawrence dredging inspector, 1549.

Foster, Mr. Arthur De Witt (King's, N.S.)
Animals, health of, 10406.
Fisheries, protection of, 12046.
Fruit growing, 9675.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10776-10785, 12046.

Foster, Mr. Arthur De Witt—Cont.
Militia camp supplies, 9213.
Minister of Public Works, proposed censure of, 10239.

Foster, Hon. George E. (Minister of Trade and Commerce)
Grain traffic diversion, 2505.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1371.
Ocean freight rates, 2504.
West Indian trade agreement, 890, 2012, 2111.

Fournier, H., employment of, 1740.

Fowler, Mr. George W. (King's and Albert)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Cement duty, 336.
Redistribution of representation, 337.
Transportation, 337.
St. John improvements, 337.
Trade of Canada, 339.
By-elections, 343.
Naval defence, 350.
Reciprocity with United States, 339, 351.
Auditor General's office, 9216, 10144.
Judges in New Brunswick, 11639.

France, Canadian flotations in, 1953.

Fredericton
Land purchase, 621.
Military grounds, 1555.
Pier washout, 7035.

Freight rates
Equality of, 10955; div., 10972.
Ocean, 1561, 2504, 9040.
Western, 1496, 6255, 8923, 11572, 11782.

French Canadians
Repatriation of, 3032, 3123.
Rights of, 127.

French investments in Canada, 2180.

Friedmann treatment for tuberculosis. *See* **Tuberculosis.**

Fripp, Mr. Alfred E. (Ottawa)
Criminal Code amendments, 11608.
Naval forces of the Empire, 9517.
Ottawa City water supply, 8550, 8629, 8640.
Public Works estimates, 11487.

Fruit
Industry, 2279.
Inspectors, dismissal of, 2619.
Tariff on, 6943.

Fruit Marking Bill. Res., 9662. 1r., 9687. 2r. and com., 10081, 11927. 3r., 11939.

Fur farming, 2177, 2370.

Garland, Mr. William F. (Carleton, O.)
McGrath, E. A., employment of, 7386.
Printing Bureau, re-organization of, 7808.
Public Service Commission, 7808.

Gaspé
Railway facilities, 1777, 1793, 8555, 8880.
Steamship service, 3418, 4420, 7212, 7621.

Gatros wharf, 3178.

Gauthier, Mr. Louis J. (St. Hyacinthe)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Monk, Hon. F. D., resignation of, 113.
Naval defence, 115.
By-elections, 116.
Bourassa, Emile, 7217.
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 5621, 6050, 6156.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1716, 4630, 5536, 5911.
Privilege, 5150, 5621, 6050.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7879.

Gauthier, Mr. Louis P. (Gaspé)
Ile-aux-œufs lightkeeper, 9220.

Gauvreau, Charles A. (Temiscouata)
Agriculture, aid to, 8104.
Amqui mail contract, 3037
Dismissals
Cacouna Indian agent, 1746.
L'Islet postmasters, 1745.
Pointe Rivière du Loup postmaster, 4429.
Port Joli lighthouse keeper, 1745.
Rimouski lighthouse keeper, 2620.
Rivière du Loup railroad engineer, 933.
St. Roch des Aulnaies excise officer, 809.
Village des Aulnaies postmaster, 1746.
Dugal, Alphonse G., employment of, 3887, 4058.
Fenian Raid veterans, 1741.
Fraserville harbour works, 1019.
Highways improvement, 8840.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11533.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 2172, 8870.
Cacouna water tank, 8358.
Estimates, 6807.
Ice contract, 1742.
Operating rules, 8645.
Sunday observance on, 8131.
Tobin branch, 8640.
Isle Verte
Mail service, 4427.
Wharf, 1743.
Laferrière, J. Alban, employment of, 3550.
L'Etoile, Joseph, investigation, 2162.

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles A.—Cont.
L'Islet
Post offices, 1740.
Preventive officers, 2170.
Wharf, 1739.
Mail bag locks, 7618.
Marine affairs at St. Roch, 804.
Militia, 4426, 5154.
Morin, David, employment of, 1740.
Morin, Joseph, employment of, 2615.
National Transcontinental Railway—Esdras Morin, 955.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4182, 4757, 9284.
North Sydney public building, 3550.
Parcel post, 11838.
Post office estimates, 11349.
Quebec Central railway, 1739.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10906.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3397.
St. Eloi mails, 1019.
St. Patrice and Notre Dame du Portage mail service, 3415.
St. Roch des Aulnaies
Government lightship, 953.
Preventive officer, 2615.
Seed grain petitions, 4278.
Temiscouata
Veterans, 700.
Public works, 11804.
Trois Pistoles breakwater, 11200.
Tuberculosis, Friedmann treatment for, 1556.

Georgian Bay Canal, 1154, 2621, 3074, 9230.
See also Montreal.

German, Mr. William M. (Welland)
Banks and banking, 1268, 2475.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4405, 11758, 11791, 11845.
Conservation Commission, 6458.
County court judges, 6280.
Criminal Code amendments, 11605.
Dominion notes, printing of, 6488.
Dullman, case of, 6610.
Fisheries patrol service, 6223, 6507.
Fruit marking, 10085.
Geological Museum building, 6234.
Highways improvement, 8223, 11996.
Hudson Bay Railway, 10942.
Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 8561.
Japanese treaty, 7021.
Judges, additional, 11806.
Militia estimates, 11029.
Natural gas exports, 6425.

German, Mr. William M.—Cont.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1305, 1311, 3505, 4332, 4457, 4512, 4516, 5101, 5275, 5604, 9138 (amdt.), 9276, 9316, 9389, 9410, 9584, 9951, 9957 (amdt.), 9984.
New Westminster Harbour Commission, 2545.
Ottawa government buildings, 6230.
Peace centenary conference, 11943.
Picton postmaster, 7891.
Post Office estimates, 11423-11429.
Privy Council, Canadian appeals, 9826.
Public Works estimates, 11079, 11485-11490, 11503.
Railways and Canals estimates, 11302, 11311.
Railway subsidies, 11685.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7568.
Supreme Court Amendment Bill, 9826.
Welland Canal construction, 934, 6525.
West Indian trade agreement, 2094.

Gilbert, Arthur, employment of, 621.

Girard, Mr. Joseph (Chicoutimi and Saguenay)
Agriculture, aid to, 8105.

Gleichen customs office, 807.

Gobeil, Antoine, employment of, 10824.

Gobeil, Joseph, employment of, 10825.

Gold and Silver Marking Bill. 1r., 3174. 2r., 8674. Com., 8674. 3r., 8742.

Gold production in Canada, 8668.

Good Roads. *See* **Highways.**

Goulman's Point breakwater, 4424.

Government Annuities Bill. Res., 9596. 1r., 9613. 2r., 9845. Com., 9845. 3r., 10069.

Government Railways Claims Bill. 1r., 2108, 9233. 2r. and Com., 11905. 3r., 11906.

Government Railways Provident Fund Bill. Res., 719. 1r., 777. 2r., 8135. Com., 8136. 3r., 8183.

Government Savings Banks, 6481.

Government steamers
Contracts for, 582, 797.
Eureka, 8655.
Pictou, at, 8354.
Supplies, purchase of, 6174.
Wages of officers, 6260.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P. (South Renfrew)
Adulteration Act amendment, 11648.
Agriculture
Aid to, 8509.

Graham, Hon. Geo. P.—Cont.
Estimates, 10384.
Experimental farms, 10260, 10270.
Banks and banking, 6484.
Brockville and Grand Trunk Railway terminals, 6248.
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, 3405.
Canada Northwest Loan Company, 7344.
Canadian Medical Association, 3885.
Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company, 3406.
Canadian Northern Railway Bill, 4362, 8458.
Canadian Northern Railway subsidy, 11731, 11843, 11746, 11794, 11843, 11854.
Canadian Northern and Quebec Railway Company, 3410.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1969.
Civil Service Commission, 6471.
Conservation Commission, 6456.
Dismissals
Brinston postmaster, 1369.
Morrow, Jno., 8132.
Foresters, Independent Order of, 1310.
Freight rates. *See* Ocean *and* Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.
Government annuities, 9605, 9848.
Government railways provident fund, 771, 8135.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds, purchase of, 1570.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway loan, 11800, 11860.
Highways improvement, 8200, 8846, 11991.
House of Commons
Business, expedition of, 12132.
Staff, classification of, 11953.
Hudson Bay Railway, 623, 10947.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 1826, 8551, 8868, 12031.
Estimates, 6807, 12087.
Pensions, 8135.
Japanese treaty, 7057.
Justice Department estimates, 12037.
Level railway crossings, 623.
Little Current lighthouse, 8640.
Mayflower disaster, 2374, 7037.
Militia estimates, 11026, 11070.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3649.
Mounted Police estimates, 6412.
National Gallery of Canada, 9836.
National Transcontinental Railway
M. Balkam, C. E., employment of, 7891.
Estimates, 11100, 11226, 11240.
Investigation commission, 623.
Works, 6251.
Yards and divisional points, 6252.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1067, 4476, 4950, 5515, 5824, 5383, 5912, 6040, 6045, 9324, 9364, 9435, 10041.
Ocean freight rates, 11665.
Ontario superior courts, 6637.
Parliamentary procedure
Adjournment motions, 7846.
Money grant, amendment of, 5853.
Notice, sufficiency of, 7693.
Questions, answering of, 3888.
Statements of members, acceptance of, 5824.
Patents, renewal of, 3833.
Personal explanation, 704.
Public Works estimates, 11078, 11148, 11170, 11174, 11483.
Quebec bridge, 11256.
Railway accidents, 6173.
Railway divisional points, removal of, 7718, 9923, 9930, 9932.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10846-10860, 10886, 10899-10953, 11294-11319.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 1309, 3388.
Rideau canal lightkeeper, 8655.
Rideau Hall improvements, 6233.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7693, 7695, 7846, 8286, 9364.
Rural mail boxes, 6938, 7038.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6534.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario subsidy, 11802, 11873, 11895.
Walberg, claim, 6242.
West Indian trade agreement, 2100.

Graham wharf, 809.

Grain Bill. Res., 8678, 9109. 1r., 9134. 2r., and Com., 9866. 3r., 9918.

Grain
Commissioners, 6270.
Elevators, internal, 2503.
Imports and exports, 595.
Traffic diversion, 2504.

Grand Mere public building, 1018.

Grand Rivière wharf, 2173.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway
Atlantic seaport, 799, 1160.
Montreal, connection with, 933.
New Hazleton station site, 1365.
Regina mail service, 1953.
Saskatchewan river bridges, 6742.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bill. 1r., 477. 2r., 764. Com. and 3r., 2146.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Bonds Purchase Bill. Res., 1566. 1r., 1582. 2r., and 3r., 1840.

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Loan Bill. Res., 11798. 1r., 11801. 2r. and Com., 11860. 3r., 11872.
See also Private Bills.

Grand Trunk Railway
Directors, 602.
New England extension, 2175.

Gray, Ambrose, employment of, 11572.

Green, Mr. Robert F. (Kootenay)
Fruit marking, 9676.
Imperial Underwriters' Corporation, 4414.
Lead bounties, 10147, 10155.

Grondines telephone station, 3892, 7624.

Grosse Isle lighthouse, 616.

Guilbault, Mr. Joseph B. O. (Joliette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech: Naval defence, 576.
Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, 2110.
Joliette postmasters, 2373.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3260 (amdt.), 3896, 10024.

Gunhild steamer purchase, 1741.

Gutelius, F. P., employment of, 605, 6813, 8131.

Guthrie, Mr. Hugh (South Wellington)
Agriculture, aid to, 8510.
Banks and banking, 2361, 10136.
County court judges, 6281.
Customs estimates, 8699, 8707, 8723, 8730.
Fenian Rail bounty, 6665.
Foresters, Independent Order of, 7178, 7343.
Highways improvement, 8589. 8820.
House of Commons staff classification, 11954.
Japanese treaty, 7140.
Judges, superior court, 6627.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 8486.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3707.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1404, 1407, 4700, 5845, 5856 (amdt.), 9319, 9368, 9521.
Parliamentary procedure
Money grant, amendment of, 5845, 5859.
Previous question, moving of in committee, 9334.
Patents, renewal of, 4316.
Photo-engravers, importation of, 7751.
Rules of the House, 6324, 8251, 9368.

Guthrie, Mr. Hugh—Cont.
Sheep, purchase and sale of, 651.
Tariff, customs, 6448.
West Indian trade agreement, 2082.

Guysborough
Buoy contractors, 4427.
Customs officials, 8857.
Fish trap licenses, 626.
Fishery guardians, 1498.
Lobster packers, 4427.

Gypsum products, importation of, 2174.

Haggart, Hon. John, death of, 5612, 5632.

Halifax
Dockyard, 1554.
Harbour, navigation of, 6806.
Terminals, 603, 6790, 10893.

Hansard. *See* **House of Commons Debates.**

Hants county strike, 8647.

Harbour au Boucher customs sub-collector, 3416.

Harbours, federal control of, 2583.

Hay, free transportation of, 703, 1015, 2656, 3038, 3175, 10208.

Hay and Straw grades, 11943.

Hazen, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries)
British Columbia fisheries decisions, 4065.
Buoys
Contract, 924.
Service, 6185.
Supervision, 6181.
Vessels, construction of, 6221.
Canada Shipping Bill, 787, 913.
Canadian Medical Association, 3849.
Companies Act, 2886.
Conservation Commission, 6461.
Criminal Code amendments, 12138.
Customs and Fisheries protection, 1097, 3272, 3280, 3318.
Dismissals in Cape Breton, 830, 855, 6560.
Dry dock Duke of Connaught, 705.
Fisheries
Exhibit at Toronto exhibition, 10816.
Hatcheries, 10817, 10819.
Oyster culture, 10814.
Protection service, 6222, 6508, 10815. *See also* Customs and Fisheries.
Trawling, 3281, 3345.
Foreign fishing vessels in Canadian waters, 949.
Forest fires, prevention of, 6462.
Ice breaking in Great Lakes, 6217.

Hazen, Hon. J. D.—Cont.
Ice conditions in North Atlantic, 6505.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11348.
Judges in New Brunswick, 11641.
Justice Department estimates, 12034.
Landry, A., appointment of, 6560.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10682-10748, 10753-10821, 12046.
Montreal Harbour Commission, 694, 913, 1539.
Munro, W. L., dismissal of, 10696.
National Gallery of Canada, 8998.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1039, 4303, 4435, 4447, 4627, 5168, 5294, 5923, 5947, 5992, 5571, 5890, 5911, 9149, 9165, 9308, 12150.
Canadian fleet unit, cost of, 4447.
Previous question, motion for, 7415.
New Westminster Harbour Commission, 2542, 2573.
North Fraser Harbour Commission, 2582.
Parliamentary procedure: appointment of temporary chairman, 5992.
Patronage committees, 6201.
Pelagic sealing, 6508, 12045.
Pilotage commission, 2283, 2374, 6187, 6624, 6498, 7638.
Pollution of navigable waters, 8620.
Privy Council, Canadian appeals to, 9829.
Quebec Harbour Commission, 6732, 7293, 8038, 8563, 8893.
Radiotelegraphy, regulation of, 778, 786, 787, 2419, 8686.
St. John harbour improvements, 4279.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6513.
Stefansson expedition, 12058.
Supreme court, 8580, 9829.
Vancouver Harbour Commission, 7292, 8501, 8900.
Wrecking plant establishments, 6178.

Henderson, Mr. David (Halton)
Agriculture, aid to, 8110.
Canadian Medical Protective Association, 3401, 3844.
Customs estimates, 8711, 8729.
Farmers' Bank commission, 2725.
Highways improvement, 8603.
Post Office
Rate on drop letters, 11918.
Rural mail delivery, 11414.

High Commissioner's office, 6452.

Highways Improvement Bill. 1r., 949. 2r. 8183, 8529. Com., 8581, 8591. 3r., 8820. Senate amdts., 11973; disagreed to, 12023, 12162. *See also* 26, 375, 799, 12091.
Amendment proposed: Mr. Guthrie, 8820; div., 8850.

Hobson's Nose lighthouse, 1163.

Hog cholera and glanders, 6290.

Homesteads and Homesteading
Entries, 4061, 8354, 8856.
Inspections, 2720, 3178.
Inspectors
Estevan, 700, 1161.
Humboldt, 802.
Medicine Hat, 9220.
Moosejaw, 805.
Prince Albert, 803.
Regina, 615, 805.
Saskatchewan, 615.
Saskatoon, 803.
Yorkton, 1018.
Pre-emption
Fee, 9840.
Payments, interest on, 3035.
Regulations, 11569.
Women homesteaders, 3889.

Hough, John, employment of, 10415.

House of Commons
Accommodation, need of increased, 6238.
Ascension Day adjournment, 8739.
Ash Wednesday adjournment, 2656.
Business of the House, 2279, 3180, 10416, 11971.
By-elections in 1912, return of, 5632.
Christmas adjournment, 1169, 1266.
Committees, select standing, 368.
Debates, official report of
Distribution, 11076.
French daily edition, 11076.
Lengthy answers to questions, insertion of, 3041, 3118.
Omission of pairs, 8463.
Reporters, appointment of, 5.
Reporting in committee, 5149.
Translation, 11955.
Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms, temporary, appointment of, 1405.
Easter adjournment, 6047.
Estimates, 6730.
Government business, precedence of, 2279, 3180.
Ice supply, 12134.
Indemnity of members, 11082-11087, 12131.
Internal Economy Commissioners, 5.
Law branch, 2720, 10412.
Messengers, list of, 2162, 3041.
Morning sittings, 8739, 9227.
Parliamentary procedure. *See that title.*
Reading room, admission of translators to, 9844.
Returns, questions regarding, 1370, 1563, 3124, 3185, 4280, 4282, 6943.

House of Commons—Cont.
Rules for limitation of debate. *See that title.*
Rules of the House. *See* Parliamentary procedure.
Sergeant-at-Arms, acting, appointment of, 1405.
Speaker, salary of, 11081.
Staff
Appointments, 6732, 6939, 11873.
Classification, 11803, 11952.
Salary increases, 7615.
Translation of returns, 11076.
Translators, appointment of, 1405, 11665.
Vacancies
South Bruce, 11072.
South Lanark, 12024.
Chateauguay, 11803.
Ventilation of chamber, 6230.
Water supply, 2417.
Wednesday sittings, 2279.

Hudson Bay, patrol of, 6277.

Hudson Bay Railway, 623, 1563, 10940.
Terminals, 3891, 4058.

Hudson wharf, 957.

Hughes, Hon. Sam. (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Dismissals, 866.
Fenian raid bounty, 6682, 6726.
Mackenzie, General, resignation of, 10418.
Militia estimates, 6296, 6726.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4723, 4936, 5575, 5607, 5701, 9314.
Official private car, 6298.
St. John Ambulance Association, 6169.

Hughes, Mr. James J. (King's, P.E.I.)
Banks and banking, 2348.
Bay fortune breakwater, 6259.
Customs estimates, 12105.
Dredging
Northumberland straits, 2722.
Prince Edward Island, 8653, 9840, 12126.
Highways improvement, 8606, 8838.
Ice, artificial, 2620.
Intercolonial Railway freight rates, 12067.
Kingsborough postmaster, 6259.
Little Sands breakwater, 6259.
Lorne Valley mail service, 8653, 9594.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 12051.
Militia estimates, 11012-11015, 11022-11072.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3632, 5070, 5565, 9200, 9468.
Post Office estimates, 12103.
Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 2721, 3179, 9217.

Hughes, Mr. James J.—Cont.
Dredging, 8653, 9840, 12126.
Mails, 7890.
Provincial subsidy, 4023.
Public works engineers, 8653.
Supreme court, 9341.
Railway, 12086.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10926-10940, 11318.
Returns, inquiry for, 5146.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7793.
St. Peters Bay wharf, 3035.
Souris breakwater, 5152.
Steamer Earl Grey, 3035.
Steamship subsidies, 12106.

Hull wharf repairs, 586.

Humboldt homestead inspector, 629, 802.

Hutchinson, Lois B., Bounty Bill. Res., 10064, 10678. 1r., 10680. 2r., Com. and 3r., 11647.

Hydrographic surveys, 12057.

Ice
Aldershot camp contract, 2725, 6256.
Artificial, contract for, 2620.
Breaking, 808, 6217.
House of Commons supply, 12134.
Intercolonial Railway contracts, 1742, 2010.
Navigation and, 808, 3034, 6217, 6505.

Ile-aux-œufs lightkeeper, 9220.

Ile Perrot
Bridge, 9947, 11199.
South wharf, 9842.

Immigration, 20, 180, 548, 609.
Bonuses, 601.
Estimates, 11548.
Montreal officials, 618.
Naval and military league, 600.
Oriental, 1164.
Quebec officers, 1367.
Regulations, 3028.
St. Jean building, 1166.
Societies, 3032.
United States, from, 6253.

Immoral literature and the mails, 11906.

Imperial Conference of 1911, 7630, 7722.

Imperial Defence, Minister of Militia and Postmaster General on, 591.

Incorporation. *See* **Companies Act.**

Indians
Alberta reserve, 622.
Coté's band, 8642.

Indians—Cont.
Estimates, 11562.
Land sales, 8123, 8465. *See also* Capilano and Kitsilano.
St. Anne de Restigouche reserve, 4423.
Schools, 1158, 6621.
Shelburne county, 1555.
Vernon, B.C., inspector, 4420.

Industrial Disputes Act
Amendment or repeal, question of, 1016.
Askwith, Sir George, report of, 3184.

Inland Revenue estimates, 11345, 11534, 12108.

Inspection and Sale Act. *See* **Fruit Marking.**

Insurance companies' statements, 3413.

Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, bill for acquisition of. Res., 4167, 8551, 8859. 1r., 8893. 2r. and Com., 9658. 3r., 9822. Senate amdts., 12024; disagreed to, 12034, 12163. *See also* 128, 834, 935, 1746, 1795, 1949, 2172, 3122, 3552, 6806, 12094.
Cacouna station water tank, 8358.
Car shortage, 286, 1156.
Chaudière Junction employees, suspension of, 11570.
Conciliation board, 6256.
Dismissals, 8137, 8143, 8655.
Dorchester spur line, 2164.
Employees
Rating of, 8358.
Transfer of, 642.
Wages increase, 6257.
Winter clothes, 2722.
Estimates, 6242, 6898.
Extensions in Nova Scotia, 1986, 2416.
Freight rates, 937.
Gas plant, 3123.
Grand Narrows section, 3414.
Guysborough branch, 583, 1952.
Halifax terminals, 603, 6790, 6937, 10893.
Hay, free transportation of, 703, 1015, 2656, 3038, 3175, 10208.
Ice contracts, 1742, 2010.
Kindling wood contracts, 958.
Lavery, roadmaster, 11571.
Lavoie, L., trackman, 2720.
Lévis station, sale of papers at, 6262.
Linoleum, purchase of, 3417.
Management, 630, 1157, 6839, 6876, 8354, 9594.
New Glasgow subway, 934.
Ocean Limited train, 1366.
Operating rules, 8645.

Intercolonial Railway—Cont.
Patterson, C., employment of, 1560.
Pictou freight, 1157.
Provident Fund. *See* Government Railways.
Revenues, 11204.
Rolling stock additions, 2165.
Running rights, 157.
St. Edouard station, 934.
Sackville wharf, 3548.
Sayabec station, 2168.
Stellarton employees, 5151.
Sunday observance, 8131.
Ties contract, 2170.
Tobin branch, 8640.
Train ticket agents, 2166.
Trenton station, 934.
Works unauthorized, 594.

Interior Department estimates, 11547.

International Waterways Commission, 4362.
Salaries, 9695.

Investigations into political partisanship, 2161. *See also* Duchemin *and* Lane.

Isle Verte wharf, 1743.

Jamaica, trade with, 1019.

Jameson, Mr. Clarence (Digby)
Fenian raid bounty, 6692.
Highways improvement, 8830.
Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 1769.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5039.
Public buildings, cost of, 9839.
Trawling operations, 3295, 3325.

Japanese immigration, 7550.

Japanese Treaty Bill. 1r., 6497. 2r., 6949, 6975. Com., 7021, 7040. 3r., 7138, 7187.
Amdt. proposed: Mr. Oliver, 7138; div., 7177.

Joliette customs office, 1498.

Jones, J. P., grain commissioner, 9593.

Judges Act Amendment Bill. Res., 11624. 1r. and 2r., 11647. Com., 11806, 11926. 3r., 11927.

Judges' salaries, 2009, 6280, 8053, 9691, 12043. *See also* Ontario Superior Courts Bill.

Judicial Committee of Privy Council. *See* **Privy Council.**

Justice, acting minister of, 1363.

Justice Department estimates, 6280, 10973, 12034.

Justice, Minister of, payments to, 8127.

Kay, Mr. William F. (Missiquoi)
Brigham-Farnham mail contract, 2172.
Farnham military camp, 3890.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4610.
Noyan customs officers, 619.
Post Office estimates, 11437.
Rules for limitation of debate, 8227.
St. Armand mail contract, 3890.

Kennedy, Isaac, claim of, 1561.

Kentville
Experimental farm, 6945, 8856.
Public building, 3031.

Kildare postmaster, 1498.

Kingston penitentiary, 1156, 3176.

Kitsilano Indian reserve, 8465, 8741, 10826.

Knowles, Mr. William E. (Moosejaw)
Canadian Medical Association, 3859.
Canadian Northern Railway Bill, 4363.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1974.
County court judges, 6281.
Fruit marking, 9663, 9669.
Grain Bill, 2284, 2419, 2504, 9110, 9876, 9888.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway: Saskatchewan river bridges, 6742.
Homestead inspections, 2720.
Japanese treaty, 7064.
Lead bounties, 10175.
Moosejaw
Customs appraiser, 10144.
Land district, 2721.
Lands office, 10823.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4215, 4813, 5949, 6008, 5732, 9372.
Parliamentary procedure: appointment of temporary chairman, 6008.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7797, 9372.
Russian immigrants, treatment of, 10529.
Steel rails, remission of duty on, 6873.
Swift Current lands office, 10822.

Kootenay rifles, disbandment of, 1018.

Kyte, Mr. George W. (Richmond, N.S.)
Aldershot camp
Dismissal of caretaker, 5155.
Supplies for, 6256, 8130.
Apple trade of Nova Scotia, 6414.
Banks and banking, 2449, 10340, 10343, 10360, 10373.
Chambly canal superintendent, 10823.
Coast Guard newspaper, 1550.
Dismissals
Bourgeois lighthouse keeper, 1500.
Cape Breton, 818, 867, 925, 6540, 8713.
Devereaux, Charlotte, 612, 6699.

Kyte, Mr. George W.—Cont.
Fougère, Peter, 6902.
O'Brien, Michael, 10754, 10768.
Fishery inspector Ward Fisher, 1164.
Fruit inspectors, 2619.
Government Railways provident fund, 757.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 8871.
Estimates, 6782.
Judges' salaries, 8054.
Justice, acting Minister of, 1363.
Kentville experimental farm, 6945, 8856.
Landry, A., appointment of, 6540.
L'Ardoise breakwater, 7382.
Mail bag locks, 7619.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10754, 10795.
National Gallery of Canada, 9003.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3605, 4570, 5224, 9278.
Pollution of navigable waters, 3174, 8639.
Prescott marine yard, 7465.
Privilege, 1167.
Public works in Maskinongé, 10143.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10905, 10950.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7454, 7468.
St. Peters
Canal improvements, 798, 6625, 9231.
Expropriation of lands, 971, 6625.
Harbour improvements, 1556.
Salmon river Indian school, 1158.
Seed distribution, 10391.
Steam trawling operations, 3343.
Tanner's Point lighthouse, 9341.
Trent Valley canal, claim of Corry and Laverdure, 10825.
Welland canal, resident engineer, 934.

Labour
Condition of labouring classes, 1738.
Estimates of department, 12131.
Hours on public works Bill. 1r., 695.
Pay on public works, 959.
Strike-breakers, importation of, 7725, 8036, 8227.
Sydney, conditions at, 11566.

Lachance, Mr. Arthur (Quebec Centre)
Cartridges, manufacture of, 6257.
Montcalm, postmaster, 7621.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4739, 5640.
Quebec
Customs officer, 6263.
Dry dock, 7381.
Harbour Commission, 8123.
Harbour loan, 8045.
Immigration assistant, 6263.

Lachance, Mr. Arthur—Cont.
Medical examiner, dismissal of, 6262.
Railway terminals, 12076.
Transcontinental railway station, 6258.
Rules for limitation of debate, 8339.
St. Charles river
Dredging, 6417.
Lock works, 6258.

L'Achigan breakwater, 801, 3549.

Laferrière, J. A., employment of, 3550.

Laforce, J. E., employment of, 3120.

Lafortune, Mr. David A. (Montcalm)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 352, 366, 382, 387.
Trade of Canada, 354.
Reciprocity with United States, 356.
Immigration, 358.
Nationalists, the, 360.
Highways improvement, 375.
Agriculture, aid to, 376.
By-elections, 379.
Salaries of government officials, 382.
Members' indemnity, 384.
Automobiles for Militia Department, 8132.
Female immigrants, protection of, 12170.
Mail bag locks, 7889.
Money by mail, transmission of, 11909.
Montcalm public building, 376, 11073.
National Transcontinental Railway estimates, 11231.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1127, 1134, 4902, 5399.
Public Works estimates, 11188, 11197, 12117.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10924.
Rural mail service in Montcalm, 10068.
St. Anne experimental farm, 8651.
Supreme court, 9824, 9832.

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Agriculture
Aid to, 8091.
Credits, 3160.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5782.
Patents, renewal of, 11018.
West Indian trade agreement, 2094.

Lamarche, Mr. Paul E. (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech: naval defence, 577.
Banque Internationale, 2250.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3210.

Lancaster, Mr. Edward A. (Lincoln and Niagara)
Alberta Interurban Railway Company, 8586.

Lancaster, Mr. Edward A.—Cont.
Banks and banking, 10105.
Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company, 3406, 7757, 8587, 11395, 12134.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4364, 6195, 8458.
Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, 11397.
Canadian Western Railway, 4409.
Companies Act, 3016.
Dismissals, 1005.
Dominion Northwestern Railway Company, 3400.
Fruit marking, 11936.
Georgian Bay Canal Company, 2593, 3075.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway branch lines, 2144.
Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway, 8584.
Huron and Ontario Railway Company, 2539.
Manitoba-Ontario Railway, 3832.
Manitoba Radial Railway Company, 8587.
Moncton and Northumberland Strait Railway, 8585.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4973, 4998, 5836.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company, 3411.
Nipissing Central Railway, 8584.
Pacific and Peace River Railway Company, 8583.
Parliamentary procedure
Friday sitting, validity of after midnight, 4998.
Money grant, amendment of, 5837.
Railway companies' rates, control of by Railway Commission, 2144.
Railway divisional points, removal of, 9928, 9931.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 1309.
Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company, 3509.
Van Buren Bridge Company, 11391.

Lanctot, Mr. Roch (Laprairie-Napierville)
Banks and banking, 2354.
Intercolonial Railway ties, 2170.
Judges' salaries, 11643.
Mail bag locks, 7618.
Mines Department, 2167.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2933, 5359, 9994.
Public Works estimates, 11085.
Railway Commission, 9691.
Sayabec postmaster, 2170.

Landry, A., appointment of, 6540. *See also* Dismissals, Descouse.

Land titles, Manitoba, 11942.

Lane, C. S. payments to, 1558.

Langevin, J. O., employment of, 9221.

Lanoraie wharf, 2619.

La Patrie printing contract, 8125, 8459.

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Colonels, honorary, 2174.
Desjardins, Auguste, employment of, 2174.
Dismissals
Herbertville postmaster, 2178.
Normandin postmaster, 2178.
Rimouski, 2178, 2179, 2373.
St. Henri de Taillon postmaster, 2178.
Fenian raid veterans, 7219.
Gilbert, Arthur, employment of, 621.
Grosse Ile lighthouse, 616.
Highways improvement, 8533.
Lavoie, Louis, employment of, 2720.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4098, 5292, 5971.
Quebec Harbour Commission advocate, 617.
Quebec Minister of Agriculture, 9341.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7870.
Ste. Anne experimental farm, 7808.
St. Germain wharf, 2173.
Sayabec station contract, 2168.

Lapointe, Mr. Louis A. (Montreal, St. James)
Montreal postal stations, 9593.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4995.
Parliamentary procedure: validity of Friday sitting after midnight, 4995.
Public Works estimates, 11194.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6523.

L'Ardoise breakwater, 7382.

L'Assomption public works, 801,3549, 9342, 11805.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid (East Quebec)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Cartwright, Sir Richard, the late, 25.
West Indian trade agreement, 26.
Naval defence, 27, 578.
National Transcontinental Railway, 29.
Tariff, 30.
Cement duty, 31.
Redistribution of representation, 35.
Macdonald and Richelieu elections, 36; proposed amdt., 41.
Antarctic expedition: death of Captain Scott, 3455.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Cont.
Banking and Commerce Committee, sittings of, 8854.
Banque Internationale, 2219.
Brown, Mr. James P., the late, 11461.
Canadian Northern railway subsidy, 11697, 11788.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1965.
Cement duty, reduction of, 30.
Civil Service Commission, 6469.
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 6098.
Conservation Commission, 6459.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9801.
Deseve, A. L., dismissal of, 11574.
Donaldson homestead entry: personal explanation, 7945.
Forest reserves and parks, 10065.
Gold and silver marking, 8675.
Government Railways provident fund, 8140.
Highways improvement, 26, 8184, 11973.
House of Commons
Morning sittings, 8739, 9228.
Sessional business, 3181.
Staff, classification of, 11953.
Wednesday sittings, 2280.
Hudson Bay Railway: one mile strip, 1563.
Imperial conference of 1911, 7630, 7724.
Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 12024.
Japanese treaty, 6497, 6962.
Justice Department estimates, 12036.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 8480, 10837.
Lead bounties, 10156.
Macdonald election, 36, 41.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3358, 3648, 3729.
Mint, Ottawa, 8660, 9106.
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 719, 887, 6474, 12056.
National Transcontinental Railway, 29, 12061, 11217, 11230.
Naval Aid Bill. On 1r., 694. On res., 1022 (amdt.). On 2r., 3231, 3259, 4238. In com.: sec. 1, 4283; sec. 2, 4472, 4484 (amdt.), 5156, 5163, 7224, 9445, 9533; sec. 4, 9352; m. to rep., 9574. On 3r., 10012 (amdt.), 12139.
Denial of rumour, 10890.
Imperial squadron at Gibraltar, 10066.
Naval defence, 27, 578, 951.
Northern waters, patrol of, 6275.
Northwest provinces, representation of, 34.
Ontario superior courts, 6625.

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid—Cont.
Ottawa
Major's Hill park, 8465.
Canadian Pacific Railway entrance, 8550.
Pardoning power, 3941.
Parliamentary procedure
Adjournment motions, 7843.
Answers, lengthy, insertion of in Hansard, 3120.
Money grant, amendment of, 11792, 11798.
Papers, original, production of, 9224.
Questions without notice, 7037.
Recalcitrant witness, motion regarding without notice, 3358, 3662.
Rules for limitation of debate. *See that title.*
Speaker, authority of to resume chair without committee report, 6162, 6383.
Pollution of navigable waters, 11667.
Prince Rupert Marine Depot, 1562.
Public Works estimates, 11091.
Quebec and Saguenay railway, 2192.
Quebec Harbour Commission, 8563, 8896.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7429, 8230, 9352, 9364, 9446, 9452, 9575.
Russian Canadians sent to Siberia, 7636, 7817.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6527.
Savings banks, Quebec, 10146.
Scott, Captain, death of, 3455.
Scott, Sir Richard, death of, 8457.
Soulanges canal superintendent, 8857.
Steel rails, remission of duty on, 1737, 5147, 6860.
Supreme court, 8570.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway subsidy, 11882.
Vancouver Harbour Commission, 8502, 8901.
West Indian trade agreement, 26, 2117.
Wolseley, Field Marshal, death of, 6734.
Yukon dismissals, 2177.

Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 582, 590.

Law Lords in Great Britain. *See* **Privy Council.**

Law, Mr. Bowman B. (Yarmouth)
Banker's Island hospital, 4059.
Barrington fishery inspector, 1160.
Brennan, Vincent, 1160.
Cousins, A., appointment of, 8654.
Customs estimates, 8697.
Du Vernet, Dr., appointment of, 8460.
Government annuities, 9603.
Immoral literature and the mails, 11908.
Indians of Shelburne county, 1555.

Law, Mr. Bowman B.—Cont.
Lane, C. S., services of, 1558.
Long Beach property purchase, 6260.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10711-10745, 10796-10819.
Militia estimates, 11030.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3211, 5469. 9487.
Port Maitland post office, 11570.
Postage on departmental mail matter, 9218.
Post Office estimates, 11411.
Public Works estimates, 11475.
Railway subsidies, 11689.
Shag Harbour buoys, 11074.
Steamer Petrel, 1497.
West Indian trade agreement, 8764.
Yarmouth
Dredging, 3033, 3890.
Port physician, dismissal of, 3894, 10796.
Post office, 3034.
Preventive officers, 1368.
Public building, 11181.
North post office, 2726.

Lead Bounties Bill. Res., 10147. 1r., 10191. 2r. and Com., 10527. 3r., 10527.

Leblanc, Maurice, employment of, 7622.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Rouville)
Accountants' Association, 3834, 3980.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Canada, its prosperity, 484.
By-elections, 492.
Quebec merger, 495.
Cement duty, reduction of, 496.
Naval defence, 497.
Agriculture, aid to, 7464, 8095.
Political favouritism, allegations of, 1952.
Archives department, 11540, 11940.
Arctic expedition, proposed, 3552.
Baie St. Paul wharf, 11073.
Banks and banking, 10116.
Banque Internationale, 2199, 2254, 4278, 11202.
Les Boules mail service, 10413.
Bourassa, Emile, payment of, 6300.
British cattle embargo, 610.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1957, 1981.
Car, private official, purchase of, 592, 3175. *See also* Militia.
Clocks for public buildings, 7467, 8124, 8462.
Cornwall-Summerstown mail contract, 1364.
County court judges, 6287.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—Cont.
Criminal Code amendments, 10076.
Customs estimates, 6882.
Deschamps, Raoul, employment of, 699.
Dismissals
Aultsville postmaster, 1368.
Cleroux, Amédée, 7386.
Contrecœur lightkeeper, 3890.
Contrecœur postmaster, 3893.
Dunn, Albert, engineer, 7221.
Farran's Point postmaster, 1369.
Nicolet mail clerk, 1745.
Paquin, Ernest, 939.
Petite Rivière postmaster, 3894.
St. Ferdinand de Beaurivage postmaster, 702.
St. Gervais postmaster, 702.
Doncaster reserve, 4422.
Drilling on Fletcher's field, 2173.
Ducharme, G. N., 4059. *See also* Public Service Commission.
Estimates, printing of in French, 6165.
Exhibitions, international, 10379.
Experimental farms, 6289, 10258.
Fiset, Elzear, appointment of, 1160.
Fisheries regulations, 8127.
France, Canadian flotations in France, 1953.
French excise stamps, 6295.
French trawlers, 3298.
Government annuities, 9598, 9601, 9845.
Grain traffic, division of, 2504.
Grande Rivière wharf, 2173.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds, purchase of, 1573.
Haggart, Hon. John, death of, 5612.
High Commissioner's office, 3355, 6452.
Highways improvement, 8594.
House of Commons
Accommodation, need of increased, 6238.
Debates, French translation of, 11955.
Elevator service, 6238.
Hudson Bay Railway, 10948.
Ice breaking at Gaspé, 6220.
Ice conditions in North Atlantic, 6505.
Imperial Defence
Minister of Militia on, 591.
Postmaster General on, 591.
Immigration
For 1911-12, 609.
Female, protection of, 2169.
Regulations, 3028.
Imperial Underwriters' Corporation, 4413.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11516.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 1789, 6806, 8555, 8886.
Managing board, 9594.
Trains, 6248.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—Cont.
Japanese Treaty, 6419, 6975.
Judicial salaries and administration, 2009, 8058, 11926, 12043.
Justice Department estimates, 10974.
Kennedy, Isaac, claim of, 1561.
Lavergne, Mr. Armand, 582.
Law Lords in Great Britain, appointment of, 7818, 8058, 9828.
Magdalen Islands wireless letters, 6241.
Malbaie mail carrier, 10416.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10718-10747, 10754, 10802-10818.
Militia Department private car, 592, 3175, 6298, 6727.
Militia estimates, 11047, 11064.
Monk, Hon. F. D., resignation of, 590.
Montreal
Armouries, 7035, 7204.
Bridges, 2369.
Drill hall, 2614.
Government offices, 2167.
Harbour Commission, 1497, 1534.
Immigration officials, 618.
Military cemeteries, 11665.
Murray Bay post office site, 6262.
National Gallery of Canada, 9006, 9837.
National Transcontinental Railway
Construction, 3175.
Estimates, 11100, 11242.
Quebec terminals, 584, 7809.
Naval defence, 497, 596.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3043, 4344, 4493, 4934, 4947, 5615, 5623, 5829, 5872, 5884, 5924, 5938, 5996, 9289, 9962 (amdt.).
New Westminster Harbour Commission, 2540.
Ottawa
Federal district, 2176.
Water supply, 8630.
Paris agency, 11541.
Parliamentary procedure
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 5996.
Money grant, amendment of, 5849.
Statements of members, acceptance of, 5829.
Peterborough lift-lock contract, 156.
Piedmont post office, 592.
Pilotage on the St. Lawrence, 2282, 6188, 6743, 7810.
Pontbriand wharf, 584.
Portneuf ex-lighthouse keeper's pension, 2619.
Post Office
British postal notes, 6495.
Estimates, 11354-11390, 11399-11457.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—Cont.
Improvements, 6235.
Mail bag locks, 6294, 6748.
Money order rates, 9595.
Newspaper postage, 600.
Parcel post, 585, 1504, 1533, 3555, 11823.
Police Gazette and postal privileges, 8132.
Post Office Bill, 11907-11926.
Rural mail delivery, 7218, 7616, 7810, 7812, 8037.
Stamp-vending machines, 11203, 11568.
Transatlantic mail service, 10417.
Privilege, 6047, 6160.
Privy Council, Judicial Committee of, 1573, 7818, 8058, 9827.
Public Service Commission, 796. *See also* Ducharme.
Public Works estimates, 11087, 11095, 11097, 11190, 11193.
Quebec
Arsenal, 8648.
Customs collector, 584.
Dry dock, 797, 1735.
Harbour Commission officers, 2167.
Harbour loan, 8044, 8897.
Legal agents of government, 7465.
Marine agency, 8647.
Merger, 1499.
Railway, Light, Heat and Power Company, 1735, 2180.
Quebec and Lévis dry dock slip, 4428.
Quebec and St. Charles river improvements, 4168.
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 1367, 2185, 4168, 6268.
Railway Commissioner, chief, salary of, 9938.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10874-10880, 10889, 10948.
Reciprocity with United States, 489.
Richelieu election, 494.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3305, 3390.
Mail subsidy of, 584.
Ross' Mill post office, 1497.
Ross rifle, 6496, 8126.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7649.
Ste. Anne des Monts mail service, 11567.
St. Charles rifle range, 7382, 8126.
St. Charles river works, 698, 4428, 8461, 8641.
St. John Ambulance Association, 6167.
St. Lawrence river
Accidents to navigation on, 588.
Damming of, 800, 1559.
Water levels, 6524.
Ste. Lucie and Lanthier mail service, 4422.

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—Cont.
St. Simeon and Tadoussac mail service, 10414.
St. Tite des Caps and Baie St. Paul, mail service, 3418.
St. Urbain-Baie St. Paul mail service, 6259.
Salvation Army and convicts, 6289.
Scott Antarctic expedition, 3452.
Sorel
Government shipyard, 953.
Marine railway, 581.
Wharf, 584, 970.
Steamboat inspection, 915.
Steel rails, duties on, 802.
Stefansson expedition, 6274.
Supreme court, 8577, 9827.
Telegraph lines, government, 11512.
Telegraph service, inter-imperial, 9021, 9945, 11656.
Welsh coal, purchases of, 795.
Wickham West post office, 7616.
Wire fencing, 585.
Wrecking plant establishments, 6177.
Yacoloff, reprieve of, 1839.

Lesperance, Mr. David O. (Montmagny)
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 1309, 3397.

Letter Carriers. *See* **Post Office.**

Lévis camp, supplies for, 6261.

Life Saving Stations, 1735, 6201, 12053.

Lightships
St. Roch, 804, 955.
Tenders for, 4425.

L'Islet
Customs officers, 2170.
Post offices, 1740.
Wharf, 1739.

Little Sands breakwater, 6259.

Living, cost of, 2164, 6442, 6622, 10444, 10468, 10494, 10603, 10620.

Lobsters. *See* **Fisheries.**

Loggie, Mr. Wm. S. (Northumberland, N.B.)
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 1814.
Estimates, 6898.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10813-10820.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3902, 4849, 5545.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10849-10859.
West Indian trade agreement, 2093, 2123.

Lord, Dr., employment of, 11571.

Lotbinière post office, 9215.

Lumber, duty on, 817.

Lunenburg customs officer, 802.

Lynch-Staunton G., employment of, 605, 6813.

Macdonald election, 36, 41, 46, 53, 103, 116, 120, 133, 142, 164, 203, 208, 224, 245, 255, 278, 323, 343, 379, 408, 463, 466, 492, 554. *See also* By-elections.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M. (Pictou)
Agriculture, aid to, 8527.
Aldershot camp, ice supply, 2725.
Back Shore and Pictou mail service, 600.
Baillie, John, employment of, 603.
Banks and banking, 11586.
Bayview lobster hatchery employees, 806.
Buoy service, 6183.
Canadian Explosives, Limited, 2575, 2884.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4401.
Canadian Northern railway subsidy, 11763, 11795, 11845, 11851.
Canadian Pacific Railway employees' strike, 1975.
Census of Canada, completion of, 960.
Civil Service reform, 8017.
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 6130.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9710, 9816.
Dismissals
Caribou Island lightkeeper, 640.
Earl Grey, pilot of, 641.
Gordon, J. A., Intercolonial Railway watchman, 7387.
Labour Gazette correspondents, 805.
Niobe, H.M.C.S., 8226.
Royal Military College, 632.
Trenton Island revenue officer, 1500.
East River public works, 4060, 6229.
Fenian raid bounty, 6666.
Fisheries Act, breach of, 4061.
Government Railways
Claims Bill, 2108, 9233, 11905.
Provident fund, 723, 728, 741, 8137.
Government steamers
At Pictou, 8354.
Supplies for, 6177.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and New Hazelton, 1365.
Highways improvement, 8207, 8834, 12011.
Industrial Disputes Act, 1016.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11345, 11515.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, acquisition of, 935, 1819, 8870.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M.—Cont.
Employees, rating of, 8358.
Estimates, 6768, 12065.
Management by commission, 8354.
Patterson, Charles, employment of, 1560.
Stellarton employees, 5151.
Transfer of employees, 642.
Trenton, new station at, 934.
Japanese treaty, 7126.
Judges' salaries, 6286, 8057, 11628.
Lightship tenders, 4425.
Mackenzie, General, resignation of, 10418, 10824.
McLean, De Wolfe, payment of, 1163.
McLeod, G., employment of, 603.
Marine officers, wages of, 6259.
Maritime provinces inland revenue inspector, 2370, 2616.
Meadowville-Murrayfield mail service, 4167.
Militia estimates, 6296.
Millville-Dalhousie Mountain mail service, 7619.
National Transcontinental Railway, operation of, 6821.
Naturalization, uniform British, 2374, 2726, 9346.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2755, 4287, 4339, 4463, 4795, 5233, 5922, 5936, 5998, 5480, 5507, 5697, 5890, 5898, 7270, 9184, 9356, 9441, 9564, 9584, 12158.
New Westminster Harbour Commission, 2544.
Official private cars, 12090.
Pardoning power, 922.
Parliamentary procedure
Appeal, second on one question, 5891.
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 5998.
Money grant, amendment of, 11795.
Rules of the House. *See that title.*
Parliamentary representation, 6939.
Patronage system, 6186.
Pictou
Freight, 1157.
Life boat crew, 961.
Mail service, 4060.
Marine hospital, 7385.
Pictou-Seafoam mail service, 4060.
Pictou-West River mail service, 7619.
Post Office
Estimates, 11429.
Mail bag locks, 7213, 7618, 8125, 8355, 9213, 9215.
Parcel post, 11834.
Prince Edward Island car ferry, 960.
Public Works estimates, 11467-11473.

Macdonald, Mr. Edward M.—Cont.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10880, 10928-10939.
Royal Military College, reported resignation of Colonel Crowe, 10824.
Rules of the House, 6340, 8411.
Scotsburn-River John mail service, 4060.
Scow tenders, 4426, 5151.
Seed distribution, 10391.
Sheep, purchase and sale of, 645.
Solicitor General, office of, 618.
Stellarton public building, 960, 1162.
Tariff, 2010, 6435.
Tatamagouche-Brulé shore mail service, 6259.
Technical education, 961.
Telegraphs and telephones, nationalization of, 4401.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11873.
West Indian trade agreement, 907, 2038, 2116.

Macdonell, Mr. A. C. (Toronto South)
Brazilian Traction Power Company, 3018.
Foresters, Independent Order of, 1310, 7179, 7338.
Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company, 3079.
Patents, renewal of, 2110, 3781, 6193, 8590.
Photo-engravers, importation of, 7741.

Mackenzie, General, resignation of, 10418, 10824.

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K. (Halifax)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
By-elections, 425.
Cable rates, 426.
Senate reform, 427.
Naval defence, 427.
Transportation, 430.
Government ownership of telegraphs, &c., 436.
Railway capitalization, 439.
Mergers, 444.
Agriculture, aid to, 8102.
Amherst paving inspector, 1549.
Amherst Point wharf, 1164.
Annapolis river ice piers, 7034.
Banks and banking, 1861, 10118, 10139, 10364, 11582.
Banque Internationale, 2232.
Bedford mail service, 2169.
Bridgetown drill shed, 1164.
Budget, 9657.
Development of commerce, 10419.
Tariff, 10421.

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K.—Cont.
Lumber duties, 10422.
British trade, 10422.
Tariff commission, 10425.
Revenue and expenditure, 10426.
Surpluses and taxation, 10431.
British Columbia subsidy, 10440.
Cost of living, 10444.
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company, 6948.
Cement
Duty on, 816.
Imports of, 599.
Customs officers in municipal councils, 1500.
Dismissals
Northumberland dredgemaster, 2620.
Oxford customs officer, 984.
Experimental farms, 10261, 10264.
Fenian raid bounty, 801, 6659.
Government Railways provident fund, 722.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds, purchase of, 1574.
Halifax dockyard property, 1554.
Halifax terminals. *See* Intercolonial Railway.
Halifax-Prospect mail service, 2614.
Highways improvement, 799, 8581.
Hobson's Nose lighthouse, 1163.
Imperial Underwriters' Corporation, 4416.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 8553.
Halifax terminals, 603, 6799, 10893.
Privy Council, Canadian appeals to, 1574.
Mack, S. E., appointment of, 802.
Middleton-Port George mail service, 6745.
Militia permanent force, supplies for, 2724.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3648.
National Transcontinental Railway
Capital account, 9221.
Constitution, 9947.
Naval enlistment, 9840.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3766, 3787, 4336, 4474, 4825, 4828, 5758, 5831.
Nictaux fish hatchery, 7216.
Niobe, H.M.C.S., repairs to, 1741, 2169.
Ocean freight rates, 2504.
Parliamentary procedure
Chairman, temporary, 4825.
Irrelevance, 5830, 5868.
Money grant, amendment of, 5837, 5840.
Notice, sufficiency of, 7681, 7693, 7695.
Parrsboro public building, 1163.
Port Lawrence dredging inspector, 1549.
Post Office estimates, 11439.
Privilege, 7634.

Maclean, Mr. Alexander K.—Cont.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7680, 9357, 9359, 9584.
Proposed amdt., 7695; ruled out, 7715.
Rural mail service, 8652.
Salmon River-Hectanooga mail service, 4062.
Sherbrooke-Sheet Harbour mail service, 2615.
South Milford-Lake Munroe mail service, 2169.
Steel rails, remission of duty on, 6840.
Supreme court, 8573.
Tariff interpretation: counsel fees, 599.
Tuberculosis, Friedmann treatment for, 4169.
Veterinary Director General: visit to Nova Scotia, 8857.
West Indian trade agreement, 699, 892, 2013, 6503, 8754.
Wilmot mail service, 4062.
Wrecking plant establishments, 6180.

Maclean, Mr. William F. (South York, O.)
Banks and banking, 1875, 11595.
Canadian Pacific Railway: new issue of stock, 606.
Coinage, subsidiary, 8662.
Divorce court, need of, 6737.
Freight rates, equality of, 10955.
Government annuities, 9601.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway
Bonds, Government purchase of, 1572.
Government director, 602.
Government loan, 11860.
Payment to by Government, 602.
Naval forces of the Empire, 427, 2520, 5630.
Ocean freight rates, 2504, 9076.
Parcel post, 11830.
Post Office estimates, 11370.
Privy Council, Canadian appeals to, 1572, 1578.
Railway capitalization, 439.
Railway Commission, 9688.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 2944, 3303, 3311 (amdt).
Telegraph service, inter-Imperial, 9024.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11894.
Transportation question, 430, 9688.

MacNutt, Mr. Thos. (Saltcoats)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech: Macdonald by-election, 163.
Animal contagious diseases, 9618.
Fruit and vegetables, tariff on, 6943.
Macdonald election, 163, 1983, 2010.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4644, 5284.

MacNutt, Mr. Thos.—Cont.
Privilege, 1983, 2010.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7717.

McCoig, Mr. Archibald B. (West Kent, O.)
Ditching machinery, duty on, 6642.
Fighting Island fishing rights, 2724, 3036.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4733.

McCraney, Mr. Geo. E. (Saskatoon)
Canadian Northern Railway, 4378.
Dismissals
Hanley Dominion land agent, 7220.
Hanley postmaster, 7220.
Saskatoon Dominion lands office clerk, 6263, 6746.
Ullyot, G. M., 6746.
Donaldson homestead entry, 8008.
Highways improvement, 8199, 8591.
Imperial Underwriters' Corporation, 4413.
Mail bag locks, 7890.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4580, 5244, 9396.
Nipissing Central Railway, 8585.
Prince Albert homestead inspectors, 803.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7819.
Saskatoon
Grain inspection terminal, 8680.
Homestead inspectors, 803.
Volunteer bounty, 8914.

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Freight rates, equality of, 10965.
Mail robberies, 7615.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4623.
Sherbrooke customs appraiser, dismissal of, 638, 6896, 6901.

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Shelburne and Queens)
Banks and banking, 10322, 10343, 10651, 11592.
Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 1805.
Steam trawling operations, 3340.

McGrath, E. A., employment of, 7386.

McKay, Mr. James (Prince Albert)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Canada, its prosperity, 288.
Transportation, 291.
Cement duty, 296.
Banks and banking, 10093, 10114.
Donaldson homestead entry, 7988.
Freight rates, western, 8992.
Northwest Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, 2596.
Railway subsidies, 11687.
Transportation question, 291.

McKenzie, Mr. D. D. (North Cape Breton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Trade conditions, 184.
Transportation, 185.
Cement duty, 188.
Tariff, 193.
By-elections, 195.
Agriculture, aid to, 8515.
Banque Internationale, 2246.
Boulardarie Centre post office, 2616.
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 6149.
Contracts, advertising of, 6183.
Criminal Code amendments, 11614.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9747.
Dismissals, 852, 998, 3422, 6611, 8162, 9609, 11917.
Dredge Cape Breton, 1550.
Fenian raid bounty, 6680.
Fisheries protection, 3281, 3336.
Foreign merchant vessels, sale of goods from, 3416.
Government annuities, 9855.
Government steamers, supplies for, 6176.
Ice breaking at Sydney, 6219.
Immigration, Syrian, 11559.
Indians: estimates, 11564.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11526.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 1799, 1986, 8876.
Estimates, 6778.
Pension fund, 8148.
Sectionmen east of Grand Narrows, 3414.
Japanese treaty, 7031, 7169.
Judges' salaries, 8052, 11630, 11646.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10712-10727, 10779-10820.
Maritime provinces, development of, 185.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2805, 4507, 5350, 5782, 10004.
New Campbellton customs officer, 2617.
Ontario Superior courts, 6634.
Patent appeals, 3352.
Pilotage commission, 6217.
Post Office Bill, 11917.
Post Office estimates, 11453.
Printing Bureau, wages in, 11546.
Public Works estimates, 11184, 11187, 11466-11478.
Public Works, Minister of: proposed censure, 10229.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10914, 10919, 11298.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7551.
St. Peters channel improvements, 1365.
Steamboat inspection, 791, 916.
Telegraph service to Quarries, 6242.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11903.
Tug boats for Government dredges, 698.
Vancouver Harbour Commission, 8902.
West Indian trade agreement, 2131.

McKenzie, Mr. D. D.—Cont.

McLean, Mr. Angus A. (Queens, P.E.I.)
Agriculture, aid to, 8513.
Government Railways provident fund, 744.
Highways improvement, 12015.
Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 8562.
Naval forces of the Empire, 9561.
Prince Edward Island dredging, 12128.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10930, 10934.

McLean, Mr. H. H. (Sunbury and Queens)
Militia estimates, 11041, 11052, 11061.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2871, 2891.

McLeod, Malcolm G., employment of, 603.

McMillan, Mr. John A., (Glengarry)
Naval forces of the Empire, 5395.

Magdalen Islands wireless service, 3033.

Mail services
Actonvale, 804.
Alain, 11567.
Amqui, 3037.
Baie St. Paul-St. Tite des Caps, 3418.
Bath, N.B., 7624.
Bonaventure, 8648.
Boylston, 3892.
Brigham-Farnham, 2172.
Bromptville, 5154, 6292.
Carleton Centre, 7625, 8129.
Cornwall-Summerstown, 1364.
Crossroads-James River, 3178.
Danby-Ste. Christine, 803.
Florenceville-Upper Wicklow, 7623, 8128.
Gloucester, N.B., 3891.
Grosvenor, 10412.
Guysborough, 626.
Guysborough-Heatherton, 1364.
Halifax-Prospect, 2614.
Isle Verte Station, 4427.
Larry's river, 2726.
Les Eboulements, 7890.
Linwood, 605.
Longs, 9218.
Lorne Valley, 7890, 8653, 9594.
Meadowville-Murrayfield, 4167.
Middleton-Port George, 6745.
Millville-Dalhousie Mountain, 7619.
Montreal, 7619.
Pictou-Seafoam, 4060.

Mail Services—Cont.
Pictou-West River, 7619, 8641.
Quyon-South Onslow, 6261.
St. Andrews-Bayside, 7623.
Ste. Anne des Monts, 11,567.
St. Armand-Frelighsburg, 3890, 4425.
St. Bazile, 618.
St. Eloi, 1019.
St. Justine, 808.
Ste. Lucie-Lanthier, 4422.
St. Patrick-Notre Dame du Portage, 3414.
St. Simeon-Tadoussac, 10414.
St. Urbain-Baie St. Paul, 6261.
Salmon River-Hectanooga, 4062.
Scotsburn-River John, 4060.
Sherbrooke-Sheet Harbour, 2615, 3121.
Sherbrooke-Sunnybrae, 11573.
South Milford-Lake Munroe, 2169.
Three Rivers, 8654.
Tolleton-Hatfield Point, 3416, 3456, 7038.
Trois Pistoles-Les Escoumains, 9219.
Wilmot Station, 4062.

Mail. *See* Post Office.

Maisonneuve
Election suit, 3036.
Postal station, 612.

Malbaie mail carrier, 10416.

Manila rope, price of, 10414.

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Agriculture in Gaspé peninsula, 10386.
Alain post office, 11567, 11573.
Atlantic and Superior railways, 2169.
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, 3891, 6743.
Avignon post office, 5133, 6745, 7622.
Baie des Chaleurs and Atlantic Railway, 2168.
Black Cape East post office, 4424.
Bonaventure
Census enumerators, 2369, 2418.
Government expenditures, 7219.
Government patronage, 3416.
Mail service, 8648.
Public works foreman, 7622, 7623.
River buoys, 11204.
Signal station, 10415, 11074.
Campbellton-Gaspé steamer service, 3418, 4020, 7212.
Carleton
Light keeper, 11075.
Revetment wall, 11073.
Wharfinger, 11075.
Carleton Centre mail service, 8129.
Clocks for public buildings, 9216.

Marcil, Hon. Charles—Cont.
Dalhousie steamship service, 7621.
Dismissals
Bourque, A., marine employee, 7628.
Bujold, L., lightkeper, 7627.
Chapados, Simon, wharfinger, 10529.
Dea, Edmund, lobster hatchery overseer, 7221.
Labillois, Alex., postmaster, 7627.
Landry, J. E., lightkeeper, 8133.
Marcotte, Madame, postmistress, 7627.
Mowat, M. M., fishery officer, 7219.
Thibodeau, L., postmaster, 11573.
Escuminac river post office, 4424.
Intercolonial Railway branch lines, 1777, 8879.
Mail bag locks, 7215.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10724-10742.
Miguasha wharf, 11073.
Militia estimates, 11027.
Montreal mail deliveries, 7619.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2707, 2727, 4881, 5370, 5797.
New Carlisle
Experimental station, 2171, 7386.
Public building, 7621.
Nouvelle river damages, 10529.
Paspebiac wharf, 10529.
Post Office estimates, 11283, 11410, 11418.
Public Works estimates, 11081, 11187, 11191.
Quebec weights and measures inspector, 8129.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10911, 10917.
Restigouche Boom Company, 7626.
Robitaille post office, 5153, 9219.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7757.
Ste. Adelaide de Pabos breakwater, 962, 1157.
Ste. Anne de Restigouche Indian reserve, 4423.
St. Godfroy buoy, 10415.

Marcile, Mr. Joseph E. (Bagot)
Acton Vale-St. Theodore d'Acton mail contract, 804.
Acton Vale public building, 8858.
Agricultural lecturers' for Quebec, 8651.
Danby-Ste. Christine mail contract, 803.
Intercolonial Railway: Station at St. Edouard, 934.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3187, 4531, 9402.
River Scibouit public works, 1162.

Marine and Fisheries estimates, 6174, 6201, 10682-10748, 10753-10821.

Maritime Provinces Inland Revenue inspector, 2370, 2616.

Marriage laws in federal territory, 583.

Martin, Mr. Mederic (Montreal, St. Mary's)
Chairman of committees and French language, 5874.
Estimates, printing of, in French, 6164, 6409.
Mail bag locks, 7213, 7617, 7890.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5916, 5872.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6523.
Victoria drill hall, 4061.

Martin, Mr. William M. (Regina)
Banks and banking, 2307.
City post office clerks, 2418.
Closure, application of term to action of House, 6035.
County court judges, salaries of, 6282.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9719.
Donaldson homestead entry, 7946.
Female labour in Saskatchewan, 3414.
Freight rates, western, 8923.
Grain Bill, 9113.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway mail service, 1953.
Homestead inspectors in Saskatchewan, 615, 3178.
Hudson Bay Railway terminus, 4059.
Jones, J. P., grain commissioner, 9593.
Letter carriers, 2418.
Mounted police pensions, 6480.
Natural gas exports, 6431.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2833, 5262, 6034, 5691.
Parcel post, 1516.
Prince Albert Dominion lands, 2720.
Public buildings, sub-letting of, 8132.
Regina homestead inspector, dismissal of, 1954.
School lands, western, 3419.
Terminal elevators, 3419.
Union Life Assurance Company, 8227, 8360.
Volunteer bounty, 8917.
Winnipeg river water power leases, 9839.

Maskinongé public works, 10143.

Mayflower, steamer, loss of, 2374, 3186, 7037.

Meat inspection, 6290.

Medicine Hat
Lands agent, 807.
Mail delivery, 2416.
Post offices, 806.
Police Point reserve, 6253.

Meek divorce bill. *See* **Private Bills.**

Meighen, Mr. Arthur (Portage la Prairie)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech: Macdonald by-election, 246.
Agriculture credits, 3124, 3171.
Banks and banking, 10089, 11588.
Canadian Explosives Limited, 2574.
Canadian Northwest Loan and Mortgage Company, 2598, 7344.
Chairman, acting, 4665, 4670.
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 6137.
Companies Act, 2995.
Co-operative Credit Societies, 9039.
Japanese Treaty, 7163.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3361, 3646, 3693.
Ocean rates, 9040.
Parliamentary procedure
Adjournment motions, 7850.
Crown grant, right to amend, 5835.
Friday sitting, validity of after midnight, 4996.
Irrelevance, 5864-5867, 5873, 5964.
Merits of bill on m. for com. to rise, discussion of, 5864, 5867.
Notice, sufficiency of, 7682.
Offensive personal references, 5779.
Previous question, moving of in com., 9331.
Recalcitrant witness, motion regarding without notice, 3361.
Rules of the House. *See that title.*
Speaker, authority of, 6315.
Statements of members, acceptance of, 5824.
Summons to recalcitrant witness, motion for without notice, 3361.
Prudential Life of Canada, 7186.
Railway Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 951.
Rules of the House, 6315.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7519, 8321. 9357, 9367, 9579, 9585.

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Victoria, N.B.)
Dismissals
Andover preventive officer, 634.
St. Leonard immigration agent, 9344, 11204.
Fenian Raid bounty, 6676.
National Transcontinental Railway estimates, 11239.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4738, 9499.
Railway subsidies, 11671.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3397.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7785.
Van Buren Bridge Company, 11391.

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9753.
Ditching machinery, duty on, 6656.

Middlebro, Mr. William S.—Cont.
Grain Bill, 9118.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3357, 3451, 3645, 3648, 3652, 3654, 3658, 3664.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1441, 1448, 4514, 5952, 5886, 9966.
Parliamentary procedure
Appeal, second on one question, 5892.
Irrelevancy, 5885-5888.
Recalcitrant witness, motion regarding without notice, 3357.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 2973, 3375.

Miguasha wharf, 11073.

Military cemeteries, desecration of, 11665.

Military property, Lévis, 11941.

Militia
Drilling on Fletcher's field, 2173.
Estimates, 6296, 6726, 11012, 11022.
Minister of, utterances of, 4426, 5154, 9345, 9841.
Permanent force, supplies for, 2724.

Miller, R. C., case of
Motion to summon before Bar of House, 3357.
Attendance at Bar, 3451, 3645.
Statement of Mr. Miller, 3646, 3651.
Statement of Mr. Miller's counsel, 3652.
Motion to commit for contempt, 3659.
Commitment to jail, 3741.
Question of cost, 5153.

Mines Department
Estimates, 11562.
Reported transfer of, 2167.

Mint, Ottawa, Bill. Res., 8658. 1r., 8674. 2r. and Com., 9102. 3r., 9109. *See also* 12113.

Miramichi river dredging, 1548.

Molloy, Mr. John P. (Provencher)
Manitoba Radial Railway Company, 8121.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5021, 5719.

Mondou, Mr. A. A. (Yamaska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech: Naval defence: amdt. proposed, 570.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3244 (amdt.).

Money circulation, 8358.

Monk, Hon. F. D.
Private secretary of, 561, 593, 961.
Retirement of, 43, 51, 113, 561, 596, 4510.

Montcalm
Postmaster, 7621.
Public building, 11073.

Montreal
Armouries, 7035, 7204.
Drill hall, 2614.
Government offices, 2167.
Harbour master, 1499, 9841.
Post office, 2167, 9593.

Montreal Harbour Commissioners Bill. 1r., 694. 2r., 913. Com., 913. 3r., 3272. *See also* 1497, 1534, 9842.

Montreal Island and Vaudreuil bridges, 2369.

Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company Bill. 1r., 1266. 2r., 1448. Com., 2591, 3074. Senate amdts., 3741.

Montreal river improvements, 6240.

Moosejaw
Customs appraiser, 10144.
Homestead inspections, 2721.
Immigration building, 11200.
Lands office, 10823.
Post office investigation, 7622.

Morin, Joseph, employment of, 2615.

Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Agriculture, aid to, 8516.
Chairman, acting as, 4508.
Experimental farms, 10262.
Fenian Raid bounty, 6678.
Government annuities, 9603.
Immigration, 12170.
Independent Order of Foresters, 7341.
Naturalization, 2386.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1686, 1697.
Pollution of navigable waters, 8637.
Rules of the House, 6344.

Mortimer Lithographing Company, 6417.

Moulin Basinet post office, 3123.

Municipal councils, government officials in 1500.

Munro, homestead entry, 8856.

Munson, Mr. Charles A. (West Northumberland, O.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
By-elections, 466.
National policy, 467.

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Accountants' Association, 3840.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Immigration, 548.
Highways improvement, 549.
Naval defence, 549.

Murphy, Hon. Charles—Cont.
Cement duty, 550.
By-elections, 553.
Barnes, Professor, experiments of, 3034.
British naval and military emigration league, 600.
Canadian Northern Railway, mileage of, 11805.
Civil Service Commission, 6470.
Companies Act, 604.
Companies, incorporation of, 605.
Conservation Commission, 6466.
Cumberland postmaster, 1017.
Dismissals
Conway, M. T., 7222.
Slack, W. F., 3037.
Georgian Bay canal, 1154.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway: Canadian port of shipment, 799, 1160.
Gutelius and Lynch-Staunton, Messrs., services of, 605.
Justice Department estimates, 12037.
Marine Public Service Commissioner's report, 4426.
Miller, R. C., case of, 5154.
Mortimer Lithographing Company, 6417.
National Gallery of Canada, 9836.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4066, 4779, 5922, 5977, 5481, 5912.
Osgoode station postmaster, 1016.
Ottawa, Government land purchases, 2725.
Parcel post, 11837.
Parry Sound weights and measures inspector, appointment of, 4061.
Post Office estimates, 11417.
Printing Bureau: women proof readers, 7809.
Private Secretaries
Ministers', 953.
Monk's, Hon. F. D., 593, 961.
Public Service Commissioner of Marine, alleged report of, 4426.
Public Service Commission: printing of report, 1743.
Public Works estimates, 11080, 11092, 11095, 11172.
Rideau canal: cleaning and painting bridges, 6252.
Rockliffe rifle range, 593.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7852.
Russell county postmasters, 593.
St. John Ambulance Association, 6170.
Tye, W. F., employment of, 604, 1362.

Murray Bay post office, 6262.

Murray, David, preventive officer, 959.

Murray, Sir George, report of on Civil Service, 360, 6469.

Nantel, Hon. Wilfred B. (Minister of Inland Revenue)
Adulteration Act amendment, 11648.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11345, 11515, 11534, 12108.
Natural gas, export of, 6427.
Petroleum and naphtha inspection, 11647.

National Gallery of Canada Bill. Res., 8995. 1r., 9009. 2r., 9622. Com., 9622, 9836. 3r., 9838. Senate amdts., 10680.

National Transcontinental Railway
Alexander, A., employment of, 1015.
Balkam, C. E., employment of, 7891.
Capital account, 9221.
Construction, 3175, 9947.
Estimates, 11099, 11206.
Extension of time Bill. 1r., 1406. 2r., and Com., 3350. 3r., 3351. *See also* Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.
Grade, changes of, 29, 6251, 6455.
Gutelius, F. P., employment of, 605, 6813, 8131.
Investigating commission, 605, 623.
Lynch-Staunton, G., employment of, 605, 6813.
Moncton-Lévis section, 586, 1950, 6936, 12094.
Quebec station, 6258, 6812.
Quebec terminals, 584, 6811, 7809, 12061, 12076.
Temporary structures, 6251.
Tye, W. F., services of, 604, 1362.
Workshops and sites, 9948.

Natural gas, 3889, 6419.

Naturalization
Amendment Bill, 1r., 1362.
Uniform British, 2374, 2726, 9346. *See also* Russian Canadians.

Natural resources, provincial control of, 6942.

Naval Affairs
Act of 1910, question of repeal, 12135.
Admiralty, statements from, 679, 4770, 4853, 5138, 5167, 5208, 5460, 5638.
Armament building, cessation of: proposal of Mr. Churchill, 6451.
Canadian fleet unit: statements of cost, 3546, 4280, 4341, 4435, 4447, 4786, 5141, 5296, 5547, 9153.
Defence, 12, 21, 27, 43, 110, 115, 135, 159, 181, 202, 223, 252, 263, 327, 350, 366, 382, 387, 427, 472, 497, 514, 546, 550, 560, 570, 576, 951, 10066, 12139.
Enlistment, 9840.
Estimates, 6272.

Naval Affairs—Cont.
Imperial squadron, 10066.
Monk, Hon. F. D., views of, 596, 4788.
Tupper, Sir Charles, views of, 4808.

Naval Aid Bill. 1r., 676. Res., 1019, 1098, 1292, 1311, 1371, 1407, 1582, 1654, 2505, 2657, 2704, 2727, 2833, 2891, 3043, 3084, 3187; div., 3262. 2r., 3457, 3748, 3787, 3896, 3941, 3982, 4066, 4170; div., 4277. Com., 4283, 4319, 4434, 5156, 7223, 7293, 7345, 9134, 9144, 9233, 9348, 9444, 9487, Rep., 9591. Con., 9698. 3r., 9950; div., 10061.
Amendments proposed
On res: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 1038; div., 3242. Mr. Verville, 3103; div., 3239. Mr. Mondou, 3244; ruled out, 3260.
On 2r.: Mr. Turriff, 3482; div., 4274. Mr. Guilbault, 3901; div., 4272.
In com.: Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 4486; ruled out, 5832, 5855. Mr. McKenzie, 4516; ruled out, 5832, 5855. Mr. Guthrie, 5856; div., 9571. Mr. German, 9148, 9277, 9390, 9413; div., 9571, 9572, 9573. Mr. Carvell, 9438; div., 9573.
On con.: Mr. Pugsley, 9698; ruled out, 9698; ruling appealed, 9707; div., 9707.
On 3r.: Mr. German, 9957; div., 9960. Mr. Lemieux, 9966; div., 9974. Mr. Carvell, 9982; div., 9986. Mr. Carroll, 9991; div., 10010. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 10024; div., 10059.
Closure applied, 9277, 9329, 9410, 9437, 9443, 9445, 9571.

Navigation and Ice. *See* **Ice.**

Neely, Mr. D. B. (Humboldt)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Reciprocity with United States, 406.
Macdonald by-election, 408.
Cement duty, 413.
Dismissals, 417.
Redistribution of representation, 421.
National resources, provincial control, 422.
Transportation, 424.
Animal contagious diseases, 9614.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4384.
Crown lands, sales of, 614.
Donaldson homestead entry, 7974.
Elevator terminal sites, 625.
Freight rates
Equality of, 10968.
Western, 8936.
Fruit marking, 9681, 11927.
Grain Bill, 9878.
Highways improvement, 8192.
Humboldt homestead inspectors, 802.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4636, 5013, 5316, 5933, 6028.
Post Office estimates, 11272, 11291, 11443.
Railway Commission, 9693.
Reciprocity with the United States, 406.
Redistribution of representation, 421, 615, 5323.
Saskatchewan forest and fire rangers, 630.
Selkirk election, 962.
Settee, question of appointment of, 631.
Smythe, A., homestead inspector, appointment of, 629.
Wynyard, Dominion lands at, 3893.

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward W. (North Oxford)
Agriculture, aid to, 2156, 8073, 8508.
Agriculture credits, 3152.
Banks and banking, 2285, 11589.
Canadian Explosives, Limited, 2580.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4374.
Canada Permanent Trust Company, 2613.
Cattle shipments to the United States, 624.
Cement imports, 611.
Ditching machinery, duty on, 6441, 6655.
Government annuities, 9847, 9851.
Highways improvement, 8596, 8842.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1475, 5047, 5277, 5542, 5913, 9459.
Parcel post, 1519.
Patents, renewal of, 3832.
Post Office estimates, 11416.
Public Works estimates, 11167.
Railway Commission, 9691.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3383.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7575.
Tariff, 6441.

New Campbellton customs officer, 2617.

New Carlisle public building, 7621.

New Chester postmaster, 3179.

Newcombe, E. L.: increase of salary, 12034.

Newfoundland, trade with, 4166.

New Harbour
Breakwater, 9842, 12121.
Postmaster, 7811, 8462.

Newspapers
Patronage list, 8124.
Postage on, 600.

Newville mail service, 619.

New Westminster Harbour Commissioners Bill. 1r., 1405. 2r., 1696. Com., 2540, 2573, 3009. 3r., 3074.

Nickle, Mr. William F. (Kingston)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Cartwright, Sir Richard, the late, 14.
Banks and banking, 16.
Agriculture, 17.
Penitentiaries, 19.
Immigration, 20.
Naval defence, 21.
Agriculture credits, 3155.
Banks and banking, 16, 10290, 10330, 10359, 11583.
Canadian Medical Association, 3860.
Chairman, acting as, 5958, 5998.
Highways improvement, 11997.
Parliamentary procedure
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 5998.
Rules of the House, 6376.
Penitentiaries, 19, 10986, 11338.

Nictaux fish hatchery, 7216.

Niobe
Dismissals from, 8226.
Repairs, 1741, 2169.

North Atlantic. *See* **Ocean.**
Ice conditions on. *See* Ice.

Northern waters, patrol of. *See* **Stefansson Expedition.**

North Fraser Harbour Commissioners Bill. 1r., 1405. 2r., 1696. Com., 2581, 3012. 3r., 3074.

Northrup, Mr. William B. (East Hastings)
Lead bounties, 10166.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3483, 5465.
Rules for limitation of debate: m. that Mr. Hazen be now heard, 7412.

North Sydney public building, 3550.

Northwest Territories, government of, 6622, 6479.

Nouvelle river damages, 10529.

Nova Scotia apple trade, 6414.

Noyan customs officers, 619, 620.

Ocean rates, 2504, 9040.

Old Age Pensions, 943, 6939, 10528, 10677.

Oliver, Hon. Frank (Edmonton)
Accountants' Association, 3783, 3977.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Government pledges, 49.
Cement duty, 52.
Macdonald election, 53.
Agriculture, aid to, 2157, 8084, 8118, 8507, 8814.
Alberta Inter-urban Railway Company, 8586.
Animal contagious diseases, 9864.
Banks and banking, 2332, 10092, 10096-10141, 10291-10375, 11590.
Budget
Revenue and national prosperity, 10597.
West Indian trade agreement, its effect upon taxation, 10599.
Cost of living and the tariff, 10603.
Cement duty, 10605.
Our foreign trade, 10608.
Tariff and the wheat grower, 10610.
Immigration, 10612.
Expenditure and taxation, 10613.
Calgary, Edmonton and Fort McMurray Railway, 6199.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4370.
Canadian Northern Railway subsidy, 11776, 11793, 11844.
Canada Permanent Trust Company, 2608.
Canada Western Trust and Mortgage Company, 2597.
Capilano Indian reserve, 8640.
Companies Act, 3024.
Conservation Commission, 12061.
Customs estimates, 8692.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9758.
Dismissals
Douglas, Howard, 3894, 7220.
MacKenzie, J. B., 9342.
Port Arthur immigration agent, 810.
Postmasters, 843.
Dominion parks, superintendent of, 957.
Donaldson homestead entry, 3272, 3745, 7826, 7839, 7843, 7892, 8226, 8360, 8465, 9223.
Edmonton
Bridge, 11507.
Customs collector, 1018.
Public buildings, 6231, 11492.
River bank protection, 11501.
Experimental farms, 10274, 10277.
Express rates, 9343.
Forest reserves and parks, 11650.
Freight rates
Equality of, 10961.
Western, 8940, 10961.
Fruit marking, 10082, 11934.
Georgian Bay canal, 2591, 3074.

Oliver, Hon. Frank—Cont.
Grain Bill, 8679, 9120, 9868, 9901.
Grain Commission, 6271.
Grand Trunk Pacific loan, 11800, 11860, 11867.
Highways improvement, 8592, 12004.
Homestead entries, 4061, 8354.
Hudson Bay Railway, 3891, 10940, 10946, 10951.
Hutchinson, bounty for Miss Lois B., 10679.
Immigration, 11554.
Chinese, 11560.
Female immigrants, protection of, 12169.
Indians
Estimates, 11563.
Land sales, 8123. *See also* Capilano and Kitsilano.
Japanese treaty, 7023, 7136, 7138, 7198.
Judges, increase of, 11634.
Justice Department estimates, 11003. 11007.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 8465, 10826, 10843.
Lead bounties, 10180, 10186.
Macdonald election, 53, 1955.
Militia estimates, 11022, 11048, 11056, 11071.
Munro homestead entry, 8856.
National Gallery of Canada, 9001, 9623.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1336, 4126, 4511, 5377, 5927, 5966, 5812, 5892, 9322, 9353, 9553, 9705.
North Fraser harbour, 2581.
Ocean rates, 9061.
Original papers, production of, 9223.
Parcel post, 11839.
Parliamentary procedure
Appeal, second on one question, 5892.
Money grant, amendment of, 5836.
Papers, original, production of, 9223.
Statements of members, acceptance of, 5823.
Patents, renewal of, 3780, 11021.
Penitentiary Act amendment, 11335-11343.
Police
Dominion, 8565.
Mounted, Royal Northwest, 886.
Pollution of navigable waters, 8636.
Post Office estimates, 11279.
Prince Albert forest reserve, 5146.
Privilege, 1955, 3270.
Public Works estimates, 11151, 11490-11494, 11499, 11507, 11513.
Railway Belt water powers, 9592, 11921.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10940, 10946, 10951, 11302.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 2969.
Rideau Hall improvements, 6232.

Oliver, Hon. Frank—Cont.
Roblin, Sir Rodmond, reply to statements of, 1955.
Rogers, Hon. Robert, proposed censure of, 7805, 7892, 9223.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7638, 8431, 8921.
Russian immigrants, treatment of, 11078.
Saskatoon Dominion lands clerk, 6748.
Survey lines, township, 56, 9221.
Telegraph service, inter-Imperial, 9033.
Timber reservation, 3893.
Union Life Assurance Company, 8369.
Vancouver Harbour Commission, 8505, 8900.
Vernon Indian inspector, 4420.
Volunteer bounty, 1370, 3892, 8907, 9942.
Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, 2603.
West Indian trade agreement, 2012, 2036, 2113, 8780.

Ontario Equipment Company, 8124, 8126, 8649, 9213, 9215, 9595.

Ontario Superior Courts Bill. 1r., 6305. 2r. and com., 6625. 3r., 6642.

Opium traffic, 4420.

Opposition leader, salary of, 8358.

Original papers, production of, 9223.

Osgoode station postmaster, 1016.

Osler, Sir Edmund (West Toronto)
Banks and banking, 1894, 6485, 6489.

Ottawa
Canadian Pacific Railway entrance, 8550.
Federal district, proposed, 2176.
Government land purchases, 2725.
Major's Hill park, 8465.
Public buildings, 6230, 6232-6240.
Water supply, 8550, 8640.

Ottawa river dredging, 656.

Oyster Ponds preventive officer, 7465.

Pacaud, Mr. Lucien T. (Megantic)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech: Naval defence, 252.
Coleraine station postmistress, dismissal of, 2179.
Naval forces of the Empire, 252, 4038, 4985, 5711.

Panama California Exposition, 7220.

Panama Canal, 601, 965.

Papineau, Mr. Louis J. (Beauharnois)
Naval forces of the Empire, 4894, 5559.

Paquet, Mr. Eugene (L'Islet)
Colonization and immigration societies, 3032.
Dismissals in L'Islet, 3037.
Farm hands in Ontario and Quebec, 3032.
Highways improvement, 8532.
Immigration: report of Mr. Olivar Asselin, 1951.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4117.
Privilege, 8742.
Railways and Canals estimates, 10873-10880.
Repatriation, Canadian, 3032, 3123.

Parcel Post Bill. Res. and 1r., 10070. 2r. and com., 11809. 3r., 11843. *See also* 585, 1504, 3362, 3555, 7551.

Pardee, Mr. Frederick F. (West Lambton)
Banks and banking, 2470, 10130.
Ditching machinery, duty on, 6657.
Fenian raid bounty, 6681.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3084, 5114, 5887.
Ontario Superior courts, 6631.
Public Works estimates, 11175.
Radiotelegraphy, regulation of, 785.
Steamboat inspection, 791.
Supreme Court, 8575.
West Indian trade agreement, 2086.

Parks, National. *See* **Forest reserves.**

Parliamentary documents, distribution of, 11534.

Parliamentary Procedure
See also Rules for limitation of debate, Rules of House, Speaker, and Deputy Speaker.
Adjournment motions, 7826, 7839-7852, 8464.
Appeal, second on one question, 5896.
Chairman and French language, 5874, 5880, 5990.
Chair, reflections on action of, 9591, 6998.
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 4825, 5878, 5989-6025.
Closure rules, application of, 9275, 9329, 9410, 9437, 9443, 9445, 9451, 9571, 9589.
Disorder, Speaker resuming chair to stop, 6018, 6020, 6022, 6161, 6164, 6374.
Estimates in French, 6164, 6452.
Friday sitting, validity of after midnight, 4995.
Irrelevance, 4473-4477, 4508, 4775, 5822, 5832, 5880-5896, 5907-5964.
Merits of a bill on m. for com. to rise, 5861-5870, 5882-5885.

Parliamentary Procedure—Cont.
Order of the Day, discussion of on m. for com. to rise, 5929.
Personal argument why com. should rise, 5881.
Principle of a bill in com., 5816.
Quoting from previous debate, 5964-5984.
Money grant, amendment of, 5832, 11792.
Naming of member, 6019.
Notice, sufficiency of, 7681-7695.
Offensive personal references, 5769-5782.
Official documents quoted from, laying on table, 7926, 7944, 8012, 9223.
Out of order: to ask for unofficial information, 4628.
Papers, original, production of, 9223.
Point of order, permissibility of discussion on, 4823.
Press comments on proceedings in House, 7457, 7955.
Previous question
Motion for, 7412.
Form of, 7413.
Not admissible in com., 9330.
Proposed amdt. after, 7695, 7715.
When admissible, 7416.
Privilege, questions of and press attacks, 712.
Questions and answers
Lengthy, 3041, 3118.
Without notice, 7036.
Recalcitrant witness, motion regarding, without notice, 3660.
Refusal of member to obey order of chair, 6039.
Rules of the House. *See that title.*
Rules for limitation of debate. *See that title.*
Speaker resuming chair without com. report, 6018, 6020, 6022.
Authority of to do so, 6161, 6306.
Statements of members, acceptance of, 5823.
Tedious repetition, 4509, 4775, 5822-5832 5880-5896, 5911, 5920, 5926.

Parliamentary representation, redistribution of, 34, 35, 45, 305, 337, 421, 615, 3482, 4274, 6939.

Parrsboro government building, 1163.

Parry Sound weights and measures inspector, 4061.

Paspebiac wharf, 10529.

Patents
Appeals on. *See* Exchequer Court.
Renewal of, 3078, 3780, 3832, 4316, 6193.

Patronage, Government. *See* **Newspapers.**

Peace centenary conference, 11943.

Pelagic Sealing
Bill. 1r., 11321. 2r., com. and 3r., 11603.
Claims, 2724, 6508, 12045.

Pelletier, Hon. Louis P. (Postmaster General)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Reciprocity with United States, 507.
By-elections, 510.
Quebec merger, 512.
Naval defence, 514.
Alameda postmaster, dismissal of, 664.
Atlantic mail service, 7204, 10417.
Banque Internationale, 2235.
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 5623, 6119.
Dismissals of postmasters, 839, 9607.
Estimates, printing of in French, 6410.
French translation of Debates, 11959.
Government annuities, 9597, 9599, 9606, 9845.
Letter carriers, conveyance of, 3745, 11463.
Mail bag locks, 6294, 6749, 6910.
National Sanitarium Association: use of stamps, 964.
National Transcontinental Railway, 11249.
Quebec terminals, 6812.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1093, 1098, 3812, 5002, 5915, 5700, 5890, 12155.
Parcel post, 1522, 10070, 11809, 11838.
Paris agency, 11542.
Parliamentary procedure
Appeal, second on one question, 5890.
Friday sitting, validity of after midnight, 5002.
Post Office Act Amendment, 11906.
Post Office estimates, 11268-11294, 11351-11390, 11398-11457.
Quebec harbour loan, 8046.
Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 513, 2194.
Railway Commissioner, chief, salary of, 9937.
Returns, production of, 4281.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3394.
Rural mail service, 6938, 7812, 10068, 12103.
Telegraph service, inter-Imperial, 9009, 9034, 9944, 11660, 11668, 12161.
Transatlantic mail service, 7204, 10417.

Penitentiary Act Amendment Bill. Res., 11330. 1r. and 2r., 11345. Com. and 3r., 11603.

Pensions. *See* **Government Annuities,** *also* **Old Age Pensions.**

Perley, Hon. Geo. H. (Argenteuil)
Accountants' Association, 3838, 3979.
Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation, 2606.
Gold and silver marking, 8674.
Grain Bill, 8679, 9111, 9866, 9899, 9903.
Grain Commission, 6270.
Guarantee Company of North America, 3404.
House of Commons staff classification, 11953.
North Atlantic rates, 9085.
Patents, renewal of, 4316.
Private secretary, allowance for, 6272.
Stefansson expedition, 6273.
Trade and Commerce estimates, 6728, 12106.
West Indian steamship service, 6269.
West Indian trade agreement, 8742, 8748.

Peterborough lift-lock contract, 156.

Petrel, government steamer, 1497.

Petroleum and Naphtha Inspection Bill. 1r., 10281. 2r. and com., 11647. 3r., 11648.

Photo-engravers, importation of, 7725, 8036, 8227.

Picton postmaster, 7891.

Pictou
County mail service, 600, 4060, 8354.
Life-boat crew, 961.
Marine hospital, 7385.

Piedmont post office, 592.

Pilotage on the St. Lawrence, 2282, 2374, 6187, 6498, 6624, 6743, 7637, 7810.

Police
Royal Northwest Mounted, 3355, 6166, 6174, 6480, 12055.
Bill respecting. Res., 717. 1r., 719. 2r., 886. Com., 886. 3r., 1653.

Pollution of Navigable Waters Bills
Mr. Bradbury: 1r., 6. 2r., 8607. Ref. to com., 8639. rep., 11666.
Mr. Kyte: 1r., 3174. 2r. and ref. to com., 8639. Rep., 11666.

Polson iron works, Government contracts with, 8641.

Pontbriand wharf, 584, 970.

Porcupine strike, 2110.

Port Arthur Dry Dock Bill. Res., 9838. 1r., 9838. 2r. and com., 10079. 3r., 10081.

Port Daniel Centre post office, 4424.

Port Hood harbour, 956, 1734.

Port Maitland post office, 11570.

Post Office
Amdt. bill. Res., 11801. 1r., 11802. 2r. and com., 11906. 3r., 11921.
Automobile for department, 8126.
Clerks in cities, 2418.
Dismissals. *See that title.*
Estimates, 6292, 6909, 11268, 11349, 11398, 12095.
Free departmental matter, 9281.
Intercolonial Railway mail facilities, 6293.
Legal adviser, 7810, 8358.
Letter Carriers
Conditions of work, 2418.
Conveyance of Bill. 1r., 3745. Withdrawn, 11466.
Service, extent of, 1951.
Mail bag locks, purchase of, 6294, 6742, 6748, 6910, 7034, 7212, 7617, 7889, 8124, 8355, 8649, 9213, 9214, 9595. *See also* Ontario Equipment Company.
Mail services. *See that title.*
Money orders tariff, 8653, 9595.
Police Gazette and postal privileges, 8132.
Railway mail clerks. *See that title.*
Rented offices, 8359.
Robberies of mails, 7615.
Rural mail service. *See that title.*
Savings banks, 1561, 1741.
Stamp-vending machines, 11203, 11568.

Power, Lenore, divorce bill. *See* **Private Bills.**

Power, Mr. William (West Quebec)
Naval forces of the Empire, 4891.
Quebec harbour improvements, 8049.

Prescott marine yard, 7465.

Preston, W. T. R., employment of, 2370.

Prince Albert Dominion lands, 2720. *See also* Donaldson.

Prince county fishery officer, 10413.

Prince Edward Island
Car ferry, 960, 2721, 3179, 9217.
Provincial subsidy, 4423.
Supreme court, 9341.

Prince Rupert
Marine depot, 1562.
Public building, 2620.

Printing and Stationery Department, reorganization of, 7808.

Printing Bureau
Wages in, 11546.
Women proof readers, employment of, 7809.

Prisons Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 10953. 2r., com. and 3r., 11466.

Private Bills discussed
Alberta Interurban Railway Company, 8586.
Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company, 3013.
Algoma Eastern Railway Company, 2144, 2145, 6197.
Athabasca and Grande Prairie Railway Company, 8970.
Athabaska Northern Railway Company, 3779, 3780.
Banque Immobilière, 2146.
Bishopric, George Frederick, patent of, 2573, 2693.
Brazilian Traction, Light and Power Company, Limited, 3014.
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, 3405.
Burrard, Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company, 10749.
Calgary, Edmonton and Fort MeMurray Railway Company, 6198.
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company, 2145.
Canadian Explosives, Limited, 763, 2574, 2694, 2876.
Canada Hail Insurance Company, 3778.
Canadian Medical Protective Association, 3401, 3842.
Canadian Northern Railway Company, 4362, 6195, 6196, 8458.
Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company, 3406, 3409, 7757, 8587, 11394, 12133.
Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, 3410, 11397.
Canadian Northwest Loan and Mortgage Company, 2596, 2614, 7344.
Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation, 2605.
Canada Permanent Public Trustee Company, 2606.
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 8969.
Canadian Premier Provident Fire Insurance Company, 9097.
Canadian Western Railway Company, 4409.
Central Railway Company of Canada, 2160, 11565.
Collingwood Southern Railway Company, 3013.
Commercial Acetyline Company of New Jersey, patent, 11016.
Delvigne, Maurice, patent, 11019.
Dominion Trust Company, 763, 3411.

Private Bills discussed—Cont.
Ebro Irrigation and Power Company, 3022.
General Accountants' Association, 3783, 3834, 3977, 6194.
Gold Medal Furniture Manufacturing Company Patent, 3078.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway
Branch Lines Company, 2143.
Time extension, 1406, 3349.
Guarantee Company of North America, 3404.
Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway, 8583.
Hull Electric Company, 3026.
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company, 2595.
Huron and Ontario Railway Company, 2539.
Imperial Traction Company, 8969.
Imperial Underwriters' Corporation, 4413, 6196.
Intercolonial Trust and Investment Company, 3887, 3980.
Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company, 3077.
Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company, 2145.
Manitoba Radial Railway Company, 8587.
Meek, F. W., divorce bill, 11566, 11738.
Middlesex Trust Company, 9095.
Moncton and Northumberland Strait Railway Company, 6050, 8585.
Newman, F. J., patent of, 3780, 4316, 6193, 8590.
New Orleans and Grande Isle Railway Company, 763, 933, 3023.
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway, 3411.
Nipissing Central Railway Company, 8584.
North Empire Fire Insurance Company, 4411.
Northwest Guarantee and Accident Insurance Company, 2596, 2614, 6198.
Ottawa Northern and Western Railway Company, 3013.
Pacific and Eastern Mortgage Company, 9096.
Pacific and Hudson Bay Railway Company, 3027.
Pacific and Peace Railway Company, 8582.
People's Trustee and Security Company. 3412.
Port Nelson Company, 7185.
Power, Lenore, divorce bill, 11741.
Prudential Trust Company, 7186.
Real Estate Loan Company of Canada, 9095.

Private Bills discussed—Cont.
Richard, A. D., patent of, 3780, 3832.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 1133, 1307, 2572, 2694, 2943, 3303, 3362, 3399.
Shuswap and Okanagan Railway Company, 3409.
Southampton Railway, 8970.
Toronto Terminals, 11072.
Van Buren Bridge Company, 11390.
Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, 2603.
Winnipeg Water Supply, 10751.

Private Secretaries, salaries of, 953, 6272, 6471.

Privilege, questions of
Beland, Mr., 6047.
Borden, Mr., 6265.
Bureau, Mr., 3747, 3932, 8464.
Carvell, Mr., 6050.
Clark, Mr. M., 6268.
Crothers, Mr., 3456.
Edwards, Mr., 4066, 8035.
Emmerson, Mr., 696, 1946.
Ethier, Mr., 6047.
Forget, Sir R., 2265.
Gauthier, Mr. L. J., 5150, 5621, 6050.
Guilbault, Mr., 4066.
Kyte, Mr., 1167.
Lemieux, Mr., 6047.
Maclean, Mr. A. K., 7634.
MacNutt, Mr., 1983, 2010.
Oliver, Mr., 1955.
Paquet, Mr., 8742.
Pugsley, Mr., 6266, 6499.
Rhodes, Mr., 708, 717.
Rogers, Mr., 3264, 3270.
Sharpe, Mr. S., 5149.
Sinclair, Mr., 4361.
Smith, Mr. Wm., 7035.
Verville, Mr., 4360.
White, Mr. W. H., 5149.

Privy Council, Judicial Committee of
Apptmt. of Law Lords to, 7818, 8058-8060.
Canadian appeals to, 1572-1581, 9826-9836.

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Criminal Code amendments, 11607.
Dussault, Arthur, employment of, 3418.
Fenian raid veterans, 625, 2171.
French translation of Debates, 11965.
Georgian Bay canal, 2645.
Highways improvement, 8602.
Ile Perrot bridge, 9947.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11517.
Judges' Act amendment, 11625, 11926.
Land titles, Manitoba, 11942.

Proulx, Mr. Edmond—Cont.
Meek divorce bill, 11566.
Morin, J. B., employment of, 3418.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3815, 4841, 5549, 9513, 12135.
Penitentiary Act amendment, 11333.
Public Works estimates, 11081, 11083, 11508.
Railway Commissioner, chief, salary of, 9938.
Rockdale Tower postal service, 2171.
Rural mail delivery, 2177.
Supreme Court, 9833.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11889.
Wendover wharfinger, 629.

Public Accounts Committee. *See* **Miller.**

Public Buildings
Cost of, 9839.
Sub-letting of, 8132.

Public Service Commission, 796, 1743, 4059, 4426, 7808.

Public Works
Engineers, Prince Edward Island, 8653.
Estimates, 11078-11098, 11143-11199.
Buildings, 6229-6240, 6402, 11483, 12114.
Dredging, 11502.
Harbours and Rivers, 6240, 11466, 11495.
Roads and bridges, 11507.
Telegraph lines, 11508, 11512.
Minister of: proposed censure. *See* Antigonish.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm. (St. John City)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Cement duty, 302.
Redistribution of representation, 304.
Transportation, 307.
Trade of Canada, 310.
By-elections, 318.
Naval defence, 327.
Banks and banking, 1279.
British Columbia financial terms, 6942.
British preference and Canadian ports, 586.
Canadian Explosives, Limited, 2579, 2694, 2879.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4364.
Customs estimates, 6884, 8018.
Debates, official: reporting in committee, 5149.
Dismissals, 863, 8018.
Deputy Speaker, proposed censure of, 9730, 9772.
Dry dock Duke of Connaught, 586, 705.
Fairville post office, 3034.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm.—Cont.
Fisheries protection, 3279.
Fishing regulations in New Brunswick, 6227.
Georgian Bay canal, 3077.
Government steamers, contracts for, 582, 797.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds, purchase of, 1576.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 8864, 12029.
Car shortage, 286.
Intercolonial Trust Company, 3980.
Japanese treaty, 6960, 7000, 7040.
Justice Department estimates, 12038.
Life-saving stations, 6202.
Mail bag locks, 6923.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3655, 3661, 3670.
Miramichi river dredging, 587, 1548.
National Gallery of Canada, 8996.
National Transcontinental Railway
Moncton-Lévis section, 586.
Operation by Grand Trunk Pacific Company, 6822.
Naval forces of the Empire, 327, 1654, 4284, 4319, 4438, 4443, 4489, 4626, 4810, 5029, 5051, 5146, 5167, 5267, 5280, 5460, 5952, 5964, 5989, 6003, 6013, 5769, 5829, 5870, 7245, 9148, 9155, 9321, 9577, 9698 (amdt.), 12150, 12171.
North Fraser harbour, 2583.
Ocean rates, 9088.
Parliamentary procedure
Adjournment motions, 7404, 7417, 7840.
Appeal, second on one question, 5889.
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 5989, 5991, 6003, 6013.
Chair, reflections on action of, 9591, 9698-9704.
Irrelevance, 5829, 5863.
Merits of bill on m. for com. to rise, discussion of, 5864, 5867.
Money grant, amendment of, 5833, 5857.
Offensive personal reference, complaint of, 5769-5781.
Point of order, permissibility of discussion on, 4823.
Previous question
Admissibility of, 7416.
In committee, 9330-9339.
Recalcitrant witness, motion regarding without notice, 3660.
Rules of the House. *See that title.*
Patents, renewal of, 3780.
Patronage, political, 6192.
Privilege, 6499.
Pulp duty, United States, 12135.

Pugsley, Hon. Wm.—Cont.
Railway Commission, 9695.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3377.
Rideau Hall improvements, 6232.
Rules for limitation of debate, 9577.
Rules of the House, 6359, 7404.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6518.
Smith, Lyman, dismissal of, 6885.
Telegraph service, inter-Imperial, 9029.
Tolleton-Hatfield Point mail contract, 3416, 7038, 9232.
Transportation facilities, 307, 4279.
Vancouver harbour, 5155.
West Indian trade agreement, 891, 2032, 2111, 8765.
West Indies, steamship service to, 6269.

Pulp, United States duty on, 12135.

Quebec
Arsenal, 8648.
Bridge, 11255.
Customs collector, 584.
Dry dock, 797, 1735, 7381.
Floating dock, 1735.
Harbour Commission, 2167, 8123, 8038, 11803.
Advocate, 617.
Quarry, 11803.
Harbour improvements, 4168. *See also* St. Charles river.
Legal agents of Government, 7465, 7810.
Marine agency, 8647.
Merger, 1499, 1735, 2180.
Post office, 6237.
Morin, J. B., employment of, 3418.
Public buildings, 1161.
Weights and measures inspector, 8129.

Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 1367, 1407, 4168, 6268, 8360.

Quebec Central Railway Company lease, 1739.

Quebec East election: returning officer's account, 3121.

Quebec Harbour Commission Bill. 1r., 6732. Res., 7293. 2r. and com., 8563, 8893. 3r., 8994.

Radiotelegraphy Regulation Bill. Res., 778. 1r., 787. 2r., 2419. Com., 8686. 3r., 8742.

Railway Act Amendment Bills
Ames, Mr. 1r., 9822.
Cochrane, Mr. Res., 9687. 1r., 9696. 2r. and com., 9918. 3r., 9941.
Meighen, Mr. 1r., 951.

Railway Belt Water Power Bill. 1r., 9592. 2r., 9946. Com., 11921. 3r., 11926.

Railway Commissioner, chief, salary of, 9687, 9696, 9918.

Railway Companies Incorporation Bill. 1r., 8121.

Railway crossings, level, 623.

Railway divisional points, removal of, 7718, 9688, 9920.

Railway Mail Clerks Bill. Res., 11801. 1r., 11802. Com., 11916. 3r., 11921.

Railway Subsidies Bill. Res., 11669. 1r., 11801. 2r., com. and 3r., 11843.

Railways and Canals estimates, 6752, 10843-10953, 11098-11142, 11206-11268, 11294-11320.

Rainville, Mr. Joseph H. (Chambly and Verchères)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Prosperity of Canada, 6.
Finances, 9.
Aid to agriculture, 10.
Naval defence, 12.
Automobiles, government, 1155.
Banks and banking, 10107, 10659.
Experimental farms, 10269.
Highways improvement, 8218, 8533.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5045. *See also* Address in Reply.

Receivers General, assistant, 6481.

Reciprocity with the United States, 47, 104, 129, 204, 213, 236, 259, 271, 339, 351, 356, 406, 453, 507, 528, 10539.

Redistribution. *See* **Parliamentary Representation.**

Reid, Mr. James (Restigouche)
Intercolonial Railway ice supply, 2010.

Reid, Hon. J. D. (Minister of Customs)
Canadian Medical Association, 3879.
Customs estimates, 6295, 6881, 8014, 8690, 8724, 8728, 8733, 8735, 12105.
Dry dock Duke of Connaught, 705.
Railway divisional points, removal of, 9932.
Sherbrooke customs appraiser, dismissal of, 6899.
Smith, Lyman C., dismissal of, 6890.
West Indian trade, 2080.

Repatriation, Canadian, 3032, 3123.

Restigouche Boom Company, 7626.

Revelstoke public buildings, 2620.

Rhodes, Mr. Edgar N. (Cumberland)
Amherst public building, 11180.
Dismissal of L. Bent, 712, 978.
Government Railways provident fund, 732.
Grand Trunk Railway officials, proceedings against, 2175.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 1832.
Extensions in Nova Scotia, 1996.
Privilege, 708, 712.
Sheep, purchase and sale of, 650.

Richards, Mr. James W. (Prince, P.E.I.)
Dismissals
Cape Egmont lighthouse keeper, 3179.
Cape Traverse postmaster, 1501.
Fish Island lightkeeper, 12163.
Malpeque collector, 1501.
North Cape lighthouse keeper, 3180.
Prince county fishery officer, 10413.
Tignish postmaster, 1502.
Tignish River lighthouse keeper, 3180.
Tignish sub-collector, 1501.
Life-saving stations, 12054.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4989.

Richelieu election, 39, 116, 221, 284, 318, 343, 379, 478, 494, 509.

Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, mail subsidy to, 584. *See also under* Private Bills.

Richibucto wharf, 9220.

Rideau canal: painting of bridges, 6252.

Rideau Hall improvements, 6232.

Riding Mountain
Drainage, 6416.
Forest reserve, 6255.

Rigaud
Arsenal, 7624, 10416.
Post office, 808, 6745, 8131, 10822.
Wharf, 11804.

Rivière du Loup harbour works, 1019.

River Scibout public works, 1162.

Roads. *See* **Highways.**

Robb, Mr. James A. (Huntingdon)
Agricultural estimates, 10393, 10405.
Butter imports, 595.
Cream exports, 595.
Dismissal of Duncan Macdonald, 812.
Grain Bill, 9127.
Independent Order of Foresters, 7337.
Militia estimates, 11053.

Robb, Mr. James A.—Cont.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4567, 5632.
Oats, imports and exports of, 595, 1291.
Sixth Hussars, 9342.
West Indian trade, 8761.
Wheat
Duty on imported, 1291.
Imports and exports, 596.

Robidoux, Ferdinand J. (Kent, N.B.)
Chairman, acting as, 5919-5926, 5990-6024.
Lanigan, Martin, dismissal of, 7632.

Robitaille post office, 5153, 9219.

Rockdale Tower mail service, 2171.

Rockliffe rifle range, cost of, 593.

Rogers, Hon. Robert, proposed censure of
Antigonish public works, 10191-10257.
Donaldson homestead entry, 7805, 7892; div., 3686, 8012.

Rogers, Hon. Robt. (Minister of Public Works)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Macdonald by-election, 208, 215.
Reciprocity with United States, 213.
Richelieu by-election, 221.
Antigonish public works estimates, 10225.
Donaldson homestead entry, 3264, 7914, 9223.
Dredging contracts, 6403.
East river, N. S., deepening of, 655.
Freight rates, western, 8947.
Grain Bill, 9885.
House of Commons
Accommodation, need of increased, 6238.
Ventilation of chamber, 6230.
Immigration, Chinese, 11560.
Inland Revenue estimates, 11528.
Japanese treaty, 7197.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 8483, 10840.
Macdonald and Richelieu elections, 208, 221, 12004.
National Gallery of Canada, 8995, 9830.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5811, 7263.
Parliamentary procedure
Irrelevance, 4473, 4476.
Notice, sufficiency of, 7693. *See also* Rules.
Patents, renewal of, 3082, 11016, 11021.
Port Arthur dry dock subsidy, 10079.
Prince Albert homestead entry. *See* Donaldson.
Public Works estimates
Buildings, 11483-11494.
Dredging, 11502-11507.

Rogers, Hon. Robert—Cont.
Generally, 11079-11098, 11143-11199, 12114.
Harbours and rivers, 11466-11482, 11495-11502..
Miscellaneous, 11509.
Roads and bridges, 11507.
Telegraph lines, 11508, 11512.
Railway Commissioner, chief, salary of, 9919.
Rideau Hall improvements, 6232.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7693, 8921.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6526.
Saskatchewan elections, 5733.
Saskatoon Dominion lands clerk, dismissal of, 6747.
Volunteer bounty, 8912, 9943.

Roper, Commander, services of, 6255.

Rosenfeldt, A. D., employment of, 8647.

Ross, Mr. Duncan C. (West Middlesex)
Banks and banking, 1284, 1897.
Cattle exports to United States, 611, 1366.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5079.
Rural mail routes, 609.

Ross' Mill post office, 1497.

Ross rifle, 6496, 8126.

Roy, Dr. J. N., expedition of, 4057.

Royal assent, 2107, 2125, 4832, 4946, 6939, 6974, 7464, 7501, 10102.

Royal Military College, reported resignation of Colonel Crowe, 10824.

Rules for limitation of debate, 7388, 7468, 7502, 7551, 7638, 7757, 7819, 8227, 8371; div., 8455.
M. that Mr. Hazen be now heard, 7412; div., 7413.
M. for previous question, 7415; div., 8453.
Interpretation of, 9352-9370, 9445, 9451, 9571-9591.
Proposed amdt., Mr. A. K. Maclean, 7695; ruled out, 7715.

Rules of the House. *See* **Parliamentary procedure, Rules for limitation of Debate** *and* **Speaker.**

Rural mail services, 609, 2177, 3416, 3456, 6938, 7038, 7218, 7616, 7810, 7812, 7890, 8037, 8652, 10069, 12103.

Russell county postmasters, 593.

Russian Canadians sent to Siberia, 7636, 7813, 10067.

Russian immigrants, treatment of, 10529, 10955.

Ste. Adelaide de Pabos breakwater, 962, 1157.

St. Charles, Mba., rifle range, 8126.

St. Charles river works, 698, 4286, 6258, 6417, 6984, 8461, 8641. *See also* Quebec Harbour.

St. Fabien postmistress, appointment of, 3893.

St. Gabriel de Brandon public building site, 2166.

St. Gerard de Magella breakwater, 3549.

St. Germain wharf, 2173.

St. Godfroy buoy, 10415.

St. Irenée lighthouse keeper, 2619.

St. John Ambulance Association, 6166, 6302.

St. John and Quebec Railway, 622, 11671, 11691.

St. John harbour improvements, 4279.

St. Lawrence river
Accidents to navigation in, 588.
Channel buoys, 10413.
Damming of, 800, 1165, 1559.
Ice conditions in, 3034.
Water levels, 6509, 6533.

St. Lin
Post office, 800.
Public building, 3549.

Ste. Marthe postmaster, 809.

St. Mary's river fishery guardian, 7809.

St. Peters bay wharf, 3035.

St. Peters canal, 798, 962, 971, 1365, 1556, 3183, 6625.

St. Pierre de Sorel postmaster, 3415.

St. Roch des Aulnaies customs officer, 2615.

Sackville wharf, 6499.

Salmon River Indian school, 1158, 1292.

Salvation Army and convicts, 6289.

Saskatchewan
Coal lands, 3420.
Female labour in, 3414.
Forest and fire rangers, 630, 631.

Sault Ste. Marie canal, 629.

Savings Banks, Quebec, Bill. Res., 10145. 1r., 10147. 2r. and com., 10524. 3r., 10527.

Sayabec postmaster, 2170.

Scatarie island fog alarm keeper, 631.

Schaffner, Mr. F. L. (Souris)
Animal contagious diseases, 9619.
Banks and banking, 10312.
Grain Bill, 9896.
Immigration from United States, 6253.
Interest, rates of to agriculturists, 1167.
Volunteer bounty, 8919.

School lands, western, sales of, 3419.

Scott Antarctic expedition, 3452.

Scott, Sir Richard, death of, 8457.

Scows, steel hopper, tenders for, 4426.

Seamanship, London, England, examinations in, 2110.

Secretary of State estimates, 11546.

Seed grain for Quebec, 8649.

Seguin, Mr. Paul A. (L'Assomption)
Dismissals
Joliette keeper of arsenal, 1555.
Radstock postmaster, 1502.
Terrebonne postmaster, 617.
Joliette customs officer, 1498, 1502, 1503.
Kildare postmaster, resignation of, 1498.
L'Assomption public works, 801, 3549, 9342, 11805.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4047, 5687.
Rules for limitation of debate, 8351.
St. Gerard de Magella breakwater, 3549.
St. Lin
Post office, 800.
Public building, 3549.

Selkirk returning officer, 962.

Senate reform, 10822.

Seven Islands lightkeeper, 9222.

Sevigny, Mr. Albert (Dorchester)
Banque Internationale, 2242.
Canadian Biscuit Company, 4023.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4498, 4698, 4838, 5451, 9294.
Pilotage Commission, 2374.

Sexsmith, Mr. John A. (East Peterborough)
Agricultural estimates, 10390.
Banks and banking, 10340.
Fruit industry, 2279.
Railway divisional points, removal of, 7718.

Sharpe, Mr. Samuel (North Ontario)
Accountants' Association, 3979.
Banks and banking, 1166, 1910, 10096-10134, 10286-10374.
Companies Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 150.

Sharpe, Mr. Samuel—Cont.
Farmers Bank inquiry, 629, 803.
Fenian raid veterans, 612.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds, purchase of, 1577.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1724.
Parliamentary procedure: Second appeal on one question, 5889.
Privilege, 5149.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 2960.
Standard Paint Company, 7615.

Shediac fishery overseer, 3028.

Sheep, purchase and sale of, 645.

Sheet Harbour Passage wharf, 6254.

Shellfish Commission, 2619.

Shipping
Casualties in Canada, 4166.
Registered tons of, 1561.

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Guysborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Canada, its prosperity, 450.
Transportation, 451.
Reciprocity with United States, 453.
Naval defence, 454.
Cement duty, 457.
Agriculture, aid to, 458.
Highways improvement, 458.
Government pledges, 459.
Dismissals, 461.
By-elections, 463.
Age limit for appointments, 800.
Agriculture, aid to, 458, 8087.
Banks and banking, 10133.
Boylston-South Manchester mail service, 4425.
Buoy contracts, 4427, 6182, 6947.
Canada-Jamaica trade, 1019.
Canadian coasting trade, 1561.
Canso lobster hatchery, 627, 9950.
Cars, official private, purchase of, 798.
Civil Service Commission, 6469.
Cole Harbour wharf, 3033.
Companies Act, 3025.
Country Harbour postmaster, 8462.
Customs estimates, 8701, 8710, 8733.
Customs officials in Guysborough, 8857.
Dismissals, 461, 860, 993, 6184, 8151, 8701, 8710, 8733, 9949, 12099.
Clementsport postmaster, 701.
Ehler, W. E., 8133.
Guysborough fishery officer, 631.
Half Island Cove postmaster, 700.
Middle Country Harbour postmaster, 701.

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—Cont.
Mulgrave preventive officer, 639.
Munro, W. L., 10687, 10703.
Newchester postmaster, 3179.
Richards, Stephen, 10770.
Sonora postmaster, 701.
Stormont postmaster, 632.
Sydney postmaster, 3555.
Dredging at Little Passage, 7468.
Duchemin, Mr. H. P., payments to, 1016, 8130, 8462.
Erinville post office, 7616.
Esquimalt dry dock, 8641.
Express charges on fish, 6256.
Fenian Raid veterans, 6418, 6509, 6662.
Fisheries
Advisory board, 603.
Bounty, 8461.
Licenses to Japanese, 1165.
Lobster licenses, 9950.
Protection to on Pacific coast, 3031.
Salmon, 2616, 12048.
Shellfish commission, 2619.
Goldboro lobster hatchery, 628.
Goulman's Point breakwater, 4424.
Government Railways provident fund, 726, 765.
Gunhild, steamer, 1741.
Guysborough
Buoy contractors, 4427.
Charles Cove mail service, 626.
Fishery guardians, 1498.
Heatherton mail service, 1364.
Lobster packers, 4427.
Trap licenses, 626.
Harbours equipment of, 8047.
Immigration, 1164, 11555.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 1807, 8563, 8871.
Dismissals, 8151.
Employees, transfer of, 643.
Estimates, 6775.
Freight cars, 1156.
Guysborough branch, 583, 1952, 1992.
Pension fund, 8151.
Isaac's Harbour
Buoys, 802.
Lobster hatchery, 959.
Japanese Treaty, 7173.
Labourers pay on public works, 959.
Larry's River-Charlos Cove mail contract, 2726.
Life-saving stations, 1735, 6190, 12053.
Lobster fishing licenses, 9950.
Long's post office, 9218.
Mail bag locks, 7215, 8124, 8649, 9215.
Manila rope, price of, 10414.

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—Cont.
Marine and Fisheries estimates, 10684-10738, 10770, 10806.
Minister of Public Works, proposed censure of, 10247.
Montreal
Harbour Commissioners, 9842.
Harbour master, 1499.
Murray, David, salary of, 959.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1243, 4284, 4472, 4590, 5252, 5699, 5904, 9323, 9968.
Newfoundland imports and exports, 4168.
New Harbour
Breakwater, 9842, 12121.
Postmaster, 7811, 8462.
Newspaper patronage list, 8124.
New Westminster harbour, 2544.
North Fraser harbour, 2589.
Ocean freight, 1561.
Ottawa water supply, 8628.
Oyster Ponds preventive officer, 7465.
Panama California exposition, 7220.
Panama canal, 965.
Pelagic sealing, 2724.
Port Bickerton buoys, 5152.
Post Office
Departmental purchases, 9215.
Estimates, 11419, 11440.
Savings banks, 1561, 1741, 6481.
Privilege, 1168.
Radiotelegraphy, regulation of, 784.
Railways and Canals estimates, 11316, 11320.
Roper, Commander, services of, 6255.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7587.
St. Mary's River fishery guardian, 7809.
Salmon fisheries, 2616, 12048.
Sault Ste. Marie canal traffic, 629.
Seed, impure, 10393.
Senate reform, 10822.
Sheet Harbour-Sherbrooke mail service, 3121.
Shellfish commission, 2619.
Shipbuilding in Canada, 10411.
Shipping at Canadian ports, 1561.
South African trade from St. John, 7212.
South Manchester post office, 3892.
Steamboat inspection, 914.
Steam trawling, 1499, 2009, 3282, 3318.
Sydney postmaster, appointment of, 3551.
Telegraphs and telephones, nationalization of, 3415.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11890, 11902.
Torbay lightkeeper, 7811.
Tracadie road postmaster, appointment of, 701.
Trent canal, 11266.

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—Cont.
Victoria, B.C.
Breakwater, 8461.
Post Office, 11202.
White Head customs officer, 2168.
Yukon telegraph service, 4167.

Sixth Hussars, 9342.

Smith, Mr. Wm. (South Ontario)
Animal contagious diseases, 9616.
Canadian Medical Association, 3877.
Dismissals in South Ontario, 869, 6894.
Experimental farms, 10276.
Fruit marking, 9683.
Horse breeding, 10404.

Solicitor General, office of, 618, 2656.

Sorel
Marine railway, 581.
Pontbriand wharf, purchase of, 584, 970.
Work shops, 7889.

Soulanges canal, superintendent of, 8857.

Souris breakwater, 5152.

South Africa, trade with from St. John, 7212.

South African Veterans' Scrip, 601, 1097, 1290, 1370, 3892. *See also* Volunteer Bounty and Veterans.

Southampton Railway Company, 10415.

South Manchester post office, 3892.

South Pole Expedition. *See* **Scott.**

Speaker (Hon. T. S. Sproule), rulings of. *See also* **Parliamentary procedure.**
Adjournment motions, 3452, 7827, 7839, 7842, 7847, 7849, 8464.
Anticipating notice on order paper, 6642.
Authority of Speaker to resume chair without com. report, 6161, 6164, 6339, 6372-6374.
Chair, reflections on action of, 9701-9707.
Appeal and div., 9707.
Disorder, resuming chair to stop, 6018, 6020, 6022, 6161, 6374.
House of Commons staff, classification of, 11958.
Indulgence of House, meaning of, 1986.
Interim report of com., discussion of, 10528.
Irrelevance, 7014, 7174, 7836, 7839.
Miller, R. C., case of, 3361, 3645, 3651, 3663, 3741, 3745. 5154.
Money grant, amendment of, 11792, 11794, 11797, 11844, 11856, 12093.
Naming of member, 6019.

Speaker (Hon. T. S. Sproule)—Cont.
Naval Aid Bill
Introductory resolution necessary, 693, 912.
Amendments out of order, 3259, 3261, 3901.
Notice, sufficiency of, 7694.
Official documents quoted from, tabling of, 7926, 7944, 8012, 9224.
Out of order proposed amendment after motion for previous question, 7715.
Papers, tabling of, 7211, 9224.
Point of order, permission of discussion on, 4825.
Press comments on proceedings in House: when not quotable, 7457, 7955.
Previous question, m. for
Form of, 7413.
When admissible, 7417.
Privilege, matter of
How far a member may go in stating, 3266, 3270.
Press statements not debatable as, 713, 1984, 2266, 3266.
Motions arising from without notice, 3663.
Proper time to bring up, 1986.
Questions and answers
Criticism of answers, 2372, 3041, 6877.
Form of answer optional, 697, 2720.
Lengthy answers, 3042, 3118, 7385.
Questions without notice, 6736, 7036, 7039.
Statements in questions, members responsible for, 8122, 9345.
Recalcitrant witness
Motions for summons to without notice, 3361.
Motion for committal without notice, 3663.
Refusal of members to obey order of Chair, 6040.
Relevance, 7975.
Speaker, action of, challengable only on notice of motion, 6162, 6373.
Unparliamentary expressions, 7715, 7865, 8262, 8263, 8299, 8385, 8388, 8496.

Stag Harbour buoys, 11074.

Stallions, thoroughbred, bonuses on, 3742.

Stanfield, Mr. John (Colchester)
Animal contagious diseases, 9618.
Government Railways provident fund, 765.
Intercolonial Railway employees, transfer of, 644.
Sheep, purchase and sale of, 648.

Steamboat inspection, 12058.

Steamers. *See* **Government Steamers.**

Steamship subsidies. *See* **Trade and Commerce estimates,** *also* **Subsidies.**

Steele, Mr. M. (South Perth)
Agriculture, Department of, mailing list, 624.
Canadian Medical Association, 3855.
Farm Weeds, distribution of, 624.
Farmers in Canada, number of, 625.
Meek divorce bill, 11738.
Parcel post, 11833.

Steel Hopper Scows, tenders for, 5151.

Steel rails, remission of duty on, 802, 1737, 2180, 5147, 6840-6875.

Stefansson expedition, 3552, 4167, 6272, 12058.

Stellarton public building site, 960, 1162.

Stevens, Mr. H. H. (Vancouver)
Accountants' Association, 3784.
Burrard Inlet Tunnel and Bridge Company, 3405.
Canadian Medical Association, 3852.
Canada Permanent Insurance Company, 5146.
Chinese opium traffic, 4020.
Japanese treaty, 7010, 7104.
Kitsilano Indian reserve, 8494.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1222, 3813, 4491, 4702, 4805, 5029, 9379.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3381.
Vancouver Harbour Commission, 8501.

Stewart, Mr. Dugald (Lunenburg)
Coderre, Hon. Louis, charges against, 6149.
Sheet Island Passage and Sober Island wharves, 6254.
Steam trawling, 3334.

Stewart, Mr. Thos. J. (West Hamilton)
Doors, import of, 2172.

Strikes, commission to investigate, 6840.

Subsidies
Mail and steamship, 6269, 11457.
Railway, 11669, 11801, 11843.

Supply Bills
For $33,044,961.78. Res., 6936. 1r., 2r., com. and 3r., 6944.
For $123,288,860.64. Res., 11602. 1r., 11603. 2r. and com., 11603. 3r., 11668.
For $23,470,316.65. Res., 1r., 2r. and com., 12133. 3r., 12139-12161.
For details see titles of departments.

Supreme Court Act Amendment Bill. Res., 8052. 1r., 8061. 2r., 8568. Com., 8568, 9822. 3r., 9836. Senate amdt., 10680.

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Agriculture credits, 3163.
Canadian Medical Association, 3857, 3872.
Farm labourers and domestic servants, commission for, 1951.
Horse breeding, 3742, 10400, 10406.
Immigration to Ontario, 11549-11559.
Seed, impure, 10392.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11886.

Swamp lands in Manitoba, 3888.

Swift Current lands office, 10822.

Sydney
Postmastership, 3551.
Railway facilities, 6787.

Tanner's Point lighthouse, 9341.

Tariff Bill. Res., 10628. 1r., 10651. 2r., 11459. Com. and 3r., 11460.
See also Budget *and* 102, 599, 2010, 6435, 6943, 9639.

Taylor, Mr. James D. (New Westminster)
Banks and banking, 11592.
Debates, French translation of, 11962.
Donaldson homestead entry, 7961.
Fisheries reference, the Dominion and British Columbia, 4064.
Freight rates, equality of, 10966.
New Westminster Harbour Commissioners, 2540, 2573, 3009.
North Fraser Harbour Commissioners, 2581, 3012.

Technical Education Commission, 961, 2724, 3185, 11921.

Telegraph and telephones, nationalization of, 3415, 4401.

Telegraph Service, Inter-Imperial, Bill. 1r., 9009. Res., 9944. 2r. and com., 11656. 3r., 11668. Senate amdts., 12161.

Temiscouata public works, 11804.

Terminal Elevators, 8679, 9122, 12108.
Sites for, 625, 3419.

Thoburn, Mr. William (North Lanark)
Chairman, acting as, 4817.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway bonds, purchase of, 1580.

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Agriculture Department estimates, 10266.
Canadian Medical Association, 3870.
Mint, Ottawa, 8666, 9108.
Mounted Police, Royal Northwest, 6475.
National Gallery of Canada, 9005.

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Banks and banking, 2467, 10345.
Canadian Northern Railway mileage, 11570.
Fruit growing industry, 9676.
Grain Bill, 9890.
Moosejaw homestead inspectors, 805.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2681, 2704, 4688, 5575, 9495.
North Atlantic freight rates, 9073.
Post Office estimates, 11273.
Power divorce bill, 11744.
Regina homestead inspectors, 805.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7883.
Sintaluta postmaster, dismissal of, 10413.
Smith, Jacob K., employment of, 11200.
Steel rails, remission of duty on, 6871.
Swift Current homestead inspectors, 805.

Thornton, Mr. Chas. J. (Durham)
Fruit marking, 9685, 11938.

Three Rivers
Coal dock inspector, 8463, 8645, 8741.
Public building, 1550, 1744, 9840.

Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway Subsidy Bill. Res., 11802. 1r., 11803. 2r. and com., 11873. 3r., 11905.

Titles of Honour Bill. 1r., 1547.

Tobin, Mr. Edmund W. (Richmond-Wolfe)
Bromptonville mail service, 5154, 12100.
Dismissals
Disraeli postmaster, 637.
St. Fortunat postmaster, 637.
St. François Xavier de Brampton postmaster, 636.
Stratford Centre postmaster, 637, 861.
Disraeli public building, 6742, 8131.
Naval forces of the Empire, 9421.
Public Works estimates, 12115.

Torbay lightkeeper, 7811.

Toronto Terminals Bill. 1r., 11072. 2r., com. and 3r., 11466.

Tracadie
Lazaretto, 597.
Lobster hatchery, 962.

Trade and Commerce Department estimates, 6728, 12106.

Transatlantic mail service, 7204, 10417.

Transportation facilities, 307, 337, 8047, 11773.

Trawling, steam, 1499, 2009, 3281, 3318.

Trent canal, 10825, 11262, 11294.

Trois Pistoles breakwater, 11200.

Tuberculosis, Friedmann treatment for, 1556, 4169.

Turgeon, Mr. Onesiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Intercolonial Railway matters, 128.
Reciprocity with United States, 129.
Naval defence, 133.
Macdonald election, 133.
Banks and banking, 10115, 10285.
Bathurst
Harbour improvements, 12125.
Letter box service, 6496.
Beresford district, proposed breakwater, 1737.
Dismissal of Edouard Chiasson, 8726.
Dredge Restigouche, 6743.
Gloucester, N.B., mail service, 3891.
Highways improvement, 8539.
House of Commons ice supply, 12134.
Intercolonial Railway
Branch lines, 128, 1773.
Freight rates, 12067.
Naval forces of the Empire, 2564, 2657, 4618, 5431, 9414.
Railway subsidies, 11670.
Railways and Canals Department estimates, 10885.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7662.
Steam trawling, 3344.
Tracadie lazaretto, 597.

Turpentine. *See* **Adulteration.**

Turriff, Mr. John G. (Assiniboia)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
By-elections, 265, 278.
Naval defence, 266.
Highways improvement, 267.
National Transcontinental railway, 268.
Tariff, 269.
Reciprocity with United States, 271.
Cement duty, 274.
Alameda postmaster, dismissal of, 657, 842.
Banks and banking, 1284, 2450.
Bayfield, H. A., employment of, 3030.
Brandon quarter section, sale of, 7385.
Canadian Northern Railway, 4367.
Canadian Pacific Railway
Control of by Railway Commission Bill. 1r., 2415.
Irrigated lands, 4423.
Issue of new stock, 632.
Canadian Western Railway, 4410.
Coal lands, Saskatoon, 3420.
Dickin, George, homestead inspector, 1161.

Turriff, Mr. John G.—Cont.
Dismissals for political partisanship, 815.
Ditching machinery, duty on, 6659.
Dorsett, W. E., investigating commissioner, 1159.
Dumping clause, 594.
Estevan homestead inspectors, 700.
Imperial Underwriters' Corporation, 4414.
Mail bag locks, 7216.
Moosejaw post office investigation, 7622.
Morrison, F. A., employment of, 1496, 6255.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3457, 4559, 5197, 5214.
New Westminster jail: refusal to accept prisoners, 1363.
North Empire Fire Insurance Company, 4411.
Post Office Department, rented offices for, 8359.
Prince Rupert public building, 2620.
Revelstoke public building, 2620.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 2957, 3312.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7831.
Rutherford, John, forest ranger, 622.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6537.
Saskatchewan coal lands, 3420.
Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, 2603.
West Indian trade agreement, 2044.
Young, Murdock, employment of, 3030.

Union Life Assurance Company, 8227, 8360.

United Shoe Machinery Company, 11667.

Vallée des Erables post office, 1161.

Vancouver Harbour Commissioners Bill. Res., 7292, 8500. 1r., 8507. 2r. and com., 8900. 3r., 8995.

Vegetables, tariff on, 6943.

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (Maisonneuve)
Alien Labour Law
Inspector, dismissal of, 8121.
Photo-engravers, importation of, 7756.
Antwerp Dominion agent, 3035.
Budget
Economic conditions in Canada, 10465.
Cost of living, comparative statements, 10468.
Foodstuffs and cold storage, 10482.
Coal, supplies and prices of, 10490.
Tariff on necessaries, 10494.
Cold storage warehouses, 1558.
Dominion steel works, 11566.
Hough, John, employment of, 10415.
Inland Revenue Department, wages of cooper for, 12108.

Verville, Mr. Alphonse—Cont.
Intercolonial Railway
Conciliation board, 6256.
Wages, 6257.
Labour, hours on public works, 695.
Letter carrier service, 1951.
Magdalen Islands, wireless letter, 3033.
Maisonneuve
Election suit, 3036.
Postal station, 612.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3098, 5040, 5989, 6026, 5741, 9502.
Public Works estimates, 11082.
Rules for limitation of debate, 7865.

Veterans grants to. *See* **Fenian Raid** *and* **South Africa.**

Veterinary Director General: visit to Nova Scotia, 8857.

Victoria, B. C.
Breakwater, 8461.
Drill hall, 4061.
Post office, 11202.

Victoria Memorial Museum, 6234.

Volunteer Bounty Bill. Res., 8905. 1r., 8921. 2r., 9622. Com., 9941. 3r., 9944.

Voters' Lists, printing of, 6730.

Warnock, Mr. David (Macleod)
Alberta land sale, 7467.
Animal contagious diseases, 9616, 9863.
Banks and banking, 2465, 10290.
Canadian Western Railway Company, 4409.
Forest reserves and parks, 11654.
Mail bag locks, 7617.
Meat inspection, 6290.
Naval forces of the Empire, 3220, 5030, 5728.
Volunteer bounty, 8919.

Water Powers. *See* **Railway Belt.**

Webster, Mr. John (Brockville)
Horse breeding, 10399, 10405.
Railway divisional points, removal of, 7718, 9920.
Seed, impure, 10395.

Weichel, Mr. William G. (North Waterloo)
Naval forces of the Empire, 3524.
Welland Canal
Construction work, 934.
Resident engineer, 934.

West Indian Steamship Service, 6735.

West Indian Trade Agreement Bill. Res., 889. 1r., 910. 2r., 2012. Com., 2042, 2110. 3r., 8742.

West Indian Trade Agreement Bill—Cont.
Proposed amendments
Mr. Carvell, 8747; div., 8812.
Mr. Pugsley, 8771; div., 8812.
See also 26, 43, 601, 699, 2832, 6500.

Wheat and Oats, imports of, 1291.

White, Mr. Gerald V. (North Renfrew)
Georgian Bay canal, 2628.
Gypsum products, importation of, 2174.

White, Mr. William H. (Victoria, Alta.)
Gray, Ambrose, employment of, 11572.
Mail bag locks, 7618.
Naval forces of the Empire, 5059, 5556, 7294, 7346.
Privilege, 5149.

White, Hon. W. T. (Minister of Finance)
Accountants' Association, 3783.
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Cement duty, 85.
Tariff commission, 102.
Macdonald election, 103.
Reciprocity with United States, 104.
Naval defence, 110.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 111.
Agriculture credits, 3165.
Auditor General's office, 8033.
Banks and banking, 1267, 1841, 2340, 2488, 10086, 10091, 10098, 10100, 10108, 10282-10378, 11576, 11596.
Banque Internationale, 2199, 4278.
Budget, 9624.
Revenue and expenditure, 9625.
Loans maturing, 9629.
Net debt, 9630.
Trade tables, 9632.
Immigration, 9637.
Tariff changes, 9639.
Cement duty, 9645.
Lead bounty, 9657.
Reply to criticisms, 10614.
Cost of living, 10620. *See also* 6442.
Canadian Explosives, Limited, 2575.
Canadian Northern Railway subsidy, 11701, 11790.
Canada Permanent Trust Company, 2607.
Canada Western Trust and Mortgage Company, 2596.
Cement duty, reduction of, 85, 9645.
Departmental char service, 6300.
Dismissals for political partisanship, 813, 993.
Ditching machinery, duty on, 6649.
Dominion notes, printing of, 6486.

White, Hon. W. T.—Cont.
Farmers Bank inquiry: printing of report, 6734.
Finance Department estimates, 6278, 6481.
Foresters, Independent Order of, 7181.
Fruit and vegetables, duty on, 6943.
Government savings banks, 6481.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company
Bonds, purchase of, 1566.
Government loan to 11799, 11865.
Guarantee Company of North America, 3404.
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company, 2595.
Imperial Underwriters' Corporation, 4415, 6196.
Japanese Treaty, 6972.
Landry, Andrew, pardon of, 931, 6594.
Lead bounties, 9657, 10157, 10527.
Militia estimates, 11044, 11066.
Mint, Ottawa, 8659, 9102.
Naval forces of the Empire, 110, 5107, 5772, 5978, 5992, 9134, 12149, 12171.
Charge of obstruction, 6500.
Parliamentary procedure
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 5993.
Offensive personal references, 5772.
Rules of the House. *See that title.*
Patents, renewal of, 3780.
Public Works estimates, 11160.
Regal Trust Company, 3413.
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, 3367.
Rules of the House, 6330, 6371, 8263.
St. John Ambulance Association, 6302.
Savings banks in Quebec, 10145, 10525.
Steel rails, remission of duty on, 6851.
Tariff, 102, 6442, 9624, 9639.
Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway subsidy, 11880.
Union Life Assurance Company, 8366.
Western Canada Mortgage Corporation, 2603.
West Indian trade agreement, 2026, 8785.

White Head customs officer, salary of, 2168.

White slave traffic. *See* **Criminal Code Amendment,** *also* **Immigration, female.**

Wickham West post office, 7616.

Wilcox, Mr. Oliver (North Essex)
Cable rates, 3031.
Dismissals, 850.
Ditching machinery, duty on, 6651.
Naval forces of the Empire, 1322, 4725, 9491.

Wilson, Mr. Charles A. (Laval)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Naval defence, 560.
Monk, Mr., resignation of, 561.
British preference, 564.
Transportation, 566.
Civil Service reform, 566.
Automobiles, Government, 1154.
Civil Service vacancies and appointments, 598.
Criminal Code amendments, 10078.
Customs estimates, 8016.
Des Prairies river dredging, 935.
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway connection with Montreal, 933.
House of Commons law branch, 2720.
Justice Department estimates: penitentiaries, 10975, 10980, 10996.
Long Sault dam, proposed, 1165.
Monk, Hon. F. D., retirement of, 561.
Naval forces of the Empire, 4683, 5001, 5090, 6011, 5589. *See also* 560.
Parliamentary procedure
Chairman, temporary, appointment of, 6011.
Friday sittings, validity of after midnight, 5008.
Penitentiary Act amendment, 11330-11344.
Public Works estimates, 11153.
Roy, Dr. J. N., voyage of, 4057.
St. Lawrence water levels, 6533.
St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary dismissals, 944.
Trent canal, 11266.

Wilson, Mr. Gordon C. (Wentworth)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech
Reciprocity with United States, 528.
Tariff, 536.
Trade of Canada, 538.
Cement duty, 542.
Pre-election promises, 542.
Transportation, 545.
Naval defence, 546.

Winnipeg city water supply, 10751.

Winnipeg river water power leases, 9839.

Winnipegosis lake, fishing in, 6259.

Wire for fencing and free list, 585.

Wireless Telegraphy. *See* **Radiotelegraphy** *and* **Telegraph Service.**

Witness, recalcitrant. *See* **Miller.**

Wolseley, Field Marshal, death of, 6733.

Wrecking plants, 6177.

Wright, Mr. William (Muskoka)
Banks and banking, 10094.
Naval forces of the Empire, 9464.

Wynyard Dominion lands agency, 3893.

Yacoloff, reprieve of, 1839.

Yarmouth
Customs officers, 1368.
Dredging, 3033, 3890.
Marine hospital, 4059.
Post office, 3034.

Yarmouth North post office, 2726.

Yorkton homestead inspectors, 1018.

Yukon
Government of, 6480.
Telegraph service, 4167.